

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 17, 1909.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.
Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

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

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications 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 by the court relating to the following causes:

In the cause of the vessel schooner *Liberty*, Josiah Rich, master (S. Doc. No. 100);

In the cause of the vessel sloop *George*, John Grant, master (S. Doc. No. 101);

In the cause of the vessel ship *Minerva*, Solomon Hopkins, master (S. Doc. No. 102);

In the cause of the vessel schooner *Nancy*, Henry H. Kennedy, master (S. Doc. No. 103); and

In the cause of the vessel brig *Anna*, Benjamin Chase, master (S. Doc. No. 104).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of James Taylor, executor of Henry H. Sibley v. United States (S. Doc. No. 105), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial to the Congress of the United States respecting national aid for the construction of main highways.

By this, its memorial to the Congress of the United States, the legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully submits the following statements:

Whereas there is a general demand by the people of the United States and of the State of Wisconsin for better and more permanent public roads: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That it is the sense of the people of this State that the National Government should aid in the permanent construction of the highways, and that the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to extend some such aid by the appropriation of a percentage of the cost of such permanently improved highways throughout the different States of the Union where and whenever a State and the several counties thereof shall by statute extend a like aid in so permanently improving their highways, or that the loan of public money by the Treasurer of the United States be authorized for such construction or the aiding thereof, or by both the appropriation and loan, and in such sums and under such conditions as may be by said Congress determined and deemed advisable; be it further

Resolved, That the governor be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

L. H. BANCROFT,
Speaker of the Assembly.

C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

JOHN STRANGE,
President of the Senate.

F. E. ANDREWS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to remove the tariff on lumber.

Whereas the present law provides for high tariff on lumber to the great injury of the people of this State and of the Nation; and

Whereas numerous industries in this State are greatly injured by such tariff on lumber; and

Whereas the said tariff on lumber, keeping out the lumber products of other countries, stimulates and compels the destruction of our own forests and thereby hinders if not nullifies the efforts of the state forest department of our State to preserve our forests and conserve our wood supply: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States speedily to abolish the tariff on lumber forthwith: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of Congress and each United States Senator representing this State, and to

the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the United States Senate.

L. H. BANCROFT,
Speaker of the Assembly.

C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

(Under protest.) JOHN STRANGE,
President of the Senate.

F. E. ANDREWS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

BILL INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BEVERIDGE:

A bill (S. 2625) granting an increase of pension to John H. Kimmel; to the Committee on Pensions.

TAXES ON INCOMES.

Mr. BROWN. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The joint resolution (S. J. R. 39) to amend the Constitution relative to incomes was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 39.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring), That the following section be submitted to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, shall be valid and binding as a part of the Constitution of the United States:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect direct taxes on incomes without apportionment among the several States according to population."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McLAURIN. I think if the Senator from Nebraska will change his amendment to the Constitution so as to strike out the words "and direct taxes" in clause 3, section 2, of the Constitution, and also to strike out the words "or other direct" in clause 4 of section 9 of the Constitution, he will accomplish all that his amendment proposes to accomplish and not make a constitutional amendment for the enacting of a single act of legislation.

Mr. BROWN. That may be true, Mr. President; but my purpose is to confine it to income taxes alone, and to forever settle the dispute by referring the subject to the several States. I am not wedded to any particular phraseology in the amendment, but I have introduced it, it has already been referred to the committee, and I am satisfied with that.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

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

Mr. CLAY. I introduce an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table until I shall see proper to call it up.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLAY to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States and for other purposes, viz: Insert the following:

771e. From and after the passage of this act every person, association, copartnership, or corporation who or which shall in his, its, or their own behalf, or as agent, engage in the business of making or offering to make contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions respecting the purchase or sale, or purchase and sale, of any grain, provisions, raw or unmanufactured cotton, stock, bonds, or other securities wherein both parties thereto or such person, association, copartnership, or corporation above named contemplate or intend that such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions shall be or may be closed, adjusted, or settled according to or with reference to the public market quotations of prices made on any board of trade or exchange upon which the commodities or securities referred to in said contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions are dealt in, and without a bona fide transaction on such board of trade or exchange, or wherein both parties or such person, association, copartnership, or corporation above named shall contemplate or intend that such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions shall be or may be deemed closed or terminated when the public market quotations of prices made on such board of trade or exchange for the articles or securities named in such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions shall reach a certain figure, and every person, association, copartnership, or corporation who or which shall in his or its own behalf, or as agent, conduct what is commonly known as a bucket shop, shall pay a stamp tax of 10 cents on each \$100 in value or fraction thereof of the merchandise covered or pretended to be covered, and also a tax of 10 cents on each \$100 on the face value or fraction thereof of all stocks, bonds, or other securities covered or pretended to be covered by each and all of such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions: *Provided, however*, That the payment of any tax imposed by this paragraph shall not be held or construed to exempt any such person, association, copartnership, or corporation from any penalty or punishment provided by the laws of any State for carrying on such business, or the making of such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions within such State, or in any manner to authorize the

commencement or continuance of such business, or the making of any such contracts, agreements, trades, or transactions contrary to the laws of such State, or in any place prohibited by municipal law; and on or before the 1st day of April, 1910, every such person, association, copartnership, or corporation, as aforesaid, shall for each office or place of business, and for each branch office or place of business wherever established, pay a special tax of \$500, and on or before the 1st day of July, 1910, and annually thereafter, for every such office or branch office a special tax of \$500, and such taxes shall be in addition to all other special taxes imposed by this act. Every person, association, copartnership, or corporation proposing to engage in or continue the business aforesaid shall, before commencing such business, file with the collector or proper deputy collector of the district in which it is proposed to carry on such business a notice in writing under oath, and in such form as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe, stating the name of the person, association, copartnership, or corporation intending to engage in such business, the names of the members of any such association or copartnership, and the names of the officers of any such corporation, together with the residences of all the individuals whose names are thus required, and the place (including street number) where such business is to be carried on, and it shall be the duty of the collector of internal revenue to keep in his office a book in which shall be recorded a complete copy of all such notices, and such book shall be open to public inspection. Every person, association, copartnership, or corporation conducting or transacting the business aforesaid shall keep or cause to be kept just and true books of account, wherein shall be plainly and legibly recorded on the day of the making of every such contract, agreement, trade, or transaction a complete and exact specification thereof, including the date thereof, the other party thereto, and the quantity, price, and the gross amount in value of each article or commodity covered or pretended to be covered by each such contract, agreement, trade, or transaction, and such books shall at all reasonable times and hours be subject to the inspection of the collector, deputy collector, and the inspector of internal revenue or any duly authorized agent of the Internal Revenue Department, and every such person, association, copartnership, or corporation shall deliver to the other party to each such contract, agreement, trade, or transaction, at the time of making the same, a written memorandum also containing the complete and exact specification thereof above referred to, to which the proper stamp shall be, before delivery, affixed. Every person, association, copartnership, or corporation who shall, in his or their own behalf, or as agent, engage in or continue in the business hereinbefore defined without having filed the notice herein required, or who shall fail or refuse to keep any such book or make any return, report, or affidavit required as aforesaid, or who shall make a false, fraudulent, or partial return, report, or affidavit, or shall fail or refuse to deliver a written memorandum, as hereinbefore required, or shall in any other respect violate any of the provisions of this paragraph, shall, besides being liable for the amount of the tax or taxes herein prescribed, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every such offense, pay a fine of not less than \$500 nor more than \$5,000, or be imprisoned not less than three months nor more than two years, or both, in the discretion of the court. All provisions of law now in force relating to the collection, recovery, and enforcement of taxes, fines, and penalties imposed under the law concerning internal revenue and not inconsistent with the provisions of this paragraph shall extend and apply to the recovery and enforcement of the taxes, fines, and penalties imposed by this paragraph.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed, and the first bill on the calendar will be proceeded with.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the amendment presented by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] last evening to paragraph 407.

Mr. HALE. I think we should have a quorum present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maine 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	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nelson
Beveridge	Clay	Gallinger	Oliver
Borah	Crane	Guggenheim	Overman
Brandegee	Crawford	Hale	Page
Briggs	Culbertson	Heyburn	Penrose
Bristow	Cullom	Hughes	Perkins
Brown	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Bulkeley	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Root
Burkett	Davis	Jones	Scott
Burnham	Depew	Kean	Smoot
Burrows	Dick	La Follette	Sutherland
Burton	Dillingham	Lodge	Tillman
Carter	Dolliver	McCumber	Warren
Chamberlain	Fletcher	McLaurin	
Clapp	Flint	Martin	

Mr. GALLINGER. I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that paragraph 407 be taken up. An amendment to it was offered last night by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. And it is the pending amendment. The Secretary will read the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the substitute offered by the committee to paragraph 407 it is proposed to insert:

407. Flint-glazed papers, 2½ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; all other surface-coated papers, not specially provided for in

this section, 5 cents per pound; if printed by other than lithographic process, or wholly or partly covered with metal or its solutions, or with gelatin or flock, and marbled or marbled hand-dipped paper, 5 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; parchment papers, imitation parchment and grease-proof papers, supercalendered or otherwise, by whatever name known, weighing 10 or more pounds per ream of 480 sheets, 20 by 30 inches in dimensions, 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; bags and envelopes made wholly or in chief value of imitation parchment or grease-proof paper, 2 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; plain basic photographic papers for albumenizing, sensitizing, or baryta coating, and basic papers for solar and other light printing, valued at 20 cents per pound or more, 3 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem; valued at less than 20 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem; albumenized or sensitized paper, or paper otherwise surface coated for photographic purposes, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph as amended is agreed to. The Secretary will read the next amendment.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the substitute offered by the committee to paragraph 408, the committee proposed to insert:

408. Pictures, calendars, cards, labels, flaps, cigar bands, placards, and other articles, composed wholly or in chief value of paper lithographically printed in whole or in part from stone, metal, or material other than gelatin (except boxes, views of American scenery or objects, and music, and illustrations when forming part of a periodical or newspaper, or of bound or unbound books, accompanying the same, not specially provided for in this section), shall pay duty at the following rates: Labels and flaps, printed in less than eight colors (bronze printing to be counted as two colors), but not printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 20 cents per pound; cigar bands of the same number of colors and printings, 30 cents per pound; labels and flaps printed in eight or more colors, but not printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 30 cents per pound; cigar bands of the same number of colors and printings, 40 cents per pound; labels and flaps, printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 50 cents per pound; cigar bands, printed in whole or in part in metal leaf, 55 cents per pound; all labels, flaps, and bands not exceeding 10 square inches cutting size in dimensions, if embossed or die cut, shall pay the same rate of duty as hereinbefore provided for cigar bands of the same number of colors and printings (but no extra duty shall be assessed on labels, flaps, and bands for embossing or die cutting); booklets, 7 cents per pound; books of paper or other material for children's use, not exceeding in weight 24 ounces each, 6 cents per pound; fashion magazines or periodicals, printed in whole or in part by lithographic process, or decorated by hand, 8 cents per pound; booklets, decorated in whole or in part by hand or by spraying, whether or not lithographed, 15 cents per pound; decalcomanias in ceramic colors, weighing not over 100 pounds per thousand sheets 20 by 30 inches in dimensions, 70 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 100 pounds per thousand sheets 20 by 30 inches in dimensions, 22 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; if backed with metal leaf, 65 cents per pound; all other decalcomanias, except toy decalcomanias, 40 cents per pound; but all the foregoing, if containing less than one-half of 1 inch margin on any side, shall pay, in addition to the rates herein provided, 10 per cent ad valorem; all other articles than those hereinbefore specifically provided for in this paragraph, not exceeding eight one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, 20 cents per pound; exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, and less than 35 square inches cutting size in dimensions, 8½ cents per pound; exceeding 35 square inches cutting size in dimensions, 8 cents per pound, and in addition thereto on all of said articles exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, if either die cut or embossed, one-half of 1 cent per pound; if both die cut and embossed, 1 cent per pound; exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch in thickness, 6 cents per pound; *Provided*, That in the case of articles hereinbefore specified the thickness which shall determine the rate of duty to be imposed shall be that of the thinnest material found in the article; but for the purposes of this paragraph the thickness of lithographs mounted or pasted upon paper, cardboard, or other material, shall be the combined thickness of the lithograph and the foundation on which it is mounted or pasted.

During the reading of the amendment,

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like, before the reading proceeds any further, to know what is the object of increasing the duty in the item in line 9?

Mr. SMOOT. I was not following closely the reading.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand that the item which has just been read is practically a new provision. It did not appear in any former act.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary has just read lines 8 and 9, on page 3. The Senator from Utah desires to know the particular provision of the amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is the item referring to certain articles less than twenty one-thousandths of an inch in thickness.

Mr. CULBERSON. I suggest to the Senator from Utah, with the permission of the Senator from Kansas, who has the floor, that it might be well to explain this entire substitute. It seems to include a great many things not included in the amendment of the committee, and there seem to be a number of increases. There are at least a few that I noted in the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It seems to the Chair it would be well to have the Secretary finish the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; let the reading be finished.

After the reading of the amendment,
 Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—
 Mr. BURKETT. There is a verbal amendment I want to suggest.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. BURKETT. In line 7, page 3, it reads "exceeding eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths." I suppose it means eight thousandths, and should it not read "exceeding eight thousandths and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths?"

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is right; not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of an inch.

Mr. BURKETT. But the word "thousandths" should also come after the word "eight," I should think.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it is necessary to repeat the word "thousandths," because the Senator will notice all the way through it reads the same way. We say "eight and not exceeding twenty one-thousandths," meaning, of course, eight thousandths.

Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Kansas I will state that there are a number of changes here in the lithographic schedule. The labels and flaps are the same as the Dingley rate, but the bands are about 5 cents a pound higher. I explained last night when this paragraph was up for discussion the reason for that advance. It was virtually agreed by the importers themselves that the advance on the cigar bands is a proper one, but they did not desire an advance upon the labels and flaps. If the Senator will notice, he will see that on the labels and flaps we have reduced the House rate 5 cents per pound, but have increased the rate on bands 5 cents per pound. The reason of that is that the bands imported used to come in in sheets, and a rate was paid upon the weight of the sheet. But now they are imported with the band cut ready for use, and it virtually makes a difference of about one-half of the rate formerly charged.

We also have eliminated from the paragraph the view cards that used to come in under the thickness of not exceeding twenty one-thousandths of 1 inch. We have carried those view cards to paragraph 412, and they are greatly advanced. At the time of the Dingley bill postal view cards were unknown in this country, but, as all Senators know, that business has grown to mammoth proportions.

The German importers, under the 5-cent rate that we now have, virtually control this market, as every Senator will see from the importations of that class of goods. The House advanced the rate from 5 to 7 cents a pound. The Senate committee have now advanced it to 15 cents a pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.

I suppose there is no Senator who has not received by mail lately postal cards showing views of America; yes, views of public buildings in Washington, printed on postal cards made in Germany. In order to save this business the committee have decided that the only way of doing it is to put a rate of duty of 15 cents a pound and 25 per cent ad valorem. I will admit that it looks to be a very large increase, and it is an increase of 325 per cent over present law, but nothing short of that, in the opinion of the committee, would save the business to the American lithographer.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee proposed as a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph as amended is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Paragraph 409 was passed over last evening. I ask that it be taken up. The Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] objected to it or asked that it be passed over. Has the Senator any objection now to paragraph 409?

Mr. PILES. I have a communication which I submitted to the committee last night in the hope that it might meet with their favor.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Washington, that the question he submitted was in relation to imitation onionskin paper.

Mr. PILES. Imitation onionskin paper.

Mr. SMOOT. The value of that paper is exceedingly high. The committee feel that the rate that has been reported is the rate necessary to protect that industry.

I ask that paragraph 409 be agreed to.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PILES. I thought I had the floor.

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

Mr. PILES. Not at present. I have a letter which I should like to submit.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington presents a letter which the Secretary, without objection, will read. The Secretary read as follows:

MUTUAL PAPER COMPANY,
 Seattle, Wash., May 27, 1909.

Hon. SAMUEL H. PILES,
 United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully call your attention to paragraph 409 of Schedule M of the Aldrich tariff bill.

You will find included among the papers mentioned in this paragraph imitation onionskin paper.

Imitation onionskin paper is a wood paper, and should not be classified together with writing, bond, and record, handmade and letter papers, all of which are principally manufactured of rag stock, and consequently should not be subject to the same duty levied upon these papers.

The imitation onionskin paper is used for commercial printing purposes and second sheets, and it would be entirely against the interests of the people of this country to levy upon this grade of paper a duty of 3½ cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. This paper is not a luxury, but a necessity. The proposed duty is equivalent to 75 per cent ad valorem, while under the present rate of 25 per cent American interests are amply protected. This high duty would entirely eliminate any further importation, and not only deprive the Treasury of considerable revenue, but weigh heavily upon the interests of the people of our country.

This we submit for your kind consideration.

Respectfully, yours,

W. BRUCE JUDSON,
 Secretary and Manager.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that there was an amendment offered last night to paragraph 409, changing the rate of 3½ cents to 3 cents on this very paper. There is a reduction in this paragraph from 3½ cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem in the present law and in the House bill to 3 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem. Onionskin and imitation onionskin paper is put on a parity with the other papers to remedy an inequality in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. PILES. It is a reduction on the imitation onionskin?

Mr. SMOOT. A reduction of one-half cent a pound on imitation onionskin.

Mr. PILES. I confess that I am not very familiar with the paper business. I ask the Senator if it is such a material reduction as would be a benefit in this matter?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no doubt of it. It is also a reduction to the lowest rate possible to protect the business in this country.

Mr. PILES. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. If I may ask the Senator from Utah, this is very expensive and very thin paper?

Mr. SMOOT. It is very expensive paper and very thin. It is used largely for fine writing paper and not altogether for printing paper.

Mr. KEAN. It is used for copying, is it not, in making a half dozen impressions?

Mr. SMOOT. It is used for that purpose also.

Mr. BRISTOW. I did not hear the conversation between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Utah. Was the Senator referring to onionskin or imitation onionskin paper?

Mr. SMOOT. We were discussing imitation onionskin.

Mr. BRISTOW. There must be some mistake as to the value of imitation onionskin. It is not a very valuable paper.

Mr. SMOOT. There is some, I will admit, made of sulphide pulp and is not very valuable paper, but the great bulk of imitation onionskin paper is paper running from 15, 16, and 17, and sometimes as high as 20 cents a pound. We have reduced, as I said, as proposed by the committee, the rate from 3½ cents to 3 cents.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is reduced from the present law?

Mr. SMOOT. It is reduced from the Dingley law of 3½ cents to 3 cents a pound.

Mr. KEAN. The ad valorem rate is the same?

Mr. SMOOT. The ad valorem rate is the same.

Mr. BRISTOW. While I am on my feet, I should like to inquire the purpose of increasing the duty on typewriter paper. It appears that the duty has been increased from 2 cents to 3½ cents on typewriter paper.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason, I think, is because it comes into a general class of paper, and it is a more harmonious division of the paper as to the rates.

Mr. BRISTOW. But there was practically no importation of typewriter paper last year, and this is an increase of 50 per cent in the duty. It is probably more universally used in correspondence than any paper that is made. It seems to me obviously unjust to the American public that there should be an increase of 50 per cent in duty over the present law on typewriter paper, when there is no importation of it.

Mr. SMOOT. It may be that the very finest—that is, the thin typewriter paper—would come in if we did not have this rate of duty; and I do not think that the advance on that class is going to increase the retail price of typewriter paper.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator will notice in the paragraph writing, letter, note, handmade, drawing, ledger, bond, record, tablet, and typewriter paper have all been increased from 2 cents a pound to 3½ cents a pound; and that is the paper that is used in every commercial institution in the United States. It is an increase on the great bulk of the paper that is used in offices, schools, printing establishments, and everywhere.

Mr. SMOOT. As I remember, all of those papers under present law carry 3½ cents a pound duty. I will look in just a minute.

Mr. President, I call attention to the present law, under which this very typewriter paper, when more than 15 pounds to the ream, pays 3½ cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; but in this bill we have reduced the 3½ cents, the present rate, to 3 cents a pound.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, no; that is—

Mr. SMOOT. I will call the attention of the Senator to the Dingley paragraph, 401, which provides that all these papers, when more than 15 pounds to the ream, shall pay 3½ cents and 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is unchanged. That is more than 15 pounds to the ream; but paper used ordinarily weighs less than 15 pounds.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that is where the Senator is mistaken. The great bulk of typewriter paper and writing paper weighs over 15 pounds to the ream. It must be exceedingly fine paper that would weigh less than 15 pounds to the ream.

Mr. BRISTOW. What size, according to the amendment, is specified at 15 pounds to the ream? What is the size of it?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no size to the paper specified; it is only as to the weight.

Mr. BRISTOW. If it is the typewriter size that is made for use, there is practically none used that weighs 15 pounds to the ream. If it is full size—17 by 22 or 17 by 28—it might weigh more than 15 pounds; but if it is the ordinary paper that you buy at the store, it never weighs 15 pounds to the ream.

Mr. SMOOT. All typewriter paper that is used by all the business houses and by the Senator, and everybody else nearly, weighs 15 pounds to the ream.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; the Senator is mistaken as to that. It never weighs more than 6 pounds a ream as prepared for use, because otherwise it would be very heavy. Three, 4, or 6 pounds is the kind that is used almost universally.

Mr. SMOOT. I am still of the opinion that this is a reduction from the present Dingley rate upon typewriter paper.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. I am sure it is a reduction from the House bill as reported, because they reported the bill at 3½ cents a pound, and we have reduced it from 3½ cents to 3 cents a pound.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator will note in the estimates that the Dingley rate is 2 cents, the House rate is 2 cents on this light paper, and the Senate rate is 3½ and 15 per cent ad valorem on those that are not ruled, and 3½ and 25 per cent on those that are ruled. So there must be some mistake. There is a very decided increase on the common paper that is used by everybody. I would be glad if the Senator would let the amendment go over until we can look into it, because I am very confident he will find that he is mistaken.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we have provided here at the end of the paragraph as follows:

Provided, That in computing the duty on such paper every 180,000 square inches shall be taken to be a ream.

So that will include the question that the Senator brought up as to the size of the paper.

Mr. BRISTOW. One hundred and eighty thousand square inches would be 500 sheets, I suppose. What size of sheet would that be?

Mr. SMOOT. I can hardly figure out just what it will be in square inches. Of course, it would depend upon the thickness of the paper, and that would have to be taken into consideration as to the number that would come in a ream.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course 480 or 500 sheets are counted as a ream. In the regular commercial transaction it is 500 sheets. Five hundred divided into 180,000 would give the number of sheets, and the square of the sheet would give the size.

Mr. SMOOT. That put into square inches would give the size. Divided by 500 sheets, it would be 360 square inches, and 360 square inches certainly would be equal to 10 by 36; so the Senator can plainly see that the sheet itself would have to be a large one.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to inquire of the Senator if any such paper as 10 by 36 inches is used as typewriting paper?

Mr. SMOOT. I am only saying that in computing the rate, the whole area of 180,000 square inches would have to be taken into consideration. It does not say that it shall be any particular size, as I stated before, but it must contain that many square inches to be counted as a ream, no matter what size it may be. If smaller in size, of course it will take that many more sheets to make a ream, but we were figuring upon the number of sheets stated by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that some years ago this matter was brought up in the courts of Colorado, and a rule was made concerning the weight of paper to be used in the filing of pleadings. The rule was that it should weigh 14 pounds, because the paper generally used was much less than that.

Mr. SMOOT. I call the attention of the Senator to the proviso to the paragraph, which applies, no matter what size the paper may be, whether it be small or large:

In computing the duty on such paper, every 180,000 square inches shall be taken to be a ream.

Mr. HUGHES. But less than that number would be taken to be a ream if the paper should be thin.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all; it will have to contain 180,000 square inches before it shall pay the duty of a ream of paper, no matter what the size of the paper may be.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, it would increase the duty according to the weight. That is to be taken into consideration generally in a tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. This schedule establishes a rule that must be followed as to what a ream of paper shall be for dutiable purposes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Evidently the sheet referred to is one 17 by 22 inches in area. I have figured it out, and that is evidently the size of the ream. That comes in commercial use in weights of 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 pounds, and sometimes as high as 24 pounds. What is generally used is 12, 14, and 16 pounds to the ream. It is cut up and makes four sheets of typewriter paper.

I would suggest that "twelve" be substituted for "fifteen," limiting the weight. Then, you would fix the duty on the paper that is used in great abundance at the same rate as the Dingley law. There would be no increase. As it is now, there is an increase of a cent and a half a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem on paper that is usually used. It does not seem to me that that is justifiable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the regulation size of typewriter paper is 17 by 22, which makes 4 sheets, or 2,000 letter sizes in a ream of 500. If the Senator thinks there is any danger in this provision and does not think the proviso covers it, I am perfectly willing to favor an amendment to except typewriter paper when less than 10 pounds to the ream of 480 sheets, 20 by 30, so as to make the duty 2 cents and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW. But what about letter paper and note paper?

Mr. SMOOT. On letter and note paper I think the rates are all right as they are.

Mr. BRISTOW. Unruled?

Mr. SMOOT. Unruled or ruled.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire what would come in as letter paper, as note paper, as ledger paper, and as bond paper?

Mr. SMOOT. That kind of paper which is used as writing paper or as ledger paper or for any other use for which it is adapted.

Mr. BRISTOW. There are business men who use bond paper in their correspondence. It is a style of paper that is better than the ordinary paper, and it sells for from 12 to 20 cents a pound. It is very commonly used by the public, by business men, merchants, and all kinds of professional men. It seems to me that on this bond paper, the paper that is used by every man who does any kind of correspondence, we ought not to increase the duty in this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas must know that bond paper, record paper, and this class of heavy paper is by this bill reduced from 3½ cents to 3 cents a pound. Certainly that kind of paper is not used by the common people.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, the Senator from Utah is not informed as to that, because he can go into the office of any lawyer or business man who buy their paper and look at the brand on the letter paper that he uses, and he will see "bond" on it in the watermark. Bond paper is almost universally used. There are hundreds of kinds of it that are made. It is called "bond paper" and is used in correspondence.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have always understood, of course, that bond paper was not generally used by the people of this country.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to know—

Mr. SMOOT. There may be a few attorneys who use it, but I doubt very much whether the great mass of them use such paper.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like the Senator to go down to the Morrison Paper Company here, who are paper jobbers, and see how many bond papers they have and the sales they make every day, and to whom they make them.

Mr. SMOOT. I think there are some sales, but not very many.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is universally used. It is the paper of commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, notwithstanding what the Senator says, there is certainly a reduction in the rate from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 cents.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; there is not. According to these figures, there is an increase from 2 cents to $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents; and when the paper is ruled, there is an increase from 2 cents per pound to $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, and from 20 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, will depend upon the weight of the paper entirely.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; of course.

Mr. SMOOT. Because under the present law the rate is $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, and we make it 3 where it is $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound when it weighs six and a quarter pounds or over—

Mr. BRISTOW. That is, where it is over 15 pounds to the ream; but where it is under 15 pounds to the ream there is an increase, and the larger part of the bond papers that are used in correspondence are under 15 pounds to the ream.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not understand the anxiety of the Senator from Kansas. Is it for the people of Kansas who use bond paper?

Mr. BRISTOW. There is not a printing office in the United States which does any amount of business that does not handle this paper as stock.

Mr. ALDRICH. That applies to printing offices, but how about the farmers and other consumers?

Mr. BRISTOW. The farmers do not use it in their correspondence, of course, but business men do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about correspondence. I am talking about bond paper.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator may ask me these questions in a light and frivolous way, but I am talking about a matter I think I know something about; and I say there is not a business man who buys his paper and knows what he pays for it who does not know that I am telling the truth about this. Of course, a man may never use a great deal of it and never pay any attention to what it costs him when he gets it and may not know anything about it; but I know something about the paper that is used by the people of the United States in their correspondence and in handling their business, and I am protesting against an increase over the Dingley rate of practically 60 per cent of the duty. I do not see any occasion for it.

Mr. SMOOT. The duty depends entirely upon the weight of the paper. I think that the very best bond paper, especially taking into consideration the proviso here, which would make the size 17 by 22, as admitted by the Senator from Kansas—the weight of that paper will be at least 16 pounds to the ream.

Mr. BRISTOW. I beg the Senator's pardon; it would not be. There is very little of it used in correspondence that weighs as much as 16 pounds to the ream. Twelve and 14 pounds is the usual weight.

Mr. SMOOT. There is very little of it used of the size of 17 by 22—

Mr. BRISTOW. Seventeen by twenty-two?

Mr. SMOOT. And that is the size that must be taken into account. Take the proviso that is offered in this paragraph—

Mr. BRISTOW. I am considering paper 17 by 22 in size and 14 pounds to the ream, which is used more than any other kind. It is true that the duty on the heavy bond paper that goes into ledgers and which is used in large books by banking institutions is not increased, but the duty on the paper that is used by the mass of the people in conducting their correspondence is increased in this bill from 50 to 60 per cent over the Dingley rates, and there are no importations of any consequence. Millions of pounds of it are used in this country. The tables here show that in 1904 there was \$22,000,000 worth of it used; and the importations last year amounted to less than \$200,000 worth.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, these changes are made to secure uniformity in rates as to all these classes of paper. While there may be a slight reduction in some sizes, there are considerable reductions in others. The kinds of paper which the Senator from Kansas is now talking about are made in this country. They will continue to be made in this country. There have been practically no importations, and it is simply for the purpose of getting better phraseology and better classification that these changes are proposed. The paper which the Senator from Kansas is talking about, bond paper, is sold, owing to domestic competition, at prices which nobody can find fault with at all. To simply change the rate upon a particular size would be to throw this paragraph out of harmony. It will not affect anybody. The people of the United States will pay the same price for their paper, and they will buy it as cheaply as they ought to, because, I repeat, domestic competition has brought down the price of paper in this country to a very low level—as low a level as is possible consistent with any reasonable profit.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, there was exported last year \$1,200,000 worth of the character of paper described in this paragraph. There was consumed in the country, or made in the country, in 1904 more than \$22,000,000 worth of it. There was imported last year, of all these papers, less than \$200,000 worth. Why should the classification be changed so as to increase the rate from 50 to 60 per cent on the paper that is most universally used, if it is not going to affect the price? If it is not going to bring any additional revenue, what is the use of the increase?

Mr. ALDRICH. I explained to the Senator as well as I could that it is for uniformity of the schedule. All these rates apply to a great variety of articles. We have tried to simplify the schedule. The general average of rates is reduced. It is impossible to take any paragraph of this bill to which specific rates are applied and not find some article which will bear a higher or a lower rate than any Senator might think was desirable. I say to the Senator from Kansas again that the price of paper of the classes that he has named is not affected by this rate, and will not be affected by it. There is no trust in this business; it is an open competition; and there is nothing for the Senator from Kansas, or any other Senator, to be afraid of in these suggested changes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, I can do nothing but repeat that I do not see any use in raising rates if there is not anything to be accomplished by it. The Senator from Rhode Island admits that there is nothing to be gained by raising these rates; and, if not, why not leave them as they are or reduce the rates? On paper between 10 and 15 pounds is where the increase is. Those are the papers that are most universally used by the masses of the people. Why not strike out "fifteen" and say "not exceeding 10 pounds?" That would not disarrange anything; it would simply reduce the weight upon which the increased duty is paid to 10 pounds, instead of leaving it at 15.

It would not change the phraseology; it would simply permit the large amount of paper that is used to bear the same rate under this bill that it does under the Dingley law. If there is nothing to gain by the committee's proposition, I can not see why the committee can not consent to that change. If it is necessary, I will move an amendment. There was an amendment submitted to paragraph 409, was there not?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The word "one-half" was stricken out, on line 11, on page 165, so that it reads "3 cents" instead of "three and a half cents." That was agreed to.

Mr. BRISTOW. I move that the word "three" be stricken out and "two" be inserted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 165, in the proposed substitute of the committee for paragraph 409, on line 11, strike out "three" and insert "two," so that it will read "2 cents a pound and 15 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. BRISTOW. That will leave the duty the same as it is in the Dingley law, except that it will be an increase of from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. It will make the rate 2 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem, while under the Dingley law it is 2 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN], with whom I have a pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. He is not present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present, I should vote "yea" and he would vote "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire if the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed the Senator from California has not voted.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MONEY. I wish to state that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] is absent sick, and is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Chamberlain	Davis	Money
Bankhead	Clapp	Fletcher	Newlands
Beveridge	Clay	Gore	Rayner
Bristow	Crawford	Hughes	Simmons
Brown	Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Stone
Burkett	Cummins	La Follette	Tallaferro
Burton	Curtis	Martin	

NAYS—35.

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Brandagee	Depeu	Heyburn	Piles
Briggs	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Bulkeley	Dixon	Kean	Scott
Burnham	Dolliver	Lodge	Smoot
Burrows	Flint	McCumber	Sutherland
Carter	Gallinger	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Oliver	

NOT VOTING—29.

Bailey	Foster	Owen	Stephenson
Bourne	Frazier	Paynter	Taylor
Bradley	Frye	Perkins	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Richardson	Warner
Daniel	McEnery	Shively	Wetmore
Dillingham	McLaurin	Smith, Md.	
du Pont	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	
Elkins	Overman	Smith, S. C.	

So Mr. BRISTOW's amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is a committee amendment pending to paragraph 412, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 412, page 166, line 24, after the words "ad valorem," insert a semicolon and the following words:

Views of any landscape, scene, building, place, or locality in the United States on cardboard or paper, not thinner than eight one-thousandths of 1 inch, by whatever process printed or produced, including those wholly or in part produced by either lithographic or photogelatine process, except show cards and panels, occupying 35 square inches or less of surface per view, bound or unbound, or in any other form, 15 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem; thinner than eight one-thousandths of 1 inch, \$2 per thousand.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. This completes the paper schedule, except as to paragraphs 402 and 405; but the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has an amendment, I think, in regard to window glass, which I ask may now be taken up and disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, in lieu of paragraph 97, as printed in the House text, it is proposed to insert the following:

97. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches,

valued at not more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 1½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 1,200 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 2,400 square inches, valued at not more than 2½ cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; valued at more than 2½ cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; above that, valued at not more than 3 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; valued at more than 3 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; Provided, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, imported in boxes, shall contain 50 square feet, as nearly as sizes will permit, and the duty shall be computed thereon according to the actual weight of glass.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have a communication here which I desire to have the Secretary read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PATTERSON GLASS MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Cameron, W. Va., June 16, 1909.

Hon. N. B. SCOTT,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are glad to note that you are using your efforts to prevent any reduction in the tariff on common window glass. The window-glass business is probably now in the worst condition of any industry in the country. Highly skilled workmen have had their wages gradually reduced to near common labor basis, and yet there is hardly a window-glass manufacturer who has made a cent for two years. In fact, most of them have lost money. And any material reduction will prevent the business ever being put on a profitable basis, for as soon as domestic conditions might be adjusted so that there is a living in it we will be crowded out by cheap foreign glass. We have the cheapest of fuel, and have practically not made a cent for over two years, while many of our friends have fared much worse. So we trust that you will use every effort to help out in the matter, as a reduction in the tariff will almost be an irrevocable blow. Assuring you of our appreciation for what you have done, with regards,

Very truly,

PATTERSON GLASS MANUFACTURING CO.,
G. B. PATTERSON, Secretary.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on yesterday morning I had a paragraph read from my home paper, which gave the information that the window-glass factory at Buckhannon, in my State, had gone into the hands of a receiver, with liabilities of \$75,000, and without any assets. We have just had read at the desk a letter showing the condition at another point in my State, where, as that communication states, they have almost free fuel, and yet they are scarcely able to exist.

On the smaller sizes of glass, which the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota most affects, the freight rate from my State to Gulf ports such as New Orleans and Galveston is 41 cents, while the freight rate from Belgium by water is only 13 cents to those same ports. If you reduce the duty on glass, I ask in all fairness of the Members of the Senate how you can expect us to compete and keep our window-glass industries going in West Virginia? It is one of the many industries in my State employing a great many people, and I do think it would be a great hardship if those who believe in the principle of protection, those who believe that the American workman and the American manufacturer should be protected against low labor in foreign countries and against cheap freight rates, should now adopt the proposition to reduce the duty on glass. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will not adopt this amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if we were removing the duty from glass, the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] would be very apt. But we are not removing the protective duty in the slightest degree, in my opinion, so as to impair a fair protection. The Senator is correct when he states that the condition of the glass trade in the United States to-day is deplorable, but what has brought about that condition? Not the tariff. The tariff has not affected it in the slightest degree, because there is not one pound of this window glass imported. What has affected it? They have gone into a rate warfare upon the price of this window glass until they are slaughtering each other; and because they are by their competition destroying each other they ask us to place a higher duty than we have now—a duty that will be above 100 per cent—to allow them possibly to recoup in the future when they get over this warfare. If I thought 100 per cent was not a fair duty, I would certainly be in favor of a higher one if it was necessary.

But considering the cost of production at home and abroad, as near as we could get at it, we felt that when the time should arrive when these companies should cease attempting to destroy each other and place their articles upon the market

at a fair and honest valuation, we would still have a sufficient duty to give them adequate protection. The trouble from which they are suffering now has nothing whatever to do with the duties or lack of sufficient duty upon glass.

Mr. BACON. May I make an inquiry of the Senator from North Dakota? I made an inquiry last evening of the chairman of the committee as to what would probably be the ad valorem under this amendment. The Senator was not then prepared to state. Do I understand the Senator from North Dakota correctly when I understand him to say that the duty under this amendment will be 100 per cent?

Mr. McCUMBER. You can easily see about what it will be. It ranges from a little above 100 to a little less than 100 per cent upon each bracket.

Mr. BACON. I am simply asking for information.

Mr. McCUMBER. Take, for instance, the first bracket. If it is valued at not over $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, it would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound duty. If it is valued at over $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, it would be $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents duty. Upon that bracket it would be slightly less than 100 per cent, and it would follow about that all through the brackets.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator this: While the different gradations have been treated a little differently in the amount of duty imposed, is not the general average of the duties on common window glass about the same as under the Dingley law, or raised?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, no. It has been very much reduced.

Mr. BACON. Very much reduced?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Then, prior to that time it exceeded that amount?

Mr. McCUMBER. It exceeded that amount upon the present valuation of the glass.

Mr. BACON. Then I understand—

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course I may say that the price of glass at the time the Dingley bill was passed was probably more than it is now.

Mr. BACON. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. But taking the valuations as we have them to-day, it is considerable of a reduction.

Mr. BACON. Very well. I understand, from what the Senator says about none of this glass being imported, that the figures on page 11 refer to a different class of glass, used for other purposes—glass for photographers' purposes, and so forth.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is correct.

Mr. BACON. And do not relate in any manner to common window glass?

Mr. McCUMBER. They relate to the glass used for pictures.

Mr. BACON. And under the Dingley rate there is absolutely no importation of common window glass.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is absolutely correct at the present time.

Mr. BACON. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment to the amendment. The Secretary will state it.

The SECRETARY. Strike out in the printed amendment all that appears on page 1 and the first 7 lines on page 2 and insert:

97. Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, $1\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have received yesterday and to-day 20 telegrams from the different local presidents of the American Window Glass Workers' Association throughout the country protesting against any reduction in these duties. I ask to have one of them read and placed in the RECORD, together with a list of the others which I have received.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, without objection, and the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senator GEORGE T. OLIVER,
Independence, Kans., June 16, 1909.
Washington, D. C.:

This local protests against any decrease in duty on window glass. Any reduction means less work and lower wages.

F. E. DELGAUFRER,
Local President.

The list referred to is as follows:

LOCAL PRESIDENTS OF WINDOW GLASS WORKERS' ASSOCIATION PROTESTING AGAINST A REDUCTION OF DUTY ON WINDOW GLASS.

F. E. Delgauffer, Independence, Kans.

John Griffin, Caney, Kans.

G. B. Gundy, Chanute, Kans.

John F. Miller, Coffeyville, Kans.

Gustave Wery, Clarksburg, W. Va.

Aramis Joris, Clarksburg, W. Va.
George F. Ernst, Clarksburg, W. Va.
Joseph Mondron, Fairmont, W. Va.
Fred Brasseur, Mount Vernon, Ohio.
Dandoy, Sandusky, Ohio.
Ernest Lefevre, Maumee, Ohio.
A. P. Bonneau, Cleveland, Ohio.
Martin Clever, Kane, Pa.
John Hanley, Kane, Pa.
W. R. Keazle, Kane, Pa.
Arthur Vandermesse, Point Marion, Pa.
Henry Hubeau, Point Marion, Pa.
G. C. Wedkind, Wilcox, Pa.
Albert Brown, Port Allegheny, Pa.
Harry Skidmore, Dubois, Pa.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I can not let this amendment, as proposed by the committee, pass without registering my earnest protest in behalf of both the manufacturers and the workmen in this important industry, who are to-day in an impoverished condition. I wish now to take issue with the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, who offered the amendment, that there have been no importations of window glass since the adoption of the Dingley bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator allow me for a moment?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not state that there had been no importations since the enactment of the Dingley bill. I say there are no importations now, and have not been for a year or so.

Mr. OLIVER. There are no importations now, simply because the times have been so bad for the last two years that there have been practically no building operations going on, and also the market for window glass has been so restricted and so narrowed that the American manufacturers have been selling glass below cost.

I have figures here to show that there were importations in the years 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904, running up to such an extent that the manufacturers and the workmen met together, and for the sole purpose of meeting these importations and of enabling the manufacturers here to meet the prices named by their foreign competitors the workmen agreed to a reduction of wages so that the manufacturers could sell their glass at reduced prices. As a result, these importations, which were over a million boxes, of 52 pounds each, in the fiscal years 1902 and 1903, dropped in 1904 and 1905 to 296,000, and last year to only 274,000.

I was visited yesterday by the president of the American Window Glass Makers' Association. He told me their men were being scattered, driven into other employments, and that this reduction of duties on window glass would simply give certain markets which are now held by the American manufacturers, particularly the Gulf coast and the Pacific coast markets, directly into the hands of the Belgian manufacturers.

I am aware that this amendment proposed by the committee will be passed; but I can not allow it to be passed without registering a protest in behalf of these manufacturers who are being driven out of business and of those men who are being driven out of employment.

Mr. DICK. I should like to ask the member of the committee in charge of this matter what results he expects from the adoption of the amendment. What is to be expected from this legislation?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will say candidly that I expect this fierce contest which is at present going on between the manufacturers of glass to cease some time. I think it will have to cease, or they will all go under in a short time. When it does cease, then I want to give them sufficient protection, so that they can manufacture as against the foreigner. But I do not want to give them more, or, at least, any great amount more, than is necessary for fair protection, and I can but feel, as near as I can get information on the cost of production at home and abroad, taking into consideration freight, and so forth, that a duty averaging about 100 per cent is sufficient protection; that that is a duty which will give them a fair profit on their manufactures.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. DICK. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand the Senator from North Dakota to say that the duties average 100 per cent. I am advised by gentlemen who have knowledge on the subject that the average is less than 80 per cent.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can figure it out for himself.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not the time to figure it out.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is right here in the amendment. The amendment gives the figures. So the Senator can not make a mistake. I will take the third bracket—valued at over $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, $1\frac{3}{4}$; that is less. I am speaking now of the lower classes of window glass.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the average?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not figured it out.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, we can not hear a word. This is an important matter, and we can not hear a word.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have not averaged this upon the higher class, but by reading the amendment in the first three brackets it will be seen that it amounts to very nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. DICK. If I understand the reply of the Senator, it is expected by this reduction to force the manufacturers into a settlement of their difficulties.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not so understand it.

Mr. DICK. Perhaps I misunderstood it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not think it will force them or have the slightest thing to do with them. The tariff, whether it has been 1 cent or whether 200 per cent, seems to have made no difference whatever in their contests with each other and in the low price they have fixed for their product. I stated—and I thought I stated clearly—that I expected this condition to cease some time and that they would put their window glass upon the market at a fair remuneration, and whenever they do that, then I want a tariff sufficiently high to give them fair protection, and I think that this does give them fair protection.

Mr. DICK. Then I misunderstood the Senator. I understood the Senator to say that after they settle their differences he expects to give them a tariff which would yield sufficient protection for the business.

Mr. MONEY. I suppose it is a very interesting colloquy which is going on on the other side, but not a word of it is being heard here.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it is due to the fact that there is much disorder in the Senate, and not that the Senators do not speak loud enough. If the Senate will be in order, and if there will be less conversation between Senators individually, the Senator could be more easily heard.

Mr. DICK. Mr. President, it is admitted that this business is in a demoralized condition. Large numbers of factories are closed. Thousands of men are out of employment. A reduction of the tariff in this instance invites importations and reduces the price of the home product. The wages of the men engaged in this business are fixed by the monthly price of the glass itself. It would seem to me that if any schedule of this bill might be left undisturbed, or as now fixed in the law, this is clearly one to be so taken, and I hope that nothing will add to the disturbance of the business, already in a demoralized condition, by changing the rates that have so long obtained and to which the business has adjusted itself.

There are 6,700 skilled window-glass workers in this country, all of whom are members of organized labor, capable of producing annually 11,000,000 50-foot boxes of the sizes and qualities required by American consumers.

This demonstrates the fact that if all the skilled American window-glass workers were employed at their respective trades in the making of window glass a sufficient number of boxes to supply the entire consumption of the country could be made in six months, thus compelling the forced idleness of the workmen during the remainder of the year.

I submit the comparative wages of American and foreign workmen:

American workmen: Blowers, \$120.50 per month; gatherers, \$90.25 per month; cutters, \$124 per month; flatteners, \$130 per month. Foreign workmen (I use the phrase "foreign" as referring particularly to the Belgian workers, our greatest competitors): Skilled workmen—Blowers, \$60 to \$80 per place; gatherers, \$40 to \$50 per place; cutters, \$28 to \$38 each; flatteners, \$40 to \$60 each.

In the case of a part of the more unskilled labor, the following were the wages shown by the figures that I was able to obtain:

Lehr tenders, \$48 to \$60 per month; shove boys, \$48 to \$60 per month; roller boys, \$48 per month. Foreign unskilled labor: Lehr tenders, girls, \$15 to \$18 per month; shove girls—that is, in place of the boys used in this country—\$15 to \$18 per month; roller carriers, girls, \$18 per month.

In addition, we might add to the American unskilled or perhaps semiskilled workmen what we know as the "snapper," one to each place, who receives an average of \$48 per month. In Europe they dispense with the services of a snapper.

The price of American skilled labor is determined monthly by the selling price for the current month, while the price of foreign skilled labor is fixed annually.

To better understand these figures, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that the American blower and gatherer work singly, or one to each place, while the foreign blower and gatherer work double, or two to each place. The latter condi-

tion is due to a surplus of workers. The American blower works one hundred and sixty hours per month and produces 1,440 rollers (you might know them better as cylinders), or 200 boxes of window glass, single strength. The foreign blower works one hundred and eighty hours per month, producing 2,200 cylinders, or 312 boxes of glass.

The average number of 50-foot boxes of common window glass imported annually for the last twenty-four years is 854,324, aggregating 20,503,776 boxes. A box consists of 50 square feet.

I believe that a lowering of the duty on common window glass would mean an increased importation of that article, comparative with the amount of the said reduction, and would work a corresponding injury to the window-glass workers and manufacturers alike of this country.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I presume most of the Senators are aware of the fact that the window-glass factories shut down usually the first week in June and resume again the first week in September, virtually putting the skilled labor and all other labor out of employment for three months. There is perhaps no other manufacturing industry that requires more skill or places a greater strain upon the mechanic than blowing glass. With a cylinder anywhere from 4 to 8 feet in length, with a man holding it on the end of a pipe, a pipe 4 or 5 feet long, you can well imagine not only the muscular strain, but also the amount of lung power he must necessarily have to blow that cylinder out.

These men are asked to come in competition with the window-glass blowers of Belgium, where, unless the conditions of wages have changed in the last four years, when I visited that country, the wages are not more than one-fourth of what the window-glass blower in this country gets.

It is all right to charge that it is a cutthroat business with the manufacturers themselves that has brought the price of glass where it is and ruination to themselves. Many of these window-glass factories in this country are what we call "co-operative." They are organized by the workmen themselves—by men who have been frugal and saved a few thousand dollars. Eight or ten or fifteen of them pool their small savings and build a small factory. When the time comes that there is no demand for glass, these men have to earn, as it were, weekly stipends to keep their families. Consequently, they authorize the sale of the glass at a ruinous price in order that they may keep at work. Before the panic of 1907, when building in this country fell off, when people would not improve or build new houses, the window-glass business was fairly good under the protection we had under the Dingley law.

But conditions combined to put these men in a very bad shape. All they have in the world is invested in these small factories, and the legislation that is being offered here, proposing a reduction of the duties on glass, I want to say to my fellow-Senators, is a direct stab at the laboring men themselves and the mechanics engaged in the window-glass business.

I do not intend to detain the Senate, but I have tried in these few words to present this case as I know it exists. I do not believe there is a single window-glass factory in my State—I may be mistaken—that is not what we call "co-operative," belonging to the men themselves who operate and control the plant. I do hope it will not be the pleasure of the Senate to reduce the duty on glass.

Before taking my seat, however, I desire to present a letter from a glass worker. It is as follows:

WASHINGTON, June 16, 1909.

Hon. N. B. SCOTT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of 3,000 employed and over 3,000 idle window-glass workmen, members of the National Window Glass Workers' Association, of which I have the honor to be president, it becomes my duty to solemnly protest against the passage of the amendment proposed by Senator McCUMBER, now pending, or the passage of any measure that will reduce the duty on common window glass, especially referring to all sizes up to and including 24 by 30 inches square. I desire to call your attention to the fact that the window-glass industry is already in peril. More than 50 per cent of the hand-operating plants are out of blast, many of them are in the hands of a receiver, and those now operating are so doing without profit or at a loss. More than 50 per cent of the workmen are now idle, and those who are employed are receiving for their high skill and excessively hard labor lower wages than are paid in some fields of common labor. The manufacturers' selling price of glass being at an unprofitable figure, the workers receiving starvation wages, with half of them idle, and the selling price to the actual consumer as low or lower than for many years, why reduce the duty on glass? Is it to benefit the importer at the expense of the manufacturer and workmen? Imported window glass under the present rates can be laid down at San Francisco and New Orleans cheaper than domestic product. The extreme western and southern markets alone consuming one-fifth of such sizes, is it the intention to turn those markets over to foreign product?

Would not the proposed reduction be a palpable discrimination against both the American window-glass workers and manufacturers, and would it seem befitting the wisdom of the greatest legislative body on earth that this great American industry should be injured and the

workmen further impoverished without cause or reason save the pleas of interested importers?

The present rate of duty on the first two brackets is insufficient to duly and properly protect those sizes, and upon them the duty should be increased instead of being decreased.

I would respectfully yet earnestly urge that this protest of the National Window-Glass Workers be presented by you to the Members of the United States Senate. I have the honor to remain, sir,

Very sincerely, yours,

A. L. FAULKNER,
President National Window-Glass Workers.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it may be remembered possibly that when we reached this paragraph when originally passing through the bill I offered an amendment to it slightly higher in rate than the amendment just offered by the Senator from Georgia, and slightly lower in rate than the amendment now offered on behalf of the committee by the Senator from North Dakota.

I presented at that time a table which indicated that one-half of the glass, counting now by brackets, under this paragraph was being sold—that is to say, that the market price for one-half of all the glass mentioned in this paragraph was being sold for a little less than the duty upon it. In other words, our selling price for our own article was less than the rate which had been imposed upon that article for importation under the Dingley law.

It would now be possible for the window-glass men to raise the price of their glass substantially 100 per cent and still prevent importations. A rate of that kind simply brings a tariff law into disrepute; it brings protection into disrepute. The rates now offered by the Senator from North Dakota, while not entirely acceptable to me, because I thought my amendment furnished sufficient protection, after all present a gratifying reduction and can not under any circumstances submit our glass blowers to unfair competition from abroad. The material for making glass of this character in our country is as cheap or cheaper than it is abroad, and the only difference, therefore, in the cost of production is the difference in the cost of labor.

The rates proposed by the committee now not only measure the difference between the cost of labor over there and here, but represent more than the entire cost of labor in the manufacture of glass.

I want these men to be amply protected. But to suggest that these rates will not enable them to raise the price of their glass to a point that will afford them ample profit is to disregard all the proof that has been submitted upon the subject.

It is true we have had some importations, but, as I endeavored to show then and as has been admitted since, these importations are not of window glass; they are crown and cylinder glass and unpolished glasses. Those imports have a value abroad, as I remember it, 50 per cent higher than the prices of glass of our own country, and the importations occur because we do not manufacture to any great extent or endeavor to manufacture that kind of glass, especially for pictures and for photographic processes. It is particularly—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to know where the Senator from Iowa gets authority for the statement that all the importations of glass coming under this paragraph are crown and cylinder glass—glasses of the finer grades. I can not find any authority for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Possibly the Senator from Pennsylvania has not inquired from the proper sources.

Mr. OLIVER. I rather think the Senator from Iowa has not inquired from the proper sources.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Pennsylvania possibly has not inquired at all into these importations. I have. I have been told by those who use this glass. I am told, however, in a still more conclusive way, by the valuations upon the glass, as it will be discovered in the table before the Senator from Pennsylvania. He knows as well as he can know anything that window glass has not commanded in this country anything like the price attached to these importations at any time, either since the panic of 1907 or before the panic of 1907.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator very well knows that the rates placed in these schedules showing the price of glass that is imported simply show the average, and that may include some and exclude others. As I said before, the importations of common window glass in 1903 and 1904 were so large that in order

to meet the prices quoted by importers, even under the Dingley rates, the manufacturers induced the men to accept a very great reduction in wages, and these reduced rates of wages are the ones which now prevail; and it is only because of these low rates of wages that this country is not flooded with Belgian glass. I say if these reductions in duties come, in certain districts far from the seats of manufacture foreign manufacturers will take the market on this class of glass.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Pennsylvania in his last remark said if the decrease of duty reported by the committee should be adopted there are certain districts in Pennsylvania where the business would be entirely turned over to the foreigner. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say that, Mr. President. I said there are certain districts in the country—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, in the country. That is the same thing.

Mr. OLIVER. Where our manufacturers would not be permitted to retain the business in competition with foreign manufacturers. If the Senator will allow me to fully answer the question, as an instance of that I will cite New Orleans, where, from the nearest factory—not from Pennsylvania, but from the Kansas factories, which are the nearest—the freight rate is 41 cents per hundred pounds.

The freight rate from Antwerp is 13½ cents per hundred pounds. To San Francisco it is still worse. The rate of freight from Antwerp to San Francisco is 27.8 cents per hundred pounds. The rate from the nearest factory in the United States to San Francisco is 90 cents, more than three times the rate from Antwerp; and when you come to pay three times the freight and three times the wages, you can easily see the inevitable result.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have not asked my question yet.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he has the rate from Anderson, Ind., to Gulf ports or Pacific coast ports? I had a letter from there, and I wanted to know if the Senator has it also.

Mr. OLIVER. It is about the same as the Kansas rate; about 41 cents a hundred. I can not say precisely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. This question occurred to me when the Senator made his statement, and that is the reason why I rose to ask the question. It is whether the Senator thought this committee, in fixing this duty, intended to turn these markets over to the foreigner?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, I certainly acquit the committee of any such intention; but I do believe the committee had not accurate information on the subject. I know that I volunteered several times to appear before the committee and present this question, but, with the exception of one or two five-minute conversations with the Senator from North Dakota, I have never had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the Senator if, upon his investigations of this question, he did not find that the manufacturers of glass were selling the smaller sizes at a loss.

Mr. CUMMINS. At least I believe that the window-glass manufacturers are not selling their smaller sizes at the present time at any profit. I do not know whether they are making losses upon their business or not. But, as I said before, they can increase their prices about 100 per cent without any danger of importations from any country.

I assume, I say, in response to the Senator from Pennsylvania, that we can not adjust our tariff rates upon the hypothesis that glass may be transported from one corner of the country to the other at an immense freight rate and protect that glass against every other freight rate that may reach a place or a port. For instance, I suppose if you should transport glass from Maine to California, even if it cost the manufacturers in Maine nothing to make the glass, they might not be able to reach some distant place in the United States as favorably as a foreign competitor. I do not understand that such extreme or unusual or extraordinary cases are to be provided for in the tariff bill. I repeat, the rates now suggested by the Senator from North Dakota will be more, and considerably more, than the entire labor proportion in the manufacture of glass, because, as he has said, very few of them are under

90 per cent, and some of them rise to 100 per cent, or in that neighborhood.

Notwithstanding the fact that I offered the amendment reducing the rates below those now suggested by the committee, I intend to vote for the committee amendment, believing that it is a fair disposition of the controversy.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I hope we will be able to get a vote on this proposition.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to say a word.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, it is very evident from what has been said by the Senator from North Dakota, which I understand to be conceded by Senators who occupy an antagonistic position, that the present low price of glass is not in any measure due to there being an inadequacy of tariff, so far as that may influence the high price of glass; that the price is away below anything that the tariff which is now imposed could affect; and that, as stated by the Senator from Iowa, the present prices could be raised 100 per cent and still be below the tariff wall which protects us against foreign importations.

The object I have in offering the amendment is this: I wish when the time comes that all Senators seem to anticipate, when there shall cease to be the competitive war which has resulted in these very low prices, that there may be a limitation upon the tariff which will prevent extortionate prices then from being exacted by any combination which may be made between the producers or manufacturers of this glass.

The ad valorem duty, as stated by the Senator from North Dakota, is now above normal, because of the fact that the price is below the normal. For that reason the present rate of duty is over 100 per cent, but even under the Dingley law on all common window glass at the valuation then existing the ad valorem ranged from some seventy-odd up to eighty-odd per cent. I will give it exactly. It ranged from 71.59 to 84.15; 71.59 heretofore and 84.15 at present. The only glass below that was the smaller size glass where the ad valorem at that time was only 41 per cent; but as to the general run of glass it ranged between the figures I have mentioned.

The point I wish to call attention to is that when normal conditions are restored by reason of the cessation of what is alleged to be a destructive competition, the ad valorem, if it goes back to the point it was at the time of the Dingley bill, will still be very highly protective.

The amendment which I have offered relates not to the larger glass, but to the glass which is commonly used in the construction of houses—common window glass—and the rate, I am very frank to say, is very much higher than I think it ought to be even when the normal conditions are restored. I therefore offer the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I am sorry to detain the Senate by any remarks on this subject, but there are so many window-glass factories in my State that are idle and so many people out of employment that I can not refrain, in justice to my constituents, from protesting against any reduction of duties and furnishing to the Senate the information sent to me directly from those and other factories as to the disastrous results that would follow a further reduction of duties.

I believe this proposed reduction is unjust to this great industry. I believe it compels the American manufacturer to sell at a less price than the window glass can be imported from foreign countries.

I have a list here giving figures and facts, which is worth more than mere words, showing the condition of the window-glass factories throughout the country. It will be shown by this list, on May 15 the number of factories that were idle and those that were in operation. In New Jersey there were 160, all idle; 42 were idle in Stockton, Cal.; in Centralia, Ill., 30; in Danville, Ill., 34. Indiana has about 120 pots idle. There are various States given here, and I have added up those plants that are idle. There are about 108 idle in Pittsburgh alone; in the State of Pennsylvania there are four or five hundred; in West Virginia they are nearly all idle.

The total number of hand-operated window-glass plants on May 15 in the United States were 3,080, of which 1,779 were idle. This seems to me to tell the story whether this industry that is now languishing needs a further reduction of the present duties. Why not rather increase the duty and better protect this great industry? These facts show that there are a great many more idle plants than there are active window-glass plants.

I have a letter just received this morning, dated June 16, from Morgantown, W. Va., from the president of the Marilla Window Glass Company. He says that he submits herewith some data, which I will not detain the Senate by reading. I

will not detain the Senate by reading the figures and the table, but I will ask permission to insert them in my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MARILLA WINDOW GLASS COMPANY,
Morgantown, W. Va., June 16, 1909.

Hon. S. B. ELKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In connection with the hearings now being given the tariff bill, we desire to submit some figures in relation to the tariff on window glass.

This data will show that, instead of a reduction, the duty should be raised at least a quarter of 1 cent per pound on all sizes under 20 by 30 if the American manufacturer is to be allowed to make a living profit as against foreign glass of these sizes.

On May 11 or 12 Senator CUMMINS, in discussing the window-glass schedule, submitted to the Senate a table of figures, which table, I understand, is now a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This table showed that the present selling price of American glass is below the price at which foreign glass can be imported. For example, it shows that a box of American glass, 10 by 15, is selling for \$1.14 per box and the price of foreign glass plus the duty is \$1.61, or a difference of 47 cents. That is, American-made glass, 10 by 15, is selling to-day for 47 cents less than the price at which foreign glass can be laid down in New York City.

A box of 14 by 20 American-made glass sells for \$1.20 to-day, the same foreign glass being laid down in New York City at \$1.93, or a difference of 73 cents.

A box of 16 by 24 American-made glass sells for \$1.26, foreign \$1.93, or a difference of 67 cents; and 20 by 30 American-made glass sells for \$1.32, foreign \$2.47, or a difference of \$1.15; and so on through the list.

These differences between the cost or the selling price of American-made glass and the price, duties added, at which foreign glass is laid down in New York City are advanced as a reason for a reduction in the tariff on window glass.

The argument would be conclusive in favor of a reduction if the American manufacturer were making a profit, instead of taking a loss, at these prices, and if the American workmen in American window-glass manufactories were making fair, reasonable, or living wages at these prices; but such is not the case. The American manufacturer is losing money at these prices, and the workmen in his factory are working for the very lowest wages in the history of the industry in this country, and at much less wages than their character of work deserves. It should also be borne in mind that these figures cover the cost of the manufacturing of window glass in West Virginia, where it is produced at a lower cost than in any other section of the United States.

The present low prices for American window glass are due to the disastrous competition which is on between the American manufacturers by machine process and the manufacturers by hand process. In the industry of making window glass by hand thousands of skilled workmen are employed, and in this competition with machine production their wages have been reduced over 50 per cent, and at the same time both kinds of manufacturers have been producing at actual loss. If the thousands of skilled workmen mentioned and the manufacturers for whom they work are to survive this competition, the selling price of American-made window glass must be advanced to a proper and legitimate price. To even advance it to a point where the manufacturer might come out with a very slight profit, or even with cost basis, and at the same time continue paying the low wages now being paid, the tariff should be maintained. If it is not maintained, foreign glass will be imported in such quantities that it will be impossible for the American manufacturer to raise his price to a point where he can sustain himself and continue to employ the American laborer.

From the figures heretofore given you will note that we are selling a box of 10 by 15, single strength, for \$1.14. This box actually costs us \$1.33. This means an actual loss of 19 cents. The manufacturer, American, should be allowed a reasonable profit, which surely should be not less than 25 cents a box. The freight from this district to New York City or the eastern coast market is 12 cents. This makes a total of \$1.70, the lowest figure at which the American-manufactured window glass can be manufactured and sold at a profit as against foreign glass, and this without increasing the present extremely low wages paid our workmen.

Under the present Dingley law the cost of this box of glass, 10 by 15, foreign made, plus the duty, delivered at New York City, is \$1.61, or 9 cents less than the price at which the American manufacturer can make and deliver this same box of glass and make a small profit under the present low wage cost, if he overcomes the unfortunate competition now existing and advances his prices to a living or legitimate basis.

On this box of 10 by 15, of which the cost is \$1.33, the labor item is 78 cents. Surely it is not unreasonable to say that the laborer should be advanced 25 per cent, which would be practically 20 cents on this box. This would make the cost \$1.90 instead of \$1.70, a still greater difference to the disadvantage of the American manufacturer and his workmen under the present law.

Raw material, due to the general business depression, is lower to-day than it will probably ever be again. To this extent the present cost is lower, and as material advances the cost must advance. As the total cost increases, the tariff must be higher to allow American glass to sell at its increased cost.

The above figures are given below in tabulated form, and the cost sheet referred to is also submitted. The cost sheet is a private paper, but we thought the matter so important that we add it to show the same differences exist in the other sizes.

Sizes 10 by 15 and under, per box of 50 feet.

Present selling price, American glass, at factory	\$1.14
Loss at this price (cost \$1.33)	.19
Reasonable profit should be allowed (18.8)	.25
Freight to New York City and eastern coast markets	.12

Lowest selling price with a profit for American glass	1.70
Selling price, foreign glass, plus duty and delivered at New York City, under present tariff	1.61

Disadvantage to American-made window glass, 10 by 15— .09

Respectfully submitted.

MARILLA WINDOW GLASS COMPANY,
By JO. L. KEENE, President.

All prices per box of 50 square feet.

SINGLE THICK.

	Foreign cost at Antwerp (without duty).	Duty at proposed Payne-Albright rates.	Foreign price and duties.	Selling price, American-made glass.
Not exceeding 10 by 15.....	\$0.80	\$0.72	\$1.61	\$1.14
Exceeding 10 by 15, not exceeding 14 by 20.....	.95	.98	1.93	1.20
Exceeding 14 by 20, not exceeding 16 by 24.....	.95	.98	1.93	1.26
Exceeding 16 by 24, not exceeding 20 by 30.....	1.23	1.24	2.47	1.32
Exceeding 20 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 30.....	1.32	1.24	2.56	1.35
Exceeding 24 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 36.....	1.32	1.44	2.76	1.40
Exceeding 24 by 36, not exceeding 30 by 40.....	1.40	1.70	3.10	1.51
Exceeding 30 by 40, not exceeding 30 by 50.....	1.53	1.96	3.49	1.73
Exceeding 30 by 50, not exceeding 30 by 54.....	1.65	1.96	3.61	1.88

DOUBLE THICK.

Not exceeding 10 by 15.....	\$1.24	\$1.10	\$2.34	\$1.51
Exceeding 10 by 15, not exceeding 14 by 20.....	1.33	1.50	2.83	1.65
Exceeding 14 by 20, not exceeding 16 by 24.....	1.33	1.50	2.83	1.77
Exceeding 16 by 24, not exceeding 20 by 30.....	1.85	1.90	3.75	1.97
Exceeding 20 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 30.....	1.78	1.90	3.68	1.99
Exceeding 24 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 36.....	1.78	2.20	3.98	2.02
Exceeding 24 by 36, not exceeding 30 by 40.....	1.91	2.60	4.51	2.17
Exceeding 30 by 40, not exceeding 30 by 54.....	2.10	3.00	5.10	2.37
Exceeding 30 by 54, not exceeding 30 by 60.....	2.28	3.00	5.28	2.42
Exceeding 30 by 60, not exceeding 30 by 64.....	2.77	3.00	5.77	2.62
Exceeding 30 by 64, not exceeding 30 by 70.....	3.24	3.00	6.24	2.68
Exceeding 30 by 70.....	3.87	3.00	6.87	3.19

Cost of different sizes of window glass.

SINGLE STRENGTH.

Bracket.	Size.	Labor.	Fuel, material, and other costs.	Total.	Selling price.		A.		B.	
					A.	B.				
First.....	10 by 15	\$0.82	\$0.51	\$1.33	\$1.20	\$1.14	Loss.	Gain.	Loss.	Gain.
Second.....	14 by 20	.82	.55	1.37	1.26	1.20	\$0.13		\$0.19	
Third.....	16 by 24	.82	.55	1.37	1.35	1.26	.02		.17	
Fourth.....	20 by 30	.82	.59	1.41	1.42	1.32		\$0.01	.09	
Fifth.....	24 by 30	.82	.59	1.41	1.47	1.35		.06	.06	
Sixth.....	24 by 36	.82	.63	1.45	1.56	1.40		.11	.05	
Seventh.....	30 by 40	.93	.71	1.64	1.72	1.51		.08	.13	

DOUBLE STRENGTH.

First.....	10 by 15	\$1.22	\$0.71	\$1.93	\$1.52	\$1.42	\$0.41		\$0.51	
Second.....	14 by 20	1.22	.71	1.93	1.68	1.52	.25		.41	
Third.....	16 by 24	1.22	.71	1.93	1.84	1.68	.09		.25	
Fourth.....	20 by 30	1.23	.76	1.99	2.00	1.87		\$0.01	.13	
Fifth.....	24 by 30	1.23	.76	1.99	2.06	1.89		.07	.10	
Sixth.....	24 by 36	1.23	.76	1.99	2.11	1.92		.12	.07	
Seventh.....	30 by 40	1.25	.81	2.06	2.27	2.06		.21		

Mr. ELKINS. On reflection, I think it better to insert in my remarks the list, dated May 15, from which I have just read some figures:

List of hand-operated window-glass factories.

NEW JERSEY.

Flood Glass Co., Atco, pots idle.....	8
T. C. Wheaton Co., Millville, pots idle.....	36
Vineland Glass Co., Vineland, pots idle.....	48
Cumberland Glass Manufacturing Co., Bridgeton, pots idle.....	52
Quinton Glass Co., Quinton, pots idle.....	16

Total pots idle.....

160

Getman Glass Co., Cleveland, N. Y. (cooperative), pots operating.....	24
Pacific Window Glass Co., Stockton, Cal., pots idle (financial trouble).....	42
Alkison Window Glass Co., Centralia, Ill., pots idle (bankruptcy).....	30
Sweet Glass Co., Danville, Ill., pots idle (financial troubles).....	30

INDIANA.

Blackford Window Glass Co., Vincennes (cooperative), pots operating.....	30
Vincennes Window Glass Co., Vincennes (cooperative), pots idle (machines).....	24
Princeton Window Glass Co., Princeton, pots idle (failed).....	30
Loogootee Window Glass Co., Loogootee (cooperative), pots idle (failed).....	18
Baur Window Glass Co., Eaton, pots idle.....	36
Johnston Glass Co., Hartford City, pots idle.....	60

OHIO.

Enterprise Glass Co., Sandusky (partly machines), pots (24 idle, 30 operating).....	54
Case & Merry Co., Maumee, ex machine, pots operating.....	30
Columbus Plate and Window Glass Co., Lancaster (cooperative), pots operating.....	36
Central Window Glass Co., Utica (partially cooperative), pots operating.....	36

Licking Window Glass Co., Utica (partially cooperative), pots operating.....	36
Utica Glass Co., Utica (partially cooperative), pots idle (burned May 10, 1909).....	36
Camp Glass Co., Mount Vernon, pots operating.....	48
C. P. Cole Glass Co., Lancaster, pots operating.....	45
Barnesville Glass Co., Barnesville (machines), pots idle.....	30
Eastern Ohio Glass Co., Barnesville, pots idle.....	36
Knox County Glass Co., Mount Vernon (cooperative), pots operating.....	36
Buckeye Window Glass Co., Columbus, pots operating.....	24
Findlay Window Glass Co., Findlay (failed), pots idle.....	50
Pittsburg Plate Glass Co., factory 11 (machines), pots idle.....	108

PENNSYLVANIA.

Ithaca Glass Manufacturing Co., Spring City, pots idle.....	24
Van Cleve Window Glass Co., Brownsville (failed), pots idle.....	60
Mountain Window Glass Co., Coudersport (reorganized), pots operating.....	42
Roulette Window Glass Co., Roulette (burned), pots idle.....	36
D. O. Cunningham Glass Co., Pittsburg, pots idle.....	30
Columbia Glass Co., Wellsboro, pots idle.....	36
Covington Glass Co., Covington (cooperative), pots idle.....	8
Fitzpatrick Glass Co., Falls Creek (machines), pots idle.....	48
Star Glass Co., Reynoldsville (machines), pots idle.....	36
Smethport Glass Co., Smethport (machines), pots idle.....	36
Pittsburg Window Glass Co., Washington, pots idle.....	36
McCoy Window Glass Co., Mount Jewett (machines), pots idle.....	60
Keystone Window Glass Co., Hazelhurst, pots idle.....	36
Port Allegany Window Glass Co., Port Allegany, pots (24 idle, 24 operating).....	48
Palmer Window Glass Co., Shinglehouse (receiver), pots idle.....	60
Kervin Window Glass Co., Eldred, pots operating.....	30
George Window Glass Co., Wilcox, pots idle.....	24
Brookville Glass and Tile Co., Brookville, pots idle.....	30
Pennsylvania Window Glass Co., Kane, pots idle.....	60
Kane Window Glass Co., Kane, pots idle.....	60
Standard Window Glass Co., Kane, pots idle.....	54
Healy Window Glass Co., Hazelhurst (machines), pots idle.....	35

Federated Glass Co., Point Marion (cooperative), pots operating— 30
 Jeanette Window Glass Co., Point Marion (cooperative), pots operating— 36
 Point Marion Window Glass Co., Point Marion (cooperative), pots operating— 12
 Eldred Window Glass Co., Punxsutawney (cooperative), pots operating— 24
 A. F. B. Co., Dubois (cooperative), pots operating— 30
 New Bethlehem Window Glass Co., New Bethlehem, pots operating— 30
 Masontown Window Glass Co., Masontown, pots operating— 36
 Fairchance Window Glass Co., Fairchance (cooperative), pots operating— 36

WEST VIRGINIA.

State Window Glass Co., Buckhannon (machines), pots idle— 36
 Magnolia Window Glass Co., New Martinsville (leased to the Gas State Window Glass Co.), pots operating— 24
 Banner Window Glass Co., South Charleston (cooperative), pots operating— 24
 Dunkirk Window Glass Co., South Charleston, pots idle— 36
 Clarksburg Glass Co., Clarksburg (cooperative), pots idle— 24
 La Fayette Window Glass Co., Clarksburg (cooperative), pots operating— 24
 Tuna Glass Co., Clarksburg, pots operating— 48
 West Fork Glass Co., Clarksburg, pots operating— 36
 Peerless Window Glass Co., Clarksburg, pots operating— 24
 Crescent Window Glass Co., Weston, pots operating— 48
 Fairmont Window Glass Co., Fairmont, pots operating— 36
 Grafton Window Glass Co., Grafton, pots operating— 36
 Ideal Window Glass Co., West Union (cooperative), pots idle— 24
 W. R. Jones Glass Co., Morgantown, pots operating— 48
 Marilla Window Glass Co., Morgantown (cooperative), pots operating— 30
 Patterson Window Glass Co., Cameron, pots operating— 14
 Salem Window Glass Co., Salem (cooperative), pots operating— 24
 Independent Glass Co., Sistersville, pots idle— 36
 Huntington Glass Co., Huntington, pots idle— 10

KANSAS.

Sunflower Window Glass Co., Coffeyville (cooperative), pots idle— 30
 Western Window Glass Co., Independence (cooperative), pots idle— 12
 Midland Glass Co., Independence, pots idle— 24
 Fredonia Window Glass Co., Fredonia, pots operating— 48
 Chanute Window Glass Co., Chanute, pots operating— 30
 Osage Window Glass Co., Independence (been idle one-half this year), pots idle half this year— 30
 Baker Bros. Glass Co., Caney, pots operating— 30
 Caney Window Glass Co., Caney, pots operating— 30
 Cheyenne Window Glass Co., Caney, pots operating— 30
 Coffeyville Window Glass Co., Coffeyville (burned), pots idle— 30
 Kansas Glass Co., Coffeyville, pots operating— 12

NOTE.—The American Window Glass Company operate exclusively by machinery and claim to produce about 40 per cent of the glass used in the United States.

The cooperative factories as a rule pay the skilled trades whatever the business will allow, regardless of the scale of wages fixed between the manufacturers and the glassworkers' union. This plan works a hardship on both the skilled glassworkers and the owners of the plants not cooperative.

Fifteen plants have failed and practically none of the others have made any profits for the past three years.

	Pots.
Total hand plants operating—	1,301
Total hand plants idle—	1,779
Total—	3,080

I will quote one or two sentences from the writer of the letter to which I referred. He is a man I know very well, a man of high character, and whose statements can be relied upon. He says:

This duty will show that instead of a reduction, the duty should be raised at least a quarter of 1 cent per pound on all sizes under 20 by 30, if the American manufacturer is to be allowed to make a living profit as against foreign glass of these sizes.

The argument would be conclusive in favor of a reduction if the American manufacturer were making a profit instead of taking a loss at these prices, and if the American workmen in American window-glass manufactories were making fair, reasonable, or living wages at these prices. But such is not the case.

From the figures heretofore given, you will note that we are selling a box of 10 by 15, single strength, for \$1.14. This box actually costs us \$1.33. This means an actual loss of 19 cents. The manufacturer—American—should be allowed a reasonable profit, which surely should be not less than 25 cents a box.

The writer of this letter is a Republican and a protectionist; he has some confidence in the Republican platform. He wants the difference in the cost of labor between the two countries and a reasonable profit guaranteed by the platform; and he is astonished that the Senator from North Dakota reports a reduction of present duties, wipes out all profit, and puts us on a level with European labor, giving employment to foreign labor to make goods we consume.

The Senator representing the committee comes from a State in which I do not know of a thing his State produces that is not protected. Barley is away up in the dutiable list; hay, wheat, corn, potatoes, cabbage—indeed, everything, nearly, that State produces, or that I can recall, is highly protected. Being a member of the Finance Committee, and able to secure these high duties, he comes in and pounces down upon the States producing things his State does not produce, and wants a reduction of duties. In this case he has restrained somewhat his free-trade tendencies by asking a reduction of duties, but

on nearly all the products of West Virginia he wants them on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. In justice to the Senator from North Dakota, I will say that the Senator from North Dakota reported this amendment in accordance with the unanimous vote of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ELKINS. I said I regretted that the Senator had the backing of the committee, that the committee was willing to put itself on record, favoring rather the destruction of an American industry than building it up. I did not put the responsibility entirely upon the Senator from North Dakota this time. Generally he is guilty, but the whole committee is particeps criminis now.

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

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly.

Mr. MONEY. I do not think he can say the whole committee have been particeps criminis, because this side has had nothing to do with it.

Mr. ELKINS. I mean the majority of the committee.

Mr. MONEY. I want to have the Democratic minority stand exactly right before the country.

Mr. ELKINS. I am sorry that the Senator has no voice in the committee. I regret it exceedingly, for I believe some of the minority would be more generous than the committee has been with this languishing industry. I do not know what they want, but it does seem to me the committee wishes to give our markets for window glass to foreign producers. I can not see why the distinguished chairman should so eagerly get up and declare with superb satisfaction that the Finance Committee is backing up the Senator from North Dakota in injuring an American industry.

Mr. ALDRICH. The conditions which the Senator is alluding to have nothing whatever to do with the tariff, and the Senator ought to know it as well as I.

Mr. ELKINS. Why did you reduce the duty if it has nothing to do with the tariff?

Mr. ALDRICH. The condition of affairs in the window-glass industry is entirely due to overproduction and overcompetition. It is simply taking up the time of the Senate, as the Senator from West Virginia knows as well as I do, in making statements of this kind, as to what the committee intend to do with this industry in the way of destroying it. The conditions, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] said, are entirely due to causes outside of the tariff in any way, and the industry will not be ruined if the amendment prevails, as I hope it will prevail.

Mr. ELKINS. I am a little astonished to see the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Rhode Island and the committee all in accord to-day on the reduction of duties. I do not know what has come over the spirit of their dreams. I do not know what is the matter with the committee, but I do understand what is the matter with the Senator from Iowa; he is entirely consistent; he wants duties reduced.

Mr. KEAN. Why not let us vote?

Mr. ELKINS. Because I do not want to see a great American industry injured without as vigorous protest as I can possibly make in its behalf and in behalf of thousands of men out of employment, because many window-glass plants all over the country are idle.

I do not think the argument of the Senator from Rhode Island is good, that because there is a congested condition in the market, that because there is overproduction, therefore the duty should be reduced and the condition of this industry made worse. When this congestion is relieved, when this overproduction has ceased, then is this great industry to be left without protection? Is that the way to cure overproduction? Is the remedy to let the foreign producer supply all of our demands? I do not understand this process of reasoning.

The Senator from Rhode Island is generally clear-headed, and he generally wisely and promptly settles all tariff questions as far as I am concerned, because I willingly bow down at his feet and acknowledge his superior wisdom and judgment on this subject; but because we are congested and overproduced in this country we must let Europeans come in and finish the destruction of a great industry. I have not asked in Pennsylvania, in New York, in New Jersey, or New England any reduction on any of their products, not one.

Mr. KEAN. The Senator just read from the list he has that the people engaged in this industry are out of employment in New Jersey.

Mr. ELKINS. Certainly; and what I am trying to urge on the Senator from New Jersey is that he ought to stand by his people and see to it that the manufacture of window glass is not destroyed and thousands of his people thrown out of employment.

Mr. KEAN. I do stand by my people.

Mr. SCOTT. My colleague does not know that the Senator from New Jersey was for free trade yesterday.

Mr. ELKINS. I am sorry to see that he voted for free zinc; he is rarely a free trader; generally he fights within protection lines.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. ELKINS. I do.

Mr. ROOT. The Senator asked a moment ago why the duty on common window glass should be reduced. Let me give him a reason from Bulletin No. 62 of the Census Bureau, published in 1907:

Since 1900—

Says the bulletin—

Since 1900 the glass manufacturers in the United States have made vast strides in the direction of cheaper production. Machines for mechanical manipulation in the production of window glass, for manufacturing narrow-necked bottles, and for conveying ware are some of the latest contributions to the industry. Some of these machines were perfected during the census year and are now in active operation, but their influence on industry was slight during 1904, as their operation in that year was more or less of an experiment. The general improvement in factory construction, furnace equipment, and installation of mechanical blowing machines is generally indicated by the figures presented in Table 1.

Table No. 1 shows an increase in the production of glass: For the year 1890, \$41,000,000; in 1900, \$56,000,000; in 1905, \$79,000,000. So it appears by this data of the Government of the United States that the manufacturer of window glass shares in the general prosperity and enlargement of the trade, and that in this manufacture vast strides have been made in the direction of cheaper production through the introduction of mechanical appliances, necessarily reducing the proportion of labor involved. If that is not a reason for the reduction of duty upon an article of which there is now no importation, I do not know how any reason can be adduced for the reduction of any duty whatever.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, the Senator reads from data furnished by the Census Bureau up to 1905. I am speaking in and for the year 1909. The Senator is four years out of his reckoning; he is four years behind time.

Mr. ROOT. We are not legislating for a specific period of depression in the building trade. We are legislating for a long period of years to come, and we must take our data not from the particular moment, but from the general course and development of the manufacture.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, it will be remembered that the distinguished Senator from New York represents all sorts of people in the 7,000,000 of population among his constituents. In that number there is a large body of importers, and I do not fail to detect, running like a silver thread through the woof of his argument, the importers' interests. Now, let us deal with facts as they are, and up to date the window-glass business is prostrated. This tariff is going to last ten or fifteen years. You know and admit that the business is prostrated, but you say it is dull times, and, therefore, prostrated as it is, owing to these dull times, the duty should be reduced.

I do not think any such principle ought to enter into the making up of the tariff. The window-glass industry is a very large industry in the United States, as the Senator has shown. It employs a great many people; it gives homes to a great many more. It gave an ample return heretofore, in 1905, to those engaged in it, but it does not give any now. I showed by the table I read from there are 1,700 or 1,800 idle establishments in this country. I can not understand why the Senator from New York should agree, as he does, with the Senator from Iowa and the Finance Committee and the Senator from North Dakota that because here is a prostrated industry languishing, as they admit, we must further destroy it by reducing the duty and by letting in foreign glass. How does the Senator from New York or the Finance Committee hope or believe or ever expect this industry to revive if while languishing you kill it by letting in foreign glass, giving our market over to foreign importers and manufacturers? When or how can it ever recover? What is the use to appeal to a protection Senate, if it deserts protection all over this Republic?

The trouble about all this is that some duties are too high and some are too low. Now, I am not trying to reduce the duties on the products of New York. I abide by the judgment of the committee. I have voted in every instance, I believe, to sustain the report of the committee, and I have done so up to this moment on all the products of other States. This window-glass business is important in my State and in other States near by, and it is admitted that, in some way or other, this in-

terest, if it can by protection be encouraged, ought to be encouraged instead of being discouraged.

Mr. President, I know how impatient the chairman of the committee is to have a vote. I regret that I was not in the Chamber earlier to speak more at length on this subject, but with the permission of the Senate, I will incorporate some statements in my remarks, which I will not take up the time of the Senate now to read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

S. R. WIGHTMAN GLASS COMPANY,
Morgantown, W. Va., May 13, 1909.

Senator S. B. ELKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to add our protest to the reducing of the tariff on window glass and bottles. The window-glass business, while at the present time we are not manufacturers of same, but have been raised in the window-glass business—and with the tariff reduced, can not see but that it means the ruination of the window-glass industry of West Virginia.

We are more particularly interested in the bottle business, and would ask you to use every endeavor against making any change in the present rate on empty bottles.

Thanking you in advance for any favors you can show us along this line, we remain,

Yours, respectfully,

S. R. WIGHTMAN GLASS CO.

THE CLARKSBURG GLASS COMPANY,
Clarksburg, W. Va., May 17, 1909.

Hon. STEPHEN B. ELKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The present tariff agitation is a matter with which you are quite familiar, but possibly not so familiar with the conditions confronting the window-glass manufacturers of the United States, of which product West Virginia is one of the largest producers. For your information would say that conditions over which the manufacturers have had no control have placed the business in a deplorable condition, both as regards manufacturers and workmen. The value of stocks held by the manufacturers of West Virginia have in the past four or five years decreased in value until about 50 per cent is worth no more than 25 per cent of par, while none is valued higher than par. The wages of the workers have been reduced to such an extent that at this time and for the past two years skilled men have been able to command but little more than the man without a trade.

A tariff reduction would inevitably cause the manufacturers of common window glass to lose heavily on their investments, possibly the savings of a lifetime, and force him from the line of business in which he has had a lifetime experience; furthermore it would enforce thousands of skilled workers, as well as thousands of unskilled workers, to seek other means of livelihood and leave the foreign worker the trades with which they have always been identified.

There is no question but that a tariff reduction at this time on window glass would be disastrous in its effect upon window-glass manufacturers and workers alike, and we respectfully petition you to use your influence to maintain the present tariff rates on this commodity and save to us our investments and trades, for which favor we most cordially thank you in advance.

Very truly, yours,

THE CLARKSBURG GLASS CO.,
By P. E. HOCHSTRASSER, President.

THE JOHNSTON GLASS COMPANY,
Hartford City, Ind., May 15, 1909.

Hon. STEPHEN B. ELKINS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have noticed with considerable interest the recent discussions on window glass. It is a very difficult problem to solve. We feel that at least 50 per cent of the window-glass factories are insolvent at the present time, and continuation of the present ruinous methods will greatly increase the number of plants that are in financial difficulties.

As you have well stated in your remarks, factories in West Virginia and in other sections where they have practically free fuel are much better equipped to make glass at the least cost, but at the same time factories in your own State are not free from troubles, and at least half a dozen plants are now idle in West Virginia because they can not operate at a profit. There are quite a number of factories in West Virginia and elsewhere that are known as "cooperative" and are managed by glass workers. These skilled men were induced to engage in the business because they felt that their employers were not giving them proper periods of employment and were misrepresenting the actual conditions of window-glass manufacturing.

A very few years ago, when Indiana was blessed with natural gas, we had about 40 plants that were making window glass. We now have 6 factories, 3 of which are in operation. When the Indiana plants were on the wane about one-third of them were cooperative, and these factories neither made wages nor dividends for their owners. I believe the same condition exists in West Virginia and elsewhere where cooperation is in vogue.

There has been some talk about the formation of a window-glass combinations, and the manufacturers have tried to concentrate certain portions of their business, believing it would be productive of economy. They have met with but little success, and the indications are that their attempts will be a failure. There are about 3,000 pots, which are known as "hand-operated factories." These hand-operated plants are supposed to make not more than 60 per cent of the window glass used in this country; this leaves about 40 per cent of the glass to be made by machine interests or by the American Window Glass Company. There are at least 6 or 8 other factories that are trying to make glass by machinery, but have not as yet made a commercial success of their devices.

I attach a memorandum of the hand factories in the United States, with a memorandum of their present condition as near as I can furnish them. The hand plants have been trying to benefit themselves by forming an association, and out of more than 3,000 pots they have managed to interest 1,344; this does not include the American Window

Glass Company. It is quite likely that this plan will be necessarily abandoned within a short time. Some authorities have accused us of trying to form a trust, but those who have given the question considerable thought advise us that such is not the case. Our affairs are in such desperate shape, however, that one of the gentlemen that recently attended one of our meetings stated that he did not see that it made much difference what public institution the glass makers occupied, as there did not seem to be much choice between prisons, charitable institutions, and asylums.

Just at this time it is not the intention to give you figures on foreign costs, but much of the difference can be accounted for by the employment of women and children in the semiskilled trades, such as lehr tenders, roll carriers, shove-in boys, etc. Such labor abroad receives from one-third to 40 per cent of the amount we pay for similar service, and in order to reduce their cost to a minimum, window-glass plants in Belgium are operated seven full days each week.

It is our opinion that if there is any reduction in tariff on window glass that the industry will be speedily ruined, and we do not believe that the plant of Mr. Jones, of Morgantown, would ever operate again if his suggestions were carried out.

There are several reasons for present depressed conditions, one being overproduction; the second, machine competition; and the third, labor troubles, which we have experienced almost continuously during the past two or three years. Both labor and the costs of material are lower than we have experienced in recent years and there would be little, if any, room to make further reductions in our cost if the tariff were lowered.

Yours, respectfully,

J. R. JOHNSTON, President.

Mr. CURTIS. There have been established a number of glass plants in the gas belt of Kansas. The operators ask that the present duty be retained; that is, the Dingley rate. We have the glass sand and the natural gas. We hope that other factories will be established, and believe that they will be if the Dingley rates upon glass are retained.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BACON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELKINS. I should like to know what the amendment is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, Senators in the rear do not understand what the amendment is, and I ask that it may be again stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of the printed amendment down to and including the word "pound," at the end of line 7, on page 26, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

97. Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window glass, not exceeding 150 square inches, 1 cent per pound; above that, and not exceeding 384 square inches, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 720 square inches, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 864 square inches, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. BACON. I simply desire to say that the amendment relates only to common window glass, and not to the larger sizes of glass.

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

The yeas and nays were taken.

Mr. FLINT. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ELKINS (after having voted in the negative). I now remember that I am paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I ask if he has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has not voted.

Mr. ELKINS. Then I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Bacon	Fletcher	Money	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Gore	Newlands	Stone
Bristow	Hughes	Overman	Taylor
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Tillman
Clay	La Follette	Paynter	
Daniel	McLaurin	Rayner	
Davis	Martin	Simmons	

NAYS—52.

Aldrich	Clapp	Frye	Oliver
Beveridge	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Page
Borah	Crane	Gamble	Penrose
Bourne	Crawford	Guggenheim	Perkins
Brandeggee	Cullom	Hale	Piles
Briggs	Cummins	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Curtis	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Kean	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	McEnery	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—14.

Bailey	du Pont	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stephenson
Bradley	Elkins	Richardson	Tallaferro
Clarke, Ark.	Foster	Shively	
Culberson	Frazier	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. BACON's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now, Mr. President, I ask to take up paragraph 405, with a view of completing the paper schedule. I move, on page—

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me for just a moment?

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

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the paragraph referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island is taken up, I should like to recur to paragraph 192, and suggest an amendment, which I believe will lead to no debate and which has received the assent of the Committee on Finance, as I understand. I propose the amendment to that paragraph which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 192, page 67, at the end of the paragraph, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That paper, cardboard, or pasteboard wrappings or containers that are made and used only for the purpose of holding or containing the article with which they are filled, and after such use are mere waste material, shall not be dutiable unless their contents are dutiable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Rhode Island in regard to the matter which has just been passed on. Of course, I know the Senator's intention, but I merely wish to ask whether or not what has previously been provided with reference to sardine boxes would be affected by the amendment which has just been agreed to?

Mr. ALDRICH. It would not. The amendment does not affect that kind of containers at all.

Mr. BACON. I did not know but that qualification might restore it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. BACON. Very well; I am willing to rest on the judgment of the Senator from Rhode Island in regard to that.

Mr. BURKETT. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he would permit me to offer an amendment in the paragraph which was under consideration last evening on page 215, as to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself have had some conference?

Mr. ALDRICH. To what does the Senator from Nebraska refer?

Mr. BURKETT. I propose an amendment in paragraph 657, on page 215, line 13. After the word "scientific," I propose to insert the word "fraternal."

Mr. LODGE. That is all right, Mr. President. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no objection to that amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 657, page 215, line 13, after the word "scientific" and the comma, it is proposed to insert the word "fraternal."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask that paragraph 405 be taken up; and I move, on page 157, in line 21, to strike out "one-tenth" and insert "two-tenths." This is the paragraph with reference to paper used for printing newspapers, what is known as "news print."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 405, page 157, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "one-tenth" and to insert in lieu the word "two-tenths."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island what is meant by the insertion of those words?

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

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The rate in the bill as it came from the House on this character of paper, I believe, is \$2 a ton, and that is raised to \$4.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is raised to \$4. The present law imposes a duty of \$6 a ton on this paper; the House bill proposes a duty of \$2 a ton, and the Senate Committee on Finance recommend a duty of \$4 a ton.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to propose an amendment to the amendment by moving, in line 20, to strike out, beginning with the word "valued," after the word "section," all the rest of line 20, all of line 21, and the word "pound" and the semicolon in line 22. I ask that the Secretary state the amendment.

Mr. CLAY. What is the object of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BROWN. I will state the object as soon as the amendment is reported from the desk.

Mr. CLAY. I ask that the amendment be stated.

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

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 405, on page 157, in lines 20, 21, and 22, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

Valued at not above 2½ cents per pound, one-tenth of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the effect of my proposition is to put news print paper upon the free list. My understanding of the parliamentary situation is that I must first move to strike from this paragraph the provision in regard to print paper and afterwards follow it with an amendment to put it on the free list, which I intend to do.

This subject is a most interesting one, yet I am not disposed to keep the Senate here any length of time in its discussion. While I do not want to start any trouble in this Chamber, I have made up my mind, at the risk of starting a panic in this body, to read a line from a message sent to Congress by President Roosevelt:

There should be no tariff on any forest product grown in this country; and, in especial, there should be no tariff on wood pulp; due notice of the change being of course given to those engaged in the business, so as to enable them to adjust themselves to the new conditions. The repeal of the duty on wood pulp should if possible be accompanied by an agreement with Canada that there shall be no export duty on Canadian pulp wood.

Mr. President, I have read these lines from our last great Republican President for two reasons. First, I want to call the members of the Finance Committee back into the Republican party on this question. It was one of the declared policies of President Roosevelt, spoken not alone in this message, but at other and different times, to bring about a reduction of the duties on all products of wood grown in this country.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. When did the Republican party stand for free trade, that it should now be called back, and whence is it called back to this supposed home?

Mr. BROWN. The Republican party never stood for free trade and the Republican party never will stand for free trade; but the Republican party will stand for putting those things on the free list which ought to be there. Will you undertake to tell the country that this bill, which has a free list covering several hundred articles, is a free-trade bill or an unrepudiated bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. Does the Senator desire an answer now?

Mr. BROWN. I asked the question argumentatively, but the Senator may reply if he wants to.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then I will defer a reply until such time as I may fully know what the Senator thinks about it.

Mr. BROWN. Very well. Mr. President, as I said before, this was one of the standing and publicly declared policies of the late President, Mr. Roosevelt. I call the attention of Republicans in this Chamber to the fact that the plank in the last national platform that won the election for the presidency last year was the plank that pledged the carrying out and fulfillment of the Roosevelt policies. My friends on the Finance Committee and other friends off of that committee must not point their fingers at those of us who are fighting now to carry out one of those policies. We are the Republicans on this issue.

Mr. President, there is another reason I read this extract, and that is because it calls the attention of Congress to the fact that this paper and pulp industry differs from the ordinary in-

dustries of the country. In what regard? In this regard, that it is so situated that it ought to be a subject of treaty or agreement between the two countries, Canada and the United States. That proposition is based upon the fact that in our country the raw material out of which paper is made is fast disappearing. Its disappearance is rapid and certain. The spruce tree, out of which print paper is most commonly made, is disappearing so fast that at the end of a few years, under present consumption, it will be entirely gone.

The only country from which we can get spruce is our neighbor across the line. Canada has a supply of spruce that is practically inexhaustible. Such is the testimony of everybody who has investigated the subject. Canada can furnish us her wood and we can make the pulp out of the wood and paper out of the pulp; but should trouble ever come between these two countries over tariff duties with respect to these products Canada has the power to say: "We will prohibit the exportation entirely of this raw material." Can any Senator in this body contemplate the disaster which would come to our industry and to our people if Canada should prohibit the exportation of spruce?

Some Senator a little while ago suggested to me that such a proposition was entirely mythical; that it was a dream; that Canada never would do such a thing. Mr. President, let me call the Senate's attention to a speech made by the premier of Quebec upon the second day of this month:

[From correspondence of the Paper Mill.]

Ottawa, Can., June 2, 1909.—At the banquet given last night to Sir Lomer Gouin, premier of Quebec, by the Reform Club of Montreal, in the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, the government leader definitely stated that as soon as the Crown lands act could be amended to permit of the changes necessary, the province would prohibit the export of raw material for paper making.

Taking up the question of Crown lands the premier foreshadowed certain changes which would take place, declaring that stumpage would be considerably increased. In making his important announcement as to exporting pulp, he said that public opinion was now evidently ripe for a change. The forests of the United States, he added, had become so depleted that the pulp manufacturers on the other side of the line were obliged to come to Canada for their raw material.

Does anybody dispute that proposition? Last year there was imported from Canada almost a million cords of spruce for paper purposes.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I only interrupt the Senator to call his attention to the impending peril. In the beginning of his remarks he said that disaster would come to our people if Canada should put a duty on this, and now he reads us an official statement that Canada is going to do it. What are we going to do?

Mr. BROWN. I said disaster would come to us if Canada prohibited the exportation of her spruce.

Mr. HEYBURN. It looks as though we are going to catch it, so I guess we had better get ready for the storm.

Mr. BROWN. The trouble with this bill, Mr. President, is that it invites the storm. Situated as we are, at the mercy of the Dominion of Canada, that has this lumber and this spruce wood, it does not become us to strike the first blow by putting a duty on that country's product. It becomes our duty, if we want to protect our country, to make the first advance, and make it now by saying to Canada, "We will take your wood and we will let your products in free."

Mr. HEYBURN. All of them?

Mr. BROWN. All wood products; yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why not all the rest?

Mr. BROWN. The premier proceeded to say:

He believed the time had now arrived to put a stop to this policy—

That is the policy of exporting to this country a million cords of spruce every year for paper purposes. This has nothing to do with the lumber proposition for lumber purposes—

He believed the time had now arrived to put a stop to this policy, although, of course, they could not prevent private owners from doing as they liked with their product, but the government had now decided that in the near future all pulp wood coming off the public domain and destined for the United States would have to be manufactured on this side of the line. Certain private interests perhaps, he said, would suffer, but he believed it would be necessary in the interests of the Province to adopt a similar policy to that of Ontario.

In Ontario the exportation of spruce from the crown lands is prohibited. In the Province of Quebec the stumpage for spruce collected by the government is 65 cents a cord, but with the provision that 25 cents is remitted to the lessee, provided the tree is manufactured or kept on that side of the line; in other words, there is a 25-cent export duty now on spruce coming across the line.

The importance of this subject I do not think can be exaggerated. Heaven is my witness that I would not hurt an industry if it could be avoided. I would not close a mill if it could be avoided; and I would not present this amendment if I had any idea at all that it would disastrously affect a single industry in this country; but, Mr. President, even if it did sacrifice a few private interests I want to say that the public welfare must be served first, and if it can not be served without the sacrifice the sacrifice must be made.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. It just occurred to me that we are taking the wrong end of this proposition first. I ask the Senator whether he would be in favor of putting a finished manufactured product on the free list and leaving the raw material from which it is made on the protected list?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; I am in favor of putting them both in this schedule on the free list.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, supposing the Senator might be able to put the finished product on the free list and then, when it came to the raw material that went into that product it would be found impossible to put that on the free list, would it not present a condition in which the Senator would hardly want to find himself? In other words, would it not be a wise thing to first take up the pulp question itself and dispose of that?

Mr. BROWN. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that I am not taking these paragraphs and schedules up; it is our distinguished Committee on Finance that takes them up. They have taken this one up first.

Mr. CLAPP. It is well within the constitutional prerogative of a Senator to move to vary an order imposed by the committee, and take it up in a logical order. It seems to me that is the way we ought to get at this.

Mr. BROWN. There might be some better logic in proceeding the other way, but the committee has invited a challenge and a fight along this line, and, so far as I am concerned, I think it is wholly immaterial as to which paragraph is taken up first.

To my mind there will be no doubt, provided the Senate puts print paper on the free list, that it will decide to put pulp upon the free list. Of course, the fact remains that pulp is now substantially upon the free list because of the proviso which says that there shall be no duty collected provided no export duties are levied by any country, province, or other territory.

This question was suggested by President Roosevelt at the first session of the last Congress. At the same time there were presented petitions to Congress, and I do not intend to take the time of the Senate by reading them, but merely to describe them. Here is a sample. It is an appeal purporting to come from 100,000 workers employed in newspaper and printing offices protesting in their own interest against duties on the product of which their employers are the consumers. Whether their complaint that their interests are being jeopardized is true or not I am not here to say. I am simply presenting the petitions and the complaint that the Senate may understand that there are laboring men in this country outside of those employed in the paper mills asking Congress for relief by having this duty removed.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is reading from various people who want free wood pulp. I wish to ask whether it is his purpose to quote the Democratic platform on that subject?

Mr. BROWN. I should like to quote it, but I am afraid it would prejudice my cause with so many Democrats over on the other side that I will not do it.

On April 22 of this year the Newspaper Publishers' Association, a national organization, held their annual convention in New York and passed certain resolutions which I have here. They recite the same complaint. I think I will read part of this because it comes from a body of men who are not importers. The committee is in no danger of going into hysterics, because not one of them is an importer. They are the fellows who when Congress adjourns at night send to their home papers sometimes what we write about ourselves happening during the day. They are the fellows who have stood as watchmen on the tower for good government ever since our Government has stood. I do not care how miserable the politics of the newspaper man may be, editorially the newspaper editor preaches the gospel of morality and civic virtue all the time. They are a reputable and intelligent element in our

society, and they have a right to be heard in Congress as well as have other people. They say:

For a period of years the American newspapers have been the victims of paper combinations, mergers, corners, discriminations, and secrecy in paper quotations. The failure of paper makers to employ technical skill in the operation of their plants has increased the burdens of consumers. We want to put an end to these abuses by broadening the market and by stopping schemes such as that planned in the creation of the International Paper Company, which aimed to destroy competition and to give value to a collection of antiquated mills by bringing them under one control with 7,000 square miles of timber land and undeveloped water powers to the extent of 194,000 horsepower. We object to these gigantic speculations at our expense.

This is signed by E. H. Baker, the secretary of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, giving the resolutions passed by that body of men.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator's amendment run in the line of the last suggestion made by the newspaper association—that it wants no change in the House bill? As I heard the Senator's amendment it occurred to me that he does not even adopt the House bill, but wants print paper to be absolutely free, while the newspaper association asks that the rate of the House remain.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct. I ask that it be put upon the free list, as they have always asked and have made a fight for; but afterwards, when the House committee reduced the tariff from \$6 to \$2, they said "We will take that rather than lose that much."

To-day I have no doubt that the newspaper publishers of this country would be very much gratified if they knew that this rate, brought in by a compromise, of \$4 a ton would be defeated and the House rate sustained.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. In just a moment. The House rate is \$2; the existing law is \$6 a ton. Our friends on the Finance Committee compromised by making it \$4. I have offered an amendment here to put it upon the free list, but I am frank enough to say to the Senate that I will quit this debate now if you will compromise between my amendment and the report of our Finance Committee, leave it where the House put it—at \$2 a ton.

Mr. GALLINGER. We must decline that.

Mr. BROWN. That does not go against the merits of the proposition that the product ought to be upon the free list.

Mr. DIXON. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. With pleasure.

Mr. DIXON. The price of print paper in the market is about \$45 a ton, I believe.

Mr. BROWN. It depends from whom you are buying. If you have a stand-in with the International Paper Company you may get it for less.

Mr. DIXON. On the open market about \$45 a ton is the price, is it not?

Mr. BROWN. The price varies in different markets at all times. There is no quoted price. If my friend wanted to buy paper for his splendid newspaper in Montana, the first thing he would have to do would be to consult the selling agent of this combination, and the selling agent would not talk prices to you or to any other purchaser until he found out where you lived and the location of your paper—in other words, in whose territory you were. Then, if you were in his territory, he would quote you a price, and if you were not he would tell you he did not have any paper to sell.

Mr. DIXON. With a tariff duty of about 10 per cent on print paper, when the committee has reported a tariff bill that averages about 40 per cent, on what grounds of equity, morality, or decency can this one industry in this country ask to have their material placed entirely on the free list when every other industry and every other commercial institution under the flag is living under about a 40 per cent tariff? What is the equity, what is the fairness in this demand, that we shall place print paper alone on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. The interrogatory does great injustice to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Montana—

Mr. DIXON. Perhaps in the eyes of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BROWN. In supposing he can figure it out on the basis of averages, you would not have any free list in this bill under your logic—none at all. The duty on print paper must rest upon some fact, some necessity, some condition, or else it ought not to have any resting place at all in this bill.

In view of these petitions and appeals, and in obedience to the command of the President when he sent the message I read, Congress took action. The House, at the other end of this

building, heard the voice of the President, and they provided for a committee to investigate this very fact—not to find out some way by which they could excuse a tariff or abolish a tariff, but a committee charged with ascertaining the truth about the conditions of business here and elsewhere. That committee consisted of four Republicans, I think, and two Democrats. They made an investigation that lasted ten months, and during that time they visited the mills of this country and the forests of this country. They visited Canada and her mills and forests. In addition they sent experts to Germany. They sent experts to Sweden. In addition to themselves they had experts in Canada. And all for what purpose? To find out the truth about this business. That is all they had in view.

In pursuance of that purpose the committee formulated this circular which I have in my hand. It is a letter of inquiry, and they sent it to every paper mill in America, as well as to every paper mill in Canada. The Senate will understand how full the information would be if response had been made to the inquiry. Let me give you an idea by just reading you some of the questions:

The name of company making the report; capital invested (include value of lands, buildings, machinery, tools and implements, etc.); timber land owned, distant or adjacent to mill; all other lands; salaried employees; salaried officers of corporations; superintendents, managers, etc.; average number of wage-earners employed during the year; total amount paid in wages during the year; total amount paid for rent, taxes, insurance, interest, repairs, advertising, and other miscellaneous expenses; cost of materials used during the year.

Then follows the number of cords of wood for pulp; the wood fiber purchased—ground; sulphite; soda; all other; fuel; all other materials, including mill supplies; the total cost of all materials; the pounds of newspaper manufactured; the per cent of total cost represented by wages; the per cent of total cost represented by materials; the per cent of total cost represented by all other expenses.

Then come prices—what they sold their paper for during all the months of the two preceding years; the name, location, and capacity of their mills.

That circular answered truthfully by the print-paper millers of this country would disclose the facts about their business, would it not? I want to say that of the print-paper mills to which this inquiry was sent, 188 mills responded in detail and fully, and the chairman of the select committee in his address to the Members of the House on the subject said that these responses came from all the big mills in the United States, except those in Maine and New Hampshire. I do not know why Maine and New Hampshire should turn their backs on Congress when it was undertaking to investigate a fact, a fact that it is necessary to know in order to legislate to protect them. There was not an enemy of the mill on that committee—not one. They were all friends of the industry.

Mr. President, I want to have read briefly the conclusions of the House select committee on that subject after making this investigation. I will ask the Clerk to read the matter within brackets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Your committee has taken a vast amount of testimony, which is acknowledged to be of great benefit in the pulp and paper trade. We have collected a large amount of information which, both at present and in the future, will prove of immense service to those who are interested in the use or production of pulp or paper. Your committee personally has visited and inspected carefully a large number of pulp and paper mills, have inspected and examined forests, both in the United States and in Canada, have given long study to the woods used, have considered every phase of the subject concerning which information was available, and have reached the conclusions hereinabove stated. It is not practicable, or, in the opinion of your committee, necessary for the committee in this report to set forth in detail or even in a general way the results of the information obtained.

The committee has obtained from a large number of newspaper publishers of the United States schedules showing the cost to them of paper through a series of years, which schedules have been tabulated and published in the committee's hearings.

The committee has also obtained schedules from the pulp and paper manufacturers of the United States, giving information concerning the capital invested, the cost of production, the percentage of cost paid in wages, the selling price of the articles produced, the quantity of production, etc., which schedules have been reduced to general tabulations and the tabulations published in the hearings.

The committee has also carefully investigated, through schedules and through the aid of the Department of Labor, the percentage of wages going into the cost of production of pulp and paper, and the cost of labor per unit both for pulp and paper, including the cost from the forest to the finished product, all of which tables are published in the hearings.

The committee has also investigated through statements obtained from manufacturers in Canada and through personal investigation by the Department of Labor the wage cost in Canadian mills. The com-

mittee has also obtained information concerning the wage cost and cost of production in Sweden. The committee has also obtained through the Treasury Department full information as to the importations of pulp wood, wood pulp, and print paper into the United States from different places and at different ports of entry. The committee has also obtained full and complete information as to the exportation and importation of paper and paper-making materials from and to the different countries of the world. All of this information has been published in the hearings of the committee, comprising between 3,000 and 4,000 pages of printed testimony, and all of which has been carefully and conscientiously considered by the committee in forming its decision.

The members of your committee, when appointed, had no special or general knowledge of the subject. They have labored diligently and as effectively as they could. The effort of your committee has been to arrive at facts and just conclusions, regardless of personal bias or partisan considerations. The recommendations which the committee present are the unanimous views of the entire membership of the committee.

Mr. BROWN. It seems to me no argument is needed to persuade the Senate to give some consideration and some weight to the findings of the committee that pursued the investigation as recited by the committee itself.

Mr. President, this finding was based upon testimony, and it is to the testimony briefly that I want to invite the attention of the Senate. My theory is that the committee, in their final determination to fix the tariff at \$2 a ton, decided every disputed question—every one—in favor of the tariff and in favor of the claimants for a high duty. I undertake to say that an analysis of the testimony will convince any open-minded man that no protective duty is necessary to keep the New England mills or any American mill open and busy.

Here are the elements in the cost of paper. It is the cost of wood—that is, spruce. The other cost is labor. The other costs are lime, coal, and the necessary expenses in manufacturing the article. The cost elements and factors that should control us, it seems to me, largely are the wood cost and the labor cost; and upon that question, Senators, I submit there will be but one verdict, and that is the verdict which was submitted by the chairman of the committee, when he said that print paper can be produced in America about as cheaply as it can be in Canada. The facts show that labor is higher in the mills in Canada, or some parts of the labor is, than it is in America. Let me give you the testimony on the cost of wood as the first element.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator before him that part of the report in which the House committee state that the difference in labor and the cost of maintaining the mills is about \$2—the labor difference and the cost of materials in maintaining the establishments—without going into the question of wood in any way?

Mr. BROWN. Did the Senator ask me a question?

Mr. HALE. Yes; whether he has that?

Mr. BROWN. I have the report; I just sent it to the desk.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator that particular part of the report in which the basis is stated as \$2 difference in labor, without going into the wood matter at all?

Mr. BROWN. No, I have not; I have not seen that part of the report.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will see it before the discussion is over.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to see that part of it because it is repeatedly said by members of the committee—and I will read what they say—that there is practically no difference in the labor cost, and if there is any difference at all it is in the cost of the wood. I had understood that the fight was made before our Committee on Finance on the difference in the cost of wood alone, and it is that consideration which brought in the \$4 duty.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from Maine—he is on the Committee on Finance—if the committee based its recommendation on the difference in the cost of wood or of labor, or both?

Mr. HALE. The committee did not in its recommendation as presented by the chairman of the committee this morning go to the extent that the investigation of the committee shows the difference of wood in Canada and here to be. Had it done so it would have reported not a compromise measure of \$4, but five or six dollars.

Mr. BROWN. Then they did not consider at all the difference in the cost of wood?

Mr. HALE. They certainly did.

Mr. BROWN. Did they of labor?

Mr. HALE. That is the main difference. The difference in labor is about \$2. The difference in wood in round numbers is just about \$6.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator mean to say that a cord of spruce wood in Canada costs \$6 less than a cord in America?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly. The investigation showed that perfectly clearly and perfectly plainly, and the MANN committee did not go into that, but states that its basis is the difference in labor—about \$2. It does not go into the question of the great difference, the enormous advantage that Canada has over us in her wood supply.

Mr. BROWN. Let me refresh the Senator's recollection as to what that committee found in reference to the cost of wood. I think my distinguished friend the Senator from Maine has not read the report.

Mr. HALE. Yes, I have read the report.

Mr. BROWN. Of Mr. MANN?

Mr. HALE. I have read it very carefully.

Mr. BROWN. Here are some of the words Mr. MANN delivered to the House the other day.

Mr. HALE. I am talking about the report.

Mr. BROWN. I understand—and MANN made the report, and MANN based his argument on the report and referred to it frequently—that it was a unanimous report, signed alike by Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. HALE. I am talking about the report.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Not about a speech.

Mr. BROWN. I am speaking about his report.

Mr. HALE. I am talking about the report itself.

Mr. BROWN. This is what the chairman said:

The Booth mills at Ottawa, Canada, paid \$8 per rough cord for pulp wood in log lengths at the mill during 1908. As shown by the returns to the special committee from the pulp and paper manufacturers using 1,677,000 cords of pulp wood for 1907, the average price per cord was \$7.76.

Here is the chairman of the committee quoting the testimony that says wood was worth less in the United States than it was in Canada.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does the Senator have the information, or can he tell us what a cord of wood for paper purposes is; what are the dimensions of a cord of wood for paper?

Mr. BROWN. I have forgotten the number of cubic feet.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know what a cord of firewood is. It is the same? Four by four by eight?

Mr. BROWN. It takes a cord and two-fifths.

Mr. HALE. It is 128 solid feet.

Mr. TILLMAN. We have billions and billions of pine to make it of in the South.

Mr. BROWN. Have you spruce down there?

Mr. TILLMAN. Spruce has green turpentine in it, and if you can make it out of one wood you can make it out of the other.

Mr. BROWN. I am talking about spruce out of which you can make print paper.

Mr. TILLMAN. We have not any spruce, but we have the other stuff by the billion.

Mr. BROWN. But you have not the spruce.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is the Senator prepared to say that spruce is the only wood out of which print paper can be made?

Mr. BROWN. That is the testimony of all the experts—by the mechanical process. Hemlock may be used, but very little of it is used. Spruce is the only wood existing in any amount in this country known to science which you can grind mechanically and make print paper. This print paper—

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to know if the Senator knows; or is it a guess?

Mr. BROWN. I am telling the fact about it. I am not guessing at anything.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not understand the Senator as saying that you can not make wood pulp out of anything except spruce.

Mr. BROWN. You can make it chemically out of anything, by using soda and sulphur and that process; make it chemically.

Mr. SIMMONS. Can you not make paper out of any pulp except that from the spruce?

Mr. BROWN. It would be very costly. You can not make cheap print paper used for newspapers out of any wood except spruce.

Mr. SIMMONS. There must be some misunderstanding about this matter. There is located in North Carolina—

Mr. BROWN. Soda sulphite.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very large mills.

Mr. BROWN. Soda sulphite.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know exactly the process by which they make the wood pulp, but I know they make it out of the ordinary pine. There is in one place in my State a mill which has just been finished at a cost of, I think, a million and a half. They are using this new Swiss machinery, I believe it is, although I am not sure about this, very little of which has been introduced into this country at the present time, and the representatives of that mill have been here—I am expressing no opinion about it; I am just stating facts—recently telling me that they can make paper cheaper than anybody can make it in this country out of that pine. I do not know, of course, what kind of paper it is, but they spoke of making paper.

Mr. BROWN. That is the whole gist of the difference of opinion. Will the Senator allow me to explain in a moment that cheap print paper—the kind covered by my amendment—is made by the grinding process out of mechanically ground pulp? This pulp is the result of grinding wood. It is the most cheaply manufactured of all the pulps. No chemicals are used in its manufacture at all. And the power used to run the mill is cheap water power.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me state that the mill I referred to is run by water.

Mr. BROWN. There is no doubt of that. Many of the soda and sulphite mills are making paper down there, not out of spruce but out of poplar and other woods. You can make paper out of any wood on earth by using caustic soda as a chemical, but you can not make cheap print paper out of it. You could make print paper out of poplar, but it would cost a hundred dollars a ton or more.

Mr. SIMMONS. And chestnut also.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; but by the soda or sulphite process. They could make it out of almost any wood except poplar until some genius discovered a way to subtract from the poplar an ingredient that was foreign to usable pulp for paper purposes. At the mill in my friend's State they have a machine that segregates the different parts of the poplar wood. It extracts the foreign part and leaves the rest. I am not discussing chemical wood pulp at all. The duty on chemical wood pulp is fixed by other provisions in this bill. The proposition before us is mechanical wood pulp.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would ask the Senator for information because I know very little about this matter of course. Do I understand the Senator to say that we can make all kinds of paper out of our common pine and scrub pine? We have a million acres of scrub pine down in North Carolina. Some of it is made out of chestnut. They first peel off the bark and get the extract out of it and then use the balance to make pulp. Do I understand the Senator to say that they can make all kinds of paper out of these woods except print paper?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and they can also make print paper out of them, but it is very costly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I mean commercially, as a question of value.

Mr. BROWN. It is not done anywhere as a commercial proposition. The soda and sulphite process is used to make costlier paper. The manila and all the other forms of high-grade papers are made by the chemical process of manufacturing the pulp. It was only about sixty years ago that a Dutchman by the name of Keeler over in Germany discovered a method by which you could grind spruce and get cheap wood pulp. In 1855 up in Pennsylvania the first mill of that kind was set up in this country.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nebraska is doubtless aware of the fact that print paper is not made exclusively of ground wood pulp, but that from 20 to 25 per cent of the sulphite fiber is used.

Mr. BROWN. I was going to explain that they mix it in order to give the paper a little better cohesive power. Some use 20 per cent sulphite and some 15.

Mr. GALLINGER. And some more.

Mr. BROWN. I do not think in the testimony here it is shown that anybody uses over 20 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then again, if the Senator will permit me a moment, if he will turn to the report of the committee he will find that they are not so clear themselves as to whether spruce wood is the only wood that can be used for print paper. The report says:

Whether other kinds of wood besides spruce can be profitably used for the production of cheap print paper is a matter concerning which there is some difference of opinion.

Mr. FRYE. Poplar wood is just as good as hemlock.

Mr. BROWN. I am not speaking of the manufacture of print paper from poplar by chemical process. It is so costly that nobody manufactures print paper out of poplar. There

is not a mill in New England that makes a pound of print paper out of poplar.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is very little poplar in New England.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is almost an unknown wood with us.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I wish to ask the Senator how long ago the discovery was made that spruce was the cheapest and almost the only product from which we could get print paper?

Mr. BROWN. Print paper was made prior to the discovery of the grinding process in 1844 out of the vegetable wastes of the country—straw, flax, hemp, jute, old ropes, canes, bamboo, and other cellulose fibers.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know what the old ordinary paper used to be made out of—rags.

Mr. BROWN. That is it exactly.

Mr. TILLMAN. But I wanted to know how long since they discovered that they could make print paper out of nothing but spruce.

Mr. BROWN. In 1844 they started to do it. It was always known that you could make print paper out of spruce, but to make it by the grinding or mechanical process was never known to the commercial and scientific world until 1844.

Mr. TILLMAN. Its general use has been much more recent.

Mr. BROWN. It has been used all the time.

Mr. TILLMAN. But its general use has been much more recent than 1844?

Mr. BROWN. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. TILLMAN. What I mean is that we were not dependent on spruce even twenty-five years ago.

Mr. BROWN. No; because we used rags and waste.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will say to the Senator the nut of this proposition to me is this: The subscription rates on the New York Sun, for instance, are the same that they were when this discovery was first made. Are they going to reduce them any if they get paper free?

Mr. BROWN. You will have to write to the Sun to find out. I do not know.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator is here in the interests of free newspapers and is advocating free paper. Of course, I understand the political significance of that, and I wanted to know if it involves a terrible catastrophe to and an obliteration of these headlights of information—the newspapers. If they get free paper from Canada, will they sell their papers at half a cent apiece instead of a cent, or will they cut the price from 3 cents down to 1 cent? Tell us what will be the ultimate result of this. Who are the beneficiaries?

Mr. BROWN. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina if these improved processes reduced the price of paper?

Mr. TILLMAN. That has nothing to do with the case. I want to know where your interests lie.

Mr. BROWN. My interest is with the consumers of this country.

Mr. TILLMAN. The ultimate consumer is the man who buys the newspaper.

Mr. BROWN. He is the ultimate consumer.

Mr. TILLMAN. The question is whether he is going to get more newspapers for the money than he gets now.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. In reply to the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina I will state that every newspaper man who was asked the question whether or not he would reduce the price of his paper with paper and pulp on the free list promptly replied, "No." He was then asked if he would reduce the price of advertisements, and he said, "No."

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to know where the interest in this question comes.

Mr. BROWN. I have no such direct information from the publishers, and it is wholly immaterial whether they do or not, to my mind.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is the principle involved.

Mr. BROWN. The question is whether we are going to put a duty on it. If a duty is necessary it ought to be on, and if it is not it ought to be taken off.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. GALLINGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and to whom?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma first.

Mr. OWEN. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that because the newspapers do not consent to reduce the cost of the paper from 2 cents to 1 cent or from 1 cent to a half a cent, and do not consent to change their charge for advertising as a condition precedent to lowering or removing this duty, has nothing to do with the case. To change 2 cents to 1

cent or from 1 cent to a half cent in the cost of newspapers would be an amazing change in per cent and volume, and considering the corresponding benefit to them of the reduced cost of the paper it would be entirely unjustified. That they should enter into a contract in advance to change the charge for the use of their advertising columns because of this change in the cost of paper is ridiculous. They ought not to be expected to do so. The important fact that the newspapers of this country comprise one of the greatest agencies for the education of the American people, comprise the greatest agency for the publicity in public affairs, in business matters, and in promoting commerce; in creating activity of business, and the enormous benefit of cheap paper to the people of this country in promoting their welfare, can not be exaggerated.

In my judgment instead of reducing this rate it ought to be absolutely eliminated and paper be made as free as water, or air, or sunlight, or any other providence of God. Paper, newspaper, is the basis of all modern civilization. We should glory in our magnificent public press—and except the teachers of religion—it is the most powerful and valuable of all agencies in the advance of the human race and gives more in return for what it receives than any commercial agency on earth. They should have every advantage we can give them and should have cheap paper. They make a magnificent use of it.* There can be no exaggeration of the value of cheap paper.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me a moment?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Agreeing to all that has been so eloquently said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] the point with me is to find out how it is and why it is that the Senators on the other side who are so solicitous about the welfare of American industries in protecting them and looking after labor and all that kind of thing have found it in their hearts to interfere with the spread of light by newspapers; and, wonder on top of wonders, some of these very newspapers are the headlights of protection that are clamoring for free trade for the articles which they use, and deny me the opportunity to buy this coat without a protective tariff, these pants, these shoes, everything that I have. They are humbugs and whited sepulchers—that is what they are.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I do not care to be diverted to a discussion of whether the newspaper men are humbugs or not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I said the protective-tariff advocates among the newspapers were humbugs.

Mr. BROWN. If I went into the question of the humbug business I would have to read to my friend from South Carolina his platform and ask him why he is repudiating it from time to time.

Mr. TILLMAN. Go ahead and read it; I will answer.

Mr. BROWN. It is just the plan of the enemies of this proposition to put print paper on the free list to have the discussion sidetracked.

Now, I want to get back to the meat of this question. I started to read the statement of the chairman of the Mann committee with reference to the cost of wood. I beg the pardon of the Senator from New Hampshire; he wished to interrupt me a little while ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not interrupt the Senator now.

Mr. BROWN. I read this statement as to the Booth mills at Ottawa, the very largest mills in Canada:

The Booth mills at Ottawa, Canada, paid \$8 per rough cord for pulp wood in log lengths at the mill during 1908. As shown by the returns to the special committee from the pulp and paper manufacturers using 1,677,000 cords of pulp wood for 1907, the average price per cord was \$7.70—

Or 24 per cent more in Canada than on this side of the line.

In Maine, seven establishments, using 125,000 cords, reported the average price as \$6.81; in New Hampshire, eight establishments reported the average price at \$7.89; while some of the large mills, like the Great Northern Company, W. H. Parsons & Co., and the Berlin Mills Company, refused to make out the schedules for the committee; yet the other companies reporting in Maine and New Hampshire show that the price paid for pulp wood in those States was not high. When the Wisconsin mills in 1907 purchased 50,000 cords of spruce pulp wood in Quebec they paid \$6.50 per cord f. o. b. cars there. The Wisconsin mills paid \$6.50 f. o. b. cars in Quebec early in the year 1907 before the scare about wood commenced, while the average price paid in Maine during that year was \$6.81 at the mill.

Certainly \$6.50 per cord in Quebec on cars at the shipping point is not a lower price than \$6.81 in Maine delivered at the mill.

So it seems to me the senior Senator from Maine was mistaken when he said the committee had not investigated the cost of wood and brought no information and no report back to Congress on that question, because the chairman has shown you it costs more in Canada than it does on this side of the line.

Mr. President, here is some other testimony that was taken before the committee. The American consul in the Province of Quebec was asked to investigate the cost of wood pulp and of print paper in that country. This is his report, and it is a letter addressed to the Secretary of State.

Mr. GALLINGER. Where was the letter written?

Mr. BROWN. It was written at the American consulate, Three Rivers, Province of Quebec, May 14, 1908.

AMERICAN CONSULATE,
THREE RIVERS, PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,
May 14, 1908.
The ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your dispatch No. 109, dated May 6, 1908 (file No. 8712-34), and in reply beg to state:

(1) The price of pulp wood in the rough has within a year held at \$5 per cord; at less, at very great distance from transportation facilities. Farmers who have no stumpage tax to pay have sold as low as \$4.50 and in rare instances at \$4 per cord.

(2) The robbing or peeling of the pulp wood costs from \$2 to \$3 per cord, making the price of such peeled pulp wood \$7 to \$8 per cord.

(3) The stumpage tax on wood for consumption in Canada is 40 cents per cord, but for export 65 cents per cord. For stumpage, the Canadian government estimates 600 feet to the cord, but in the trade 1,000 feet are taken as the measurement for 2 cords.

According to the local manager of the Union Bag and Paper Company, the cost of such pulp wood is \$7.13 to \$7.65 per cord, laid down at this port without any charges against the capital invested by purchase money in the limits, losses by fire, floods, etc.

That statement of our consul in Canada, together with the testimony and the reports from the mills of New Hampshire and Maine, show that the cost was about the same in the two countries.

In addition to that, we have the testimony of our Chief Forester, Mr. Pinchot, who said:

From the reports which the Forest Service received from manufacturers it is shown that the average price for pulp wood in 1905 was \$5.56 per cord f. o. b. shipping point, and in 1906 \$7.21 per cord at the mill.

That is, in this country it is less than the price fixed by our consul in Quebec.

The testimony further showed that on over a million and a half cords of wood actually bought by our mills and manufactured in 1907 they paid \$7.76 a cord delivered.

Here is some further testimony that was taken. The treasurer of the Berlin Mills Company testified—you will find his testimony on page 1391—"that the spruce wood for that large paper mill cost \$6.20 per cord delivered in 1907."

That is in Ontario.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; that is in New Hampshire.

Mr. BROWN—

The Minnesota and Ontario Power Company announces that it has contracted for a supply of 500,000 cords of spruce at prices ranging from \$3.50 to \$5 per cord delivered.

The American companies which shipped pulp wood from Canada to the United States and which had no incentive for undervaluation, because the wood was free of duty, reported to the Canadian government at Ottawa that the value of the wood shipped by them was—

And you will find this on page 1040 of the testimony—

1905, 593,642 cords, valued at \$2,600,884—\$4.38 per cord.
1906, 614,286 cords, valued at \$2,649,106—\$4.31 per cord.
1907, 628,844 cords, valued at \$2,748,909—\$4.37 per cord.
The figures are borne out by the invoices furnished to the United States authorities at 17 ports for seventeen months ending June 1, 1908 (p. 2359 of Paper Investigation), and show a sworn cost averaging \$5.02 per cord, as follows:

	Quantity, in cords.	Value.	Average price per cord.
Albany, Vt.	181,235	\$762,706	\$4.20
Bangor, Me.	14,562	56,232	3.84
Buffalo, N. Y.	10,659	58,122	5.45
Champlain, N. Y.	264,670	1,306,216	5.23
Chicago, Ill.	3,421	19,284	5.64
Detroit, Mich.	10,110	68,157	6.74
Erie, Pa.	20,768	112,480	5.41
Marquette, Mich.	31,333	146,089	4.66
Newport, Vt.	404,910	2,117,401	5.20
Milwaukee, Wis.	12,255	67,757	5.52
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	24,940	123,899	4.96
Ogdensburg, N. Y.	8,760	44,143	5.03
Oswego, N. Y.	10,942	62,411	5.70
Port Huron, Mich.	24,573	109,322	4.44
Richford, Vt.	5,021	25,677	5.09
St. Albans, Vt.	26,270	138,269	5.18
Total	1,073,113	5,397,322	5.02

Mr. GALLINGER. I will interrupt the Senator to ask him where it was that wood pulp was purchased at \$3 a cord, as I understood him to say?

Mr. BROWN. "The Minnesota and Ontario Power Company announces that it has contracted for a supply of 500,000 cords of spruce at prices ranging from \$3.50 to \$5 per cord delivered."

Mr. GALLINGER. I confess I do not know, and I should like to know, who contracted for that wood. Was it in this country or Canada?

Mr. BROWN. I do not recall certainly, but I am reasonably certain it is a firm in the State of Minnesota. Your manufacturers ought to know. They buy almost a million cords of wood.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator ought to know; he is giving us information on the subject, or trying to do so.

Mr. BROWN. I am making the effort; that is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. I appreciate that.

Mr. BROWN. The exact location of that mill I do not remember, but, as I said, I think it is an American firm.

Mr. OWEN and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which Senator does the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, those mills, I understand, are situated in International Falls, Minn. I should like to say while I am on my feet, if it will not interrupt the Senator too much, that the International Paper Company buys and imports many thousand cords of wood from Canada. It makes its purchases largely from the St. Lawrence Lumber Company of that country, one of its subsidiary concerns. Now, I am informed that the International Paper Company or its subsidiary company has certified to the Canadian government that the pulp wood which it has been importing into this country is worth less than \$5 a cord. That is a matter of official report and the Finance Committee has doubtless given it thorough investigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. But, if the Senator will permit me, that does not accord with the argument the Senator has so repeatedly made, that the wood costs more in that country than it does in this country. He says it costs \$7 or \$8 a cord here.

Mr. BROWN. My attention was diverted.

Mr. GALLINGER. That ought to be worked out.

Mr. BROWN. I did not hear the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. OWEN. I call the attention of the Senate to the report, Bulletin No. 80, Census of Manufactures, 1905, on paper and wood pulp. It shows the cost of material as reported by the factories themselves, and goes directly to the point of the costs. The material used in 1905 of Canadian pulp wood, spruce, for ground wood, was 245,087 cords, at a cost stated by the manufacturers themselves at \$2,173,612, while the cost of ground wood, spruce, domestic, for 881,106 tons, was \$6,355,563. Practically, therefore, the cost was almost the same, taking the general average of all the material referred to by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. It is fair to say that the wood which we purchase in Canada for our mills is transported by rail to our mills, and the average cost of transportation is \$4 a cord. It takes a cord and a half to make a ton of paper. That would be \$6 added to whatever price is paid in Canada as our cost for the raw material.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that that is the cost stated at the mills and not with the freight added.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, it is no use to talk about the cost to our mills importing wood from Canada as being \$3 or \$4 a cord.

Mr. OWEN. I will call the attention of the Senator to the tables as to the costs, not at the particular mill to which he has reference, but the cost of the Canadian pulp wood to the mills of the United States as a class.

Mr. FRYE. To-day that wood costs in the State of Maine \$10.03 a cord delivered at the mills.

Mr. BROWN. If that is true, why would not the Maine mills make that statement to the committee that was investigating that subject when they were called upon for that very information?

Mr. FRYE. The sworn testimony taken by the committee shows that the cost of making paper in the United States was \$7 or \$8 more than it was in Canada. That is the sworn testimony taken before the House committee. The Booth mill was the only exception, and there was no sworn statement from the Booth mill at all. There was an investigation there just at the time the Booth mill was going through a state of reorganization. It was at a time when they were paying \$7 or \$8 to get wood from Nova Scotia on account of drought, and the Ottawa mill did not get its pulp wood down to its pool. That is the only reason they paid \$8.

Then, again, in the matter of sulphite, they undertook to make their sulphite. They had to make a reorganization of the machinery they had just put into their mill, and three times they were obliged to sacrifice this sulphite and pour it into the sewer. Sulphite cost them twice as much as it ought to have cost. The Booth mill to-day can make it cheaper than any other mill in Canada or in the United States.

Mr. BROWN. But at the time as to which the Senator spoke it cost more.

Mr. FRYE. At the time I speak of they were just at a reorganization of that mill, and anybody who knows the meaning of a reorganization, adding machinery, and getting employees who have the skill to make paper, will understand perfectly well that it would cost 25 or 30 per cent more during the reorganization of a mill than it would two years afterwards.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator from Maine state to the Senate that spruce wood by the cord in Maine, delivered at the mills, costs over \$10 a cord?

Mr. FRYE. At many of the mills it costs over \$10. I think the average was \$10.02.

Mr. BROWN. But was their testimony to that effect before the committee?

Mr. FRYE. The Senator will find any quantity of testimony will be furnished by the Committee on Finance of the Senate before this debate is through.

Mr. BROWN. But nobody gets to see the testimony before that committee; and here was a committee which was in session for ten months, which invited these fellows from Maine to come and tell them what it costs, and they did not come. I want to say further that if the Senator will point me to a witness who shows that he had reliable sources of information, who testified that a cord of spruce costs \$10, so far as I am concerned I will surrender this debate and vote for a duty of \$6 and not of \$4.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. Does the Senator happen to have a copy of the House hearings before him?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; but I shall refer to them later on.

Mr. CLAPP. I want to call the Senator's attention to the reference on pages 1038 and 1039 of the pulp and paper testimony in those hearings.

Mr. BROWN. I have not that matter here, but I have quotations which I expect to use.

This committee of which I am speaking took the testimony and made the investigation. My dear friend, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], said there was no investigation up there. This committee—

Mr. FRYE. I said there was no sworn testimony.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; but the committee were there; they made an investigation in person and inquired what the cost of wood pulp was in Canada; and this is their finding: \$6.50 per cord in Quebec on the cars at the shipping point. That is certainly a lower price than \$6.81 in Maine delivered at the mills. What did Mr. MANN base that statement on?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] proved a little too much in his contention. He stated that the freight and other charges were equivalent to about \$6 per ton. That is a natural protection, which takes the place of a tariff for the owners of spruce forests and the owners of paper and pulp mills in the State of Maine. If that wood should be converted into paper in the Dominion of Canada, the railroads certainly would not deliver it to this country free of charge. The finished product would pay a higher rate than the raw material.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the other element in the cost of production of this article is the labor cost; I have a statement that was put before the Finance Committee a long time ago, away back in 1888, when the Finance Committee had under consideration the schedule for print paper and wood pulp. The only witness that I recall—there may have been others there—was the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. He testified as to conditions; and in his testimony he put in a statement which was made by the men who were engaged in this business and, of course, knew its conditions. In that statement—and I think it was expressly indorsed by the Senator from Maine—it was declared that at least 80 per cent of the cost of print paper was made up of labor. The labor begins with the rough logs;

it follows to the place where they are floated or freighted to the mill, and on to the car that carries them to their destination. Labor strips the bark; it cuts and sizes the wood into strips about 2 feet long; labor applies and controls the machines that press this wood against the grindstone; and it is labor that carries the product away. Labor follows it through all its processes, until finally it comes out print paper, for sale. The testimony is—if the Senator from Maine was right, and I think he is right on that point—that 80 per cent of the cost of production of print paper consists of labor. As, under our theory of fixing a tariff law here, labor is one of the factors to be considered, we have a right to inquire what the difference in the cost of labor is in this country and in Canada in the pulp and paper industries. On that there was a great deal of testimony which I desire to submit to your consideration.

As the first witness I call as a witness again our consul at Quebec, who, at the suggestion of our Secretary of State, investigated the condition of labor and its price in the Canadian mills. On May 14, 1908, he sent this information to the Secretary of State:

Labor in the Canadian paper mills is as high as in the United States, yea, oftentimes even higher.

Not some labor; not a little labor; but labor. It means all labor in these particular industries involved in this discussion.

Mr. GALLINGER. We all know better than that.

Mr. BROWN. He continues:

Many of the workmen employed in Canadian mills are French Canadians, generally naturalized American citizens who have returned because of the good wages obtainable in their parent country. Formerly cheaper living and lower rents, especially in the Province of Quebec, were additional inducements for their home-coming, but these no longer prevail, as the prices for provisions are at times even higher than in the States bordering on this province, and rents have risen in manufacturing and harbor towns from 50 to 100 per cent and more within the last three years.

The skilled mechanics employed in the Canadian paper mills are generally native Americans. They receive even higher wages than in the United States, as an inducement to leave their home and country.

Mr. ALDRICH. When was that?

Mr. BROWN. On May 14, 1908.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, only 20 per cent of labor in the making of paper is skilled labor. The Canadians have very largely drawn from the States for that skilled labor, and they do pay for such labor as high wages as are paid in the United States; but 80 per cent of the labor employed in Canada receives at least 30 per cent less wages than labor does in the United States, and Mr. MANN, in his speech practically admitted that there was a difference in the cost of labor between the two countries.

Mr. BROWN. Let me read Mr. MANN's speech, so that we shall not have any dispute about that.

Mr. FRYE. Well, not only does he admit that, but the Senator from Nebraska fights shy of the Mann report. He is quoting the Mann speech, but the Mann report in terms states, without regard to going into the matter of wood, that the difference between Canada and the United States in labor and in the maintenance of the establishment is \$2, and not in the material, of course.

Mr. BROWN. I do not construe the report in that way. I will read the report in a moment. The chairman of the committee who made the report did not construe the report in that way.

Mr. FRYE. As I made the statement, I should like to prove it.

Mr. BROWN. I should be very glad to have some testimony on that point.

Mr. FRYE. This is from Mr. MANN himself—

Mr. ALDRICH. From the report of the committee?

Mr. FRYE. Yes. The report states:

The retention of a duty of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound, as suggested, is justified both on the principles of a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection. It is not desirable to strike down or injure the present paper mills in the United States. To do so would not only be very expensive to the present paper-mill owners and employees, but would, probably, in the future, enhance the cost and price of paper.

Now, listen to this:

The duty proposed is about equal to the additional cost of labor in the United States and the additional cost of materials used by the paper mills caused by other tariff provisions.

Mr. HALE. Wood is left out entirely.

Mr. FRYE. Yes; wood is left out entirely.

Mr. BROWN. There is no question but what the committee had as a basis for putting on any tariff at all a difference—

Mr. HALE. In labor.

Mr. BROWN. A difference in cost of production. Some difference, else it would not have put a tariff on at all. I am

undertaking to show you, first, what the chairman of the committee said, and second, the testimony upon which it was based. The testimony which supported the report, not only supported the report, but supports my contention that the labor cost is more per ton of print paper in Canada than it is here.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The portion of the report read by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] was from the unanimous report of the committee, consisting of four Republicans and two or three Democrats, and it is a signed report of the facts found by the committee.

Mr. BROWN. Is the Senator willing to take their findings?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing to take their findings to this extent, that when they say that \$2 a ton simply equalizes the difference in the cost of labor and the tariff on materials, that is a justification to them perhaps of \$2 a ton duty, but when they leave out entirely the calculation of the difference in the cost of wood, which, in my judgment, is at least \$5 a ton of paper, or \$3 and something over per ton of wood, between the United States and Canada, they only furnish to my mind a justification for an increased rate.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad if the Senators are willing to take the findings of the committee to a certain length. I wish they would take the findings of the committee to the end. I will yield my judgment upon the proposition that this product ought to be free, if you will follow that committee to the end, and not pick out here and there a sentence of the report.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator would follow the report of the committee—not the speech of one member—but the report of the committee to the end—it is not a large or voluminous document; and any Senator can read it in twenty minutes—he would find that the end and conclusion of the report, the result arrived at, is that the difference, without counting wood in the least, is \$2 as the basis. It is not a particular part of the report that is selected that treats of this to that end, but it is the summing up of the committee and its conclusion, and is, to use the Senator's metaphor, the end and result of their investigation. Nothing could be plainer.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. HALE. I ask every Senator to read the report of the MANN committee.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the Senator, does he think Mr. MANN who made the report knows less about what the report contained and said than some Senator who did not make it?

Mr. HALE. No; I do not think anyone else knows anything more about it.

Mr. BROWN. Then let me read what he says about his own report.

Mr. HALE. The Senator fights shy of the report.

Mr. BROWN. You fight shy of the interpretation made by the man that made the report.

Mr. HALE. The interpretation is just as plain as day to everyone who reads it, and that is the basis of the action proposed here.

Mr. BROWN. If it were the basis, there would not be this rate of \$4 a ton brought in here. I wish it were the basis.

Mr. HALE. That is, to provide for the wood item, which was not treated by the Mann committee at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the committee present to the Senate evidence which is conclusive that the cost of wood in the United States is over \$2 a ton more than it is in Canada, will he vote for the duty as reported here?

Mr. BROWN. I will vote for the House report.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why?

Mr. BROWN. Because the House put the duty at \$2 a ton.

Mr. FRYE. That represents the difference in the labor cost.

Mr. BROWN. And besides, the testimony the Senator promises to produce is not in existence. I challenge you now to get ready during this debate and produce that testimony before the bar of this Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. It will be presented, and there will be no question about it when it is presented.

Mr. BROWN. It has been hidden and concealed up to date. I have been trying to find out what testimony the committee had, and must confess my effort was wholly fruitless.

I want to read just a few lines from the chairman who made the investigation and made the report referred to. The Senators from Maine and the Senator from Rhode Island are banking their conclusions on a part of the report. Let us see what their investigation and the testimony shows with reference to the cost of labor in this country and in Canada.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator from Rhode Island want me to show him the truth about this matter?

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the Senator goes on, I should like to say a word. He says we are banking our conclusion upon this report. We are banking our conclusion upon that part of the report which admits there is \$2 a ton difference between Canada and the United States in the production of paper in the cost of labor and materials affected by the tariff. We are simply adopting the report to that extent; we are taking the conclusions of the committee as to that amount; and then we take up the other items in controversy, and add less than the difference in the cost of the wood alone to the duty as fixed in the House bill.

Mr. BROWN. Now, if I may be permitted, I want to put the chairman of the House committee on the stand and let him testify about what the facts are with reference to the cost of labor in Canada and in this country:

Mr. MANN. While it would be a pleasure to me to continue the discussion all the afternoon, and might be to a few gentlemen, I know how those would feel who wish to follow me on the floor, and they have my consideration.

Now, if the gentlemen will pardon me, I will say that we had investigations made in 15 eastern paper mills, in 3 western paper mills, and in several Canadian paper mills—these mills having been run for a number of years—making comparisons from 1895 to 1907. The Booth mill at Ottawa, Ontario, is a fair sample of a modern, up-to-date Canadian paper mill. It probably could make paper as cheap or cheaper than any other mill in Canada. In the paper mills which we have examined we took several—three—fair samples of Wisconsin mills. We examined 17 eastern ground-wood mills and 15 paper mills—

Now, listen to this—

It has been asserted that the labor cost is much greater in the United States than in Canada. I have not time to go into that subject very extensively. In my opinion, from the reports which are made to us, both as to the daily wage and the cost of production—

That is the wage cost and the cost of wood, the two principal factors making the total cost of production—

I am prepared to say that the daily wage paid in the Canadian mills is about the same as paid in the American mill. I am inclined to think that the daily wage on an average is somewhat less in the Canadian mills than in the American mills. On the other hand, the labor cost of production of ground wood and sulphite paper generally is more in Canada than in the United States. While, on the whole, the daily wage on an average may be slightly less in Canada, the efficiency is considerably less in Canada. Many of the skilled workmen in the paper mills of Canada are brought from the United States. On an average the daily wage in the Canadian mills is higher than in the United States. In the eastern mills it is higher than the western, and in the Canadian it is higher than in the eastern mills.

Mr. HALE. Will not the Senator read that portion of the report which he has just read, referring to the efficiency of Canadian mills and labor?

Mr. BROWN. I will read it again.

While, on the whole, the daily wage on an average may be slightly less in Canada, the efficiency is considerably less in Canada.

Mr. HALE. Now, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that a great item in this newspaper crusade against our print paper manufacturers has been that the efficiency of our mills was not equal to that of the Canadian mills; that there was a lack of good management; and that the fault was in the management of our own mills, and yet the Senator just now reads a statement which shows the precise opposite, namely, that the efficiency of the Canadian mills is less than ours. I only call the attention of the Senator to the fact that part of the crusade has been that our mills did not understand their own business.

Mr. BROWN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that where the publishers of the country have referred to inefficient mills and shop-worn enterprises, bought at high-tide-water prices, the charge did not apply to all the paper mills in this country. Very few of them are in Maine. The Great Northern, one of the greatest mills in this country, is not in the aggregation against which the publishers bring this complaint. Their complaint was against the International people, who combined a number of broken-down mills, and capitalized them in at a figure so full of water that it was necessary to rob the publishers and the people in order to pay dividends on the capitalization. That has accounted for the "hold-up" prices of print paper in this country in the last two years.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator talks of "hold-up prices" of paper in this country. In what other country is print paper as cheap as in this country?

Mr. BROWN. I do not think they sell it any cheaper in other countries, or so cheap as they do here.

Mr. GALLINGER. They do not.

Mr. BROWN. It costs less in the United States to produce print paper used by the newspapers than any other country.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator know of any other country that does not, in legislating upon this question, impose a very much larger rate of duty on such importations than we do here? Does he know of any country where the rates are—I will not say as low as our rates—but does he know of any other country where the rates growing out of legislation in protecting these industries are not from three to five times our own rates in this country?

Mr. BROWN. The facts are that the rates of other countries, except England, I think, are as high or higher than ours. Canada to-day has a duty on print paper. For what purpose? To protect her labor, she says, against our cheap labor in this country. The Canadian government had a commission that investigated this question seven or eight years ago, and they made a report, in which they found that it cost more to manufacture paper in Canada than it did here. On that report as a basis the Canadian government was asked to continue the 25 per cent duty on print paper to protect her against the pauper labor of the United States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator ever discovered an American in a paper mill in Canada, except in the higher grades of labor—skilled labor?

Mr. BROWN. I do not recall whether or not the testimony shows that Americans are employed in the mills in the lower grades of labor; but I do not think that is very material.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will visit the mills of this country we can show him a great many Canadians working in those mills. The men who go back, of whom the Senator spoke a little while ago, because they can live better in Canada and get better wages, go back there because they have accumulated money enough in the United States to enable them to go back and live in comfort.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator want to be understood as contending that there is any substantial difference between the labor cost in print paper mills in Canada and those in the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to be understood exactly as saying that; and I will endeavor to demonstrate it in my own time.

Mr. BROWN. I shall look with great pleasure upon that demonstration.

Here is the labor cost as found by the committee, and as set forth by the chairman of the committee that made the investigation—not only the labor cost in our country but in the country to the north of us.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator reading from the report?

Mr. BROWN. I am reading from the supplemental report, made by the chairman of the committee when he addressed the House of Representatives.

Mr. GALLINGER. He forgot his report then, did he not?

Mr. BROWN. No, indeed; he did not forget his report.

Mr. HALE. The Senator fights shy of that report.

Mr. BROWN. There are three reports; first, a preliminary report; afterwards, what was called a final report, and then the chairman of the committee made a supplemental report in a speech of six hours in the House of Representatives. I quote from his testimony. Certainly Senators do not contend that the chairman of the committee reported one thing and then got up on the floor of the House and told his colleagues another?

Mr. HALE. Certainly he forgot the report.

Mr. GALLINGER. His speech was so long he forgot the report.

Mr. BROWN. Here are the figures he gave, and he says they are based on the testimony:

Wage cost per ton, 1907.

GROUND WOOD MILL.

Eastern mills		\$3.05
Western mills		2.57
Average, 20 United States mills		3.00
St. Regis mill		2.06
International Paper Company mills		2.87
Booth mill		3.29

The Booth mill is the Canadian mill.

The cost in the American mill is \$2.06, and in the Canadian mill \$3.29—the labor factor in the production. And yet you

tell this Senate that labor is higher in these factories in the United States than it is in Canada.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, in all seriousness, does he believe what he is now stating to be the fact?

Mr. BROWN. This testimony convinces me; yes. I would not be here if I were not convinced of that fact.

Mr. GALLINGER. Has the Senator been in Canada and given any attention to the laboring people of that country?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir; I have not; but I will take the testimony of Members of Congress who visited Canada, charged with the official duty of ascertaining the truth, who could have no object except to find out and report the truth.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been there fifty times, when Members of Congress have been there once; and the Senator has got—

Mr. BROWN. Then you dispute the fact?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do that fact.

Mr. BROWN. You take detached sentences from this report as fairly reliable, but you will not take all the detailed facts as true.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not take the extract from Mr. MANN'S speech.

Mr. BROWN. You expect a Congressman to tell the truth outside of the Chamber but not when he is addressing his colleagues.

Mr. FRYE. He may be mistaken. Of course he tells what he thinks to be the truth.

Mr. HALE. Which does the Senator think, in considering the action of the House, is the most conservative and careful statement—if we are to depend upon either—a majority report, in fact, the unanimous report of the committee, signed and submitted to the House, or a speech afterwards made by one of the members of the committee? Which has the most authority—the committee report or the speech?

Mr. BROWN. I say they should be taken together. The one being no better authority than the other. The truth about this report and this speech is that they are in perfect harmony. There is no discord, as I will show you before I get through, if you will stay to hear it. There is absolutely no discord between the original report and the speech.

Mr. HALE. The Senator, in whatever he may say, will fight shy of the conclusion of the Mann committee presented in their report, signed by every member, a unanimous report. He will fight shy of that and the conclusion he arrives at that the difference, without regard to the wood product, is \$2. He will fight shy of that all through, as he has already.

Mr. BROWN. No, indeed. I will say to the Senator that I am going to read that whole report before I get through. I am going to show that the report simply states the conclusion, while the speech made by the chairman, who made the report, states the details and facts upon which the conclusions are based.

I want to ask Senators now who are disputing this report or this argument of that House committee whether you know what the cost of ground-wood pulp per ton was in 1907 at the St. Regis mill in this country?

Mr. GALLINGER. I can give it to the Senator in a little while, but I will not take the time.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator informed me a little while ago that I had never been to Canada and he had, and that he knew more about this question than I do. I have read the figures of those who were there in the performance of official duty. It seems to me I have a right to rely upon this report unless a colleague of mine, of whom I think as much as I do of the Senator from New Hampshire, shows by evidence I am wrong.

Mr. GALLINGER. In my own time I will submit the facts upon which I base my conclusion. The Senator of course is acting with entire good faith in presenting his views here.

Mr. BROWN. Very well. Here is the per cent of labor cost in a ton of print paper. This is simply the labor cost in the print mill. It has nothing to do with the labor required to convert wood into pulp. It is the print mill labor. This committee report as follows: In the eastern mills of this country, \$4.54; the western mills, \$3.68; the average of 18 mills, \$4.46; the St. Regis mill, \$4; the International Paper Company mills, \$4.72; the Booth paper mill, \$4.57. Now all the mills in the United States made, at a less price of labor, a ton of print paper than the Canada mills did except the International combination, and it cost that trust, according to its own figures, only 15 cents more a ton, and yet the committee proposes to levy a duty of \$4 a ton. A fair test as to what the conditions are and what are the prices of labor and raw material is to find the total cost of producing the finished article. The committee found the total cost per ton of print paper to the International Paper Company was \$33.57; the International Paper Company, Hudson River

mill, \$28.63; the Gould Paper Company, \$29.57; the St. Regis Company, \$31.92; the Lisbon Falls, \$37.05; the Booth mills, \$34.11. These are all American mills except the Booth mill, which is located at Ottawa, Canada. In all the mills in the United States except one, the Lisbon mill, it costs less under this testimony to produce a ton of print paper in America than it does in Canada.

Let me present another witness on this question. He was a member of the House committee and personally made this investigation with his associates. He also supplemented his formal report with an address to his colleagues in the House. Mr. Stafford said with respect to labor cost:

Prior to the hearing much was heard in justification of the old tariff, that labor was cheaper in Canada than in the American mills; but the testimony discloses, without contradiction, that skilled labor in the Canadian paper mills proper receives as high wages, and in some instances higher, than in the States.

Mr. GALLINGER. Skilled.

Mr. BROWN. Do we all agree on skilled labor? Let us understand it. We all agree now that skilled labor over there is higher than here.

Mr. FRYE and Mr. GALLINGER. No.

Mr. HALE. About the same.

Mr. BROWN. About the same? Then the man who investigated it was mistaken when he said it was higher.

I wish some member of the Finance Committee or some member of the Senate who is now admitting that skilled labor is as high and may be a little higher in Canada than in America would state what reason exists for other than skilled labor being cheaper in Canada than in America.

Mr. HALE. Every reason.

Mr. BROWN. Every reason? The same reason that would make labor cheaper in Canada than here would control the skilled as well as the unskilled.

Mr. FRYE. They get it from the States.

Mr. BROWN. They get it from the States because they pay higher wages than in this country.

Mr. FRYE. No.

Mr. BROWN. That is the testimony of our consul in Quebec. I never was in Quebec, but our consul was in Quebec and he said—

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator what becomes of the Canadian skilled labor that we displace. Where does it go?

Mr. BROWN. What becomes of any laborer displaced by a man who takes his job? He hunts another job probably. Why do not these Americans stay in America and work in the American mills if the wage is as high here as it is in Canada?

Mr. GALLINGER. We have a surplus here.

Mr. BROWN. A surplus?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. FRYE. We have a tremendous population of French Canadians. They are just as loyal and devoted to their native country as any people I ever saw. They come down to our mills; they are educated and trained in those mills, and they go back home and would work there as skilled laborers in the manufacture of paper, even if the wages were 10 or 15 per cent less, because they would be at home.

In my city of not over 30,000 people there are 10,000 French Canadians. They have to have a French clerk in almost every large store. What are they there for? They are there because they can get more wages than at home. In our forests over half the cutting is done by French Canadians. Why? Because they get more wages than at home. There is not any question about it. I am familiar with wages in Canada. I have spent a good deal of time in Canada in the last thirty years. I can get two first-class guides in Canada, with a birch canoe, for \$3 a day, and at the lakes in my State I pay \$3 a day for one.

Mr. BROWN. That is a different class of labor.

Mr. HALE. It is all labor.

Mr. BROWN. I am trying to discuss the labor in this line of business, the print-paper industry. I have no testimony on labor cost in other industries. My friend the Senator from Maine may know more about the price of labor in the paper mills in Canada than these men who investigated, and more than our consul, who is there and is charged with our Government the finding out the conditions. But his report, it seems to me, ought to be reliable, and he says they pay higher wages in the paper mills, not less, than we pay in our mills.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator how much time the members of this committee spent in Canada?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know how much time was spent in Canada. They were ten months on the investigation.

Mr. HALE. They stayed there overnight.

Mr. BROWN. The consul is there all the time.

Mr. HALE. Before this matter passes from the Senate it will be brought out how superficial and inadequate was this

so-called examination made by this committee into the conditions of labor affecting this industry in Canada.

Some of us, Mr. President, have passed our lives on the border, and we go into Canada, and we see the condition of labor compared with our labor. I know what it is in the State of Maine, across an imaginary line, a part of the way between Maine and New Brunswick, and when you pass from Maine and its industries and its population and its manner of living into New Brunswick you pass as clearly into a new condition as if you went into another generation. My colleague and I know this. It is knowledge from constant experience and observation. It is knowledge that comes from observation of conditions; and it is worse than useless, and to us it is not much better than nonsense, to talk about the equality of wages and the price of wages in Canada and the United States. I know it by observation, traversing hundreds of miles repeatedly, and it is a part of the policy of this warfare that is made by the newspapers against this industry to ignore what some of us know to be the difference between the conditions in labor here and there.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator from Maine contend that the House committee which spent ten months on this proposition made a superficial investigation?

Mr. HALE. I contend that so far as their knowledge of anything in Canada is concerned—the number of mills they visited and the actual examination or investigation which they made—it was of the most unsatisfactory and superficial kind; and that will be shown.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator contend that the investigation made by that committee covering this one subject, which lasted ten months, was more superficial than that which has been made by the Committee on Finance of the Senate in the last ten weeks covering thousands of subjects?

Mr. HALE. I think the examination and the facts which have been brought out by the Committee on Finance on this subject are immeasurably more to be depended upon than anything that the MANN committee has reported and immeasurably more in accordance with the real conditions.

Mr. BROWN. But up to the present time the Senate has not one of those facts before it.

Mr. HALE. But it will have.

Mr. BROWN. There is something very significant to my mind about the history of this legislation. In the first place here is a schedule that involves not only the paper-mill industry of the country, but thousands and thousands of men employed in the paper and periodical industries of the country. A hearing was had and investigation made. The constituents of my friend, the Senator from Maine, were invited to come before the committee with the facts, and they turned their back on the committee and furnished none. I have not time to quarrel with the committee personally right now. The truth is I never in my life knew an aggregation of men of whom I thought so much individually and so little of collectively as our Finance Committee. But for ten weeks now they have had this bill, and with this important schedule before it, and no report on it until a couple of hours ago, and no testimony yet produced, and now because I am reading what testimony is in sight I am discredited and disputed because I do not live on the border and have not been in Canada and do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. HALE. It would be pretty hard to satisfy the Senator and other Senators who are cooperating with him.

Mr. BROWN. I am easily satisfied, but this committee has given us nothing. It is hard to be satisfied with nothing.

Mr. HALE. If the committee had reported earlier it would have been said that it was precipitate in its action, that it did not take time to investigate it. I have in my mind now Senators who have repeatedly stated to the Senate that the Committee on Finance was hurrying these matters unduly and was bringing in conclusions when we ought to wait nights and days. Now the Senator finds fault with us for just the reverse—for investigating, examining, comparing, and arriving at a reasonable result—and he says that he likes the members of the committee personally, but collectively they are an unsuitable organization to do the business of the Senate.

Mr. BROWN. I entirely reagree with the Senator on that proposition.

Mr. HALE. The committee has a hard job with the men who want it to hurry and the men who do not want it to hurry, and neither are satisfied whatever we do.

Mr. BROWN. I am willing you should hurry if you will give us something on which to base our action. That is the trouble. I have been interrupted several times this afternoon with interrogatories and with voluntary statements of information, and when I ask for the witness I have usually been put off with the proposition, "I will furnish the name of the wit-

ness in my own time." I hope that will be done, but I do not want in the meantime to have my colleagues find fault with my sources of information, because up to date they are the only sources that are visible.

Now, then, if I may be permitted to return to the labor proposition again, I want to quote another member of the House committee who made that investigation; and my friends make a mistake when they say the investigation in Canada was superficial. Not only did the committee go to Canada, but they sent their experts to Canada. They investigated the books of the companies—those who would let them. They visited our consuls there, and got what information they could, and to aid the committee our own State Department put into action representatives of the Government there. That is the best testimony I have, and I want to say, too, Senators, that when the American people come to measure the merits of this proposition they will look to testimony like this.

I do not dispute the information and the statements of friends who live on the border as to conditions at their homes. But it must be remembered that there are paper mills in this country that can not be found right close to the border; there are great mills in New York; there are some in Pennsylvania; some in Wisconsin and Minnesota. The House committee made an exhaustive investigation, not a superficial one. Here is the testimony of Mr. Stafford in respect to it:

But the testimony discloses, without contradiction, that skilled labor in the Canadian paper mills proper receives as high wages, and in some instances higher, than in the States. This is ascribable to their having been induced to leave employment in American mills, for which they demanded a higher wage. So also in the scale of wages paid to the unskilled labor in the paper mills.

I understood a minute ago some Senator to say that skilled labor was about the same, but unskilled labor was way down below, much cheaper; but here is the testimony of a man who was there, charged officially to find out the fact. He stands up and tells his colleagues and the country that unskilled labor, just as skilled labor, is as high and sometimes higher there than here.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator point me to the pages of the testimony that show the investigation made by Mr. Stafford or the experts there?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I have all the pages marked here.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should like to look it over.

Mr. BROWN. I have them all marked.

So also in the scale of wages paid to the unskilled labor in the paper mills. Their wages are generally on a par with those in this country, and if time permitted I would read the average wages paid in all classes of employment in the eastern and western American mills and in the Booth mill, which is an up-to-date Canadian mill, located at Ottawa.

That sort of a statement can not be brushed aside lightly, Senators. The testimony that the Senate committee has, if it has any to the contrary, ought to be produced to the Senate now.

On pages 883 and 1866 of the investigation you will find the wages of men employed in these mills in Canada and America, not by the day nor by the week, but by the hour. It has been frequently stated that we could not make a comparison of relative wages because in foreign countries they work twelve hours and only eight hours here. I want to say to the Senate that in all the paper mills in this country making print paper to-day—I think outside of 15—the laborers work twelve hours. The International Company has put them on a three-tour system. As I understand, all the western mills still retain the two-tour system—twelve hours each. But here is the per hour wage, so that whether he is working twelve or eight hours makes no difference. His labor is measured and paid for by the hour. This testimony is found on pages 883 and 1866.

Let me give the Canadian mills first. The Laurentide Canadian mill machine tender hourly gets 48 cents. The International people of this country pay that man 42 cents an hour. The Canada Paper Company (Canadian) pays him 50 cents an hour. The Booth mill pays him 35 cents an hour. The Booth mill is the only one in Canada that does not pay that man more than he gets in the United States per hour. The Laurentide and the Canadian Paper Company are on the eight-hour-a-day system, too. The Booth mill is on the twelve-hour. The second man who works gets in the Canadian mill 31 cents; in the International, 26 cents an hour. The third hand gets hourly in Canada 22 cents; from the International he gets 21 cents; and so on.

The per hour wages of every man given shows a wage advantage to the American miller over the Canadian paper miller.

You know I get just a trifle out of patience at times with a good argument that is sometimes put to a mighty poor use. For instance, I think it a good argument and a sound contention that a protective tariff is necessary in order to protect the labor employed in our country if conditions show that protection is needed. But whether or not protection is needed, you

find men all the time shouting, "We will protect American labor with this tariff. That is what it is for." I want to say that in these paper mills, according to the official reports, not only of the federal census officials, but according to the statement of officials reporting on the conditions of labor, it appears that the laborers who have been employed by these American mills in making paper have been robbed of their share of the profits.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I am impelled to ask the Senator, Is it the object of his amendment that we shall buy this product in Canada and pay them the wages, or that we shall compel American producers to sell it cheaper?

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. Neither?

Mr. BROWN. My proposition is to broaden the market for two purposes—to conserve our spruce wood here first, and second, to protect the American consumer from the extortion of a combination which is here asking a duty when none is needed.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator would not think me too persistent, is it, as a result, that we shall buy and consume the Canadian product or that we shall lower the price of the American product? It must be one or the other.

Mr. BROWN. No, indeed. My proposition is—and I think the subject ought to be left altogether to the Governments to be decided by treaty—that this vast supply of raw material, spruce wood, in Canada shall be opened to this country, to be available to it.

Mr. HEYBURN. That still does not answer the question.

Mr. BROWN. That is one proposition. My next proposition is that the raw material should be and will be manufactured here, just as it has been, and that no protective duty is necessary to protect our labor in producing paper here, because our labor is cheaper in that industry than the labor of our competitor. Why put a tariff on an article if it is not to protect us against lower wages in foreign countries?

Mr. HEYBURN. Then the last part of the question remains unanswered. Are we, because of these conditions which the Senator from Nebraska says are favorable to us, to lower the price of our product or of our labor?

Mr. BROWN. Not to lower the price of our labor.

Mr. HEYBURN. Are we to lower the price of the product?

Mr. BROWN. The result of the amendment will be to lower, in my judgment, the price of print paper, as it ought to be.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then who will be the loser? Will it be the labor? Might there be less labor employed or more?

Mr. BROWN. There will be the same amount of labor employed exactly. There is no reason to suppose that if you take the duty off, our labor will go out of employment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will it change or affect the number of men employed in the United States to put paper on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. Not in the factories.

Mr. HEYBURN. Then why is the discussion material?

Mr. BROWN. The discussion is material because the print paper using people are entitled to have a product that is not protected by a barrier and a law which allows combinations to speculate and to appropriate the labor of others as the paper trust has been and is doing.

Mr. HEYBURN. We have no method by which we can compel Americans to produce this product, and if we can not compel them to do it we would have to risk a foreign market, would we not?

Mr. BROWN. Our American manufacturers are going to Canada now for a million cords a year. We are absolutely at the mercy of that country to-day so far as raw material is concerned in the paper business.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is the exhaustion of our natural resources.

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes; that meets with great disgust, I know, from Idaho, but it is undisputed, in this testimony here, that the spruce forests of Maine, based on the present annual consumption, will not last to exceed twenty-eight years, and in New Hampshire it is about fifteen, and in New York eight and one-half. That is the result of the computation made by our Forester to conserve the forests, and there is no guess-work about his conclusion in that regard. He testified before the committee. My friend scouts the idea that there is any danger of losing this raw material. You can not reforest it inside of seventy-five or one hundred years. That is the undisputed testimony. The spruce tree is a much slower growing tree than the ordinary tree. They have in the Agricultural Department spruce trees an inch and a half in diameter that

are thirty-nine years old, trees picked out of the forest. Under the most favorable conditions the testimony is that you can not produce a spruce tree from the seedling to a diameter of 10 inches short of seventy-five years.

Mr. HEYBURN. When we had occasion to discuss this question six years ago the limit of timber was exactly the same figure they put it now. We have certainly used some timber in six years. The whole supply of timber was to be exhausted in nineteen years. That was six years ago. Now it should be thirteen years, and in another six years it should be seven years. Yet I find the Senator and I find the same Forester using exactly the same figures that they used six years ago.

Mr. BROWN. It is conceded by everybody that there is not enough spruce to furnish paper for this country to exceed twenty-five years.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is conceded, so far as I know, only by these self-constituted philosophers and by people who live so far from a forest that they only know from a railroad window what a forest looks like.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, is he sure that before this time of devastation arrives we will not have a substitute for spruce wood out of which to make paper?

Mr. BROWN. It is to be hoped we will.

Mr. GALLINGER. The probability is that we will.

Mr. BROWN. The Government to-day is spending thousands of dollars every year in trying to discover something out of which to make pulp for paper purposes to take the place of spruce.

Mr. GALLINGER. And they are doing it, too.

Mr. BROWN. I take a good deal of pride in informing the Senate that a distinguished fellow-citizen of my own home town, Mr. George Sherwood, about twenty years ago, I think, discovered a process by which to make print paper out of cornstalks, and to-day cornstalks make the finest chemical pulp in the world. The trouble with the cornstalk is that while the stalk is cheap, to transport it to the mill and to keep it from decaying makes it a costly and hazardous undertaking.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. Simply as a contribution to the information which the Senator is now giving, and I do not wish to be understood as taking issue with his position relative to the duty on paper, for what I shall say has no reference to that, I wish to state that there has recently been an experiment made in my State in the production of print paper out of okra stalks; that owing to the large product of okra to the acre a very large product of paper is possible; and that a factory is now being built in my town for the manufacture of paper out of that article. Whether it is print paper or the other kind, I do not know. I will simply state that a sample was sent to me and I showed it to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], who is a paper manufacturer.

Mr. HALE. What is the stalk? We did not hear the Senator.

Mr. BACON. The okra stalk. It is of a vegetable character. It grows 8 or 10 feet high in a warm climate and a very rich soil, and a very large product is possible on an acre. An experiment which has been made in the manufacture of it has been so satisfactory that capital has been enlisted and a factory is now being built in my town for the manufacture of paper out of okra. But I repeat, I do not know whether it is the kind of paper the Senator speaks of, which can only be made as stated by him, from the spruce pine. I simply mention it is a matter of information.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator permit me? He is very indulgent.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. HALE. On this important phase of the subject, the conservation of the forests, I want to bear some testimony in favor of this industry, which to-day is so seriously attacked. I had never known in Maine anything like good husbandry and good housekeeping in the care of timber lands until the introduction of the pulp-paper mills and the accumulation of large tracts of land which furnish the supply largely for these mills. The inspection, the guardianship, the system of cutting and preserving the smaller trees is all a part of the work and the management of the pulp and paper mills.

Mr. FRYE. And precautions against fire.

Mr. HALE. The precautions also, as my colleague has said, against fire, which our people in a reckless way never considered before, but always are a part and parcel of the general management of these companies that are assailed so fiercely here. The track of fire from railway trains, from sportsmen, from hunters,

from tramps, does not visit the land of the pulp and paper companies, because they assume at all times the protection and conservation of these great products of wood and lumber.

Moreover, it is to the credit of those companies and their management that instead of cutting and slashing broad and large, and clipping off and leaving waste thousands and tens of thousands of acres which they might do, they, by a careful conservation, supplement their supplies in the purchases that they make of the Canadian product at a sacrifice.

I know something about this industry in Maine. My colleague and I know how they have revolutionized the care and conduct and preservation of the forests. If you legislate against them and throw it into the hands of their Canadian competitors, but one result is inevitable. They are obliged then in a short time to cut and sweep off and destroy the lands that they own in the State of Maine to do their business, and that we are seeking to protect them from. That is a feature which has not been thought of and has not been considered by many Senators, but we know what it is in the State of Maine and how they are conducting their business and saving our forests. It is one of the beneficent things for which they should be given credit.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the New England paper mill manufacturers are doing and have done, as my good friend from Maine has said, everything within their power and at their command to protect their spruce forests. They go to the expense of employing expert foresters to look after their property. Admitting it to be patriotic to save the forests of the Nation, it might be added that there is another reason, and that is that they want the wood for paper purposes, and they know that paper wood is disappearing. Compelled, Mr. President, not only to buy up all the spruce forests that they can, these great companies in this country have gone to Canada and bought 6,000 square miles of spruce timber.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. It has perhaps not occurred to the Senator from Nebraska that it has now been demonstrated beyond the point of experiment that as good paper fiber can be made from sagebrush as from spruce, and we have a thousand million tons of it.

Mr. BROWN. Double it.

Mr. HEYBURN. We have 200,000,000 acres of sagebrush land in this country to make paper of. So do not despair that we will be left in Stygian darkness for want of newspapers.

Mr. BROWN. That is light on the subject. I never heard before that sagebrush was capable of convertibility into print paper.

Mr. HEYBURN. It has been absolutely demonstrated; there is no question of it.

Mr. BROWN. It has been demonstrated, but the fact remains that it has never been used.

Mr. HEYBURN. Demonstration will make it a reality.

Mr. BROWN. You demonstrate that it can be done, but you never do it. That is the trouble.

Mr. HEYBURN. They are doing it.

Mr. BROWN. Where is there a sagebrush mill making print paper? I will move to Idaho if they can make print paper out of sagebrush.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let us face the hour of necessity and, like the human race in all times, we will be equal to it.

Mr. BROWN. It is all right to be courageous and to protest that we are not afraid of these disappearing forests. There never has been a government that thought enough of itself to plan for its perpetuity which did not give grave consideration and attention to the conservation of its natural resources. Of course the Senator from Idaho is afraid of nothing. He thinks the Lord will provide the forests if the paper-mill manufacturers have a free hand to use those we have now. He may be right about it. I hope he is.

Mr. President, the limit of this source of supply is confessed by all men who use it. They are not using their own forests now. They are conserving them themselves and buying their spruce now from our competitor. Our friends from Maine say it is very cheap in Canada. Our manufacturers go to Canada and get it and are manufacturing it to-day. A third of the spruce comes from Canada that is made into print paper every year.

Not only that, but our manufacturers do not even cut off their own timber in Canada. They buy from other folks themselves. They are not so courageous as the Senator from Idaho. They see the spruce disappearing.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. FRYE. We should not be silly enough to buy raw material from Canada at \$8 a cord.

Mr. BROWN. No; and outside of the intimation of the Senators from Maine there is no testimony that the lumber in Canada costs \$8 a cord.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator himself stated in the course of his speech that Mr. Booth paid \$8 a cord.

Mr. BROWN. It costs more than \$8 a cord over there. It costs more in Canada than it does in your own State, according to the testimony upon which the committee based its report.

Now, Mr. President, my friend from Maine, just before he took his seat, said we ought not to destroy this industry. I agree to that proposition. If the industries that are making paper need protection, I am willing to vote them protection. The laborers in that industry need the same protection that the laborers do in all others, but when there is no need of protection for them, when you are paying them in your mills less than our competitors pay, do you not think the argument falls that a duty is necessary in order to protect that labor?

There is another class of laborers, Mr. President, who ought to have some consideration in this debate. In my own State there are \$250,000 in wages paid to men employed by newspapers and periodicals more than are paid in wages in all the paper mills of Massachusetts, Vermont, Michigan, Minnesota, and California combined. If this is to be a war between classes of labor, the numbers and the army are with the newspapers and the periodicals.

The number of news print mills in the United States to-day that are making news print paper is 59. The number of newspapers and periodicals amount to 21,394. The number of persons employed in the news print mills is, in round numbers, 20,000. The number of persons employed in newspapers and periodicals runs to 145,000, more than seven times as many. The amount of wages in round numbers paid to the men in the print mills is \$10,000,000 annually, while the wages paid to the men in the newspaper and periodical industries run to \$106,000,000.

Senators, that accounts for the petition that I read to you, in the first place, where the representatives of a hundred thousand of these men petition you that their employers, the newspaper publishers, have some rights in this legislation, as well as the men who sell their employers print paper.

Mr. President, in addition to the facts with reference to there being no need of protection on account of the cost of wood or pulp, or the labor in its manufacture, does it occur to Senators that the United States has other advantages over Canada which far exceed any difference in wages, even if the contention of the Senator from Maine is true?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the Senator leaves the point which he has just been discussing, I should like to ask him a question. As I understand his proposition, it is that if it should appear that in some branch of some industry the labor in the United States was cheaper than it was in the competing country, then all the products of that labor should be put on the free list.

Mr. BROWN. That is not my proposition at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I understood the Senator to state.

Mr. BROWN. That is not my proposition at all. I said if the labor that goes into a particular article costs less in this country than it does abroad, no Republican can justify a protective tariff on that article in order to protect our labor.

Mr. ALDRICH. What do you think Republicans ought to do, then? Ought they to put the articles on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. I think where our laborers can make things cheaper than other people we ought not to be compelled—

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think all those articles ought to be put on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. No; I am not talking of all articles or the classes of labor generally. I am talking about this industry and this labor.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is assuming that in all this industry the cost of labor is less in the United States than Canada, and therefore he proposes to put paper on the free list. I do not know whether he intends that as a general rule or whether there is something about this particular industry that takes it out of the general rule.

Mr. BROWN. It is the contention of the Senator from Rhode Island, and he has taught us that lesson here on no less than thirty occasions at this extraordinary session, that the protective tariff is put upon an article to protect us because our labor is paid more for making it here than is paid abroad by our competitor.

Mr. ALDRICH. But, Mr. President, if some man assumes or it is proved that in some particular occasion or some particular day the labor cost is less in the United States than it is in some other country or some other part of the world, I know of no protectionist who wants to put the articles on the free list. That is no part of my theory.

Mr. BROWN. I have considered both the labor cost and the wood cost and all the cost that goes into the product of a ton of paper, not for one day or on one occasion, but for the last two years.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator assume that printing paper can be made and sold at a less cost in the United States than in Canada?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir; we can undersell the world because we can make it cheaper than any competitor on the face of the globe.

Mr. ALDRICH. The House put a duty of \$2 per ton on this paper. The American Publishers' Association, who represent the newspapers of the United States, have asked us to retain that duty.

Mr. BROWN. Will you retain it? I will withdraw my amendment now if you will retain the House rate.

Mr. ALDRICH. My examination of this question for a number of weeks past has shown me conclusively that the facts are not as stated by the Senator from Nebraska. I disagree with him entirely as to the facts all along the line, as to labor, as to cost of material, and every other item.

Mr. BROWN. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I have given him the pages where the testimony will be found, and I have named my witnesses.

Mr. ALDRICH. These statements of witnesses have been submitted to the committee with a great variety of testimony of a number of other witnesses, and the conclusions of the committee are entirely opposite from those of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator—

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

Mr. BROWN. I do.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if it is his opinion that it will reduce the price of this paper to put it on the free list?

Mr. BROWN. That is my judgment.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, Mr. President, it is true that the tariff does increase the domestic price in our country.

Mr. BROWN. I do not care to get into that discussion as a general proposition. I say that the condition of this industry is such that, according to the testimony of one of the officers of the International Company itself, in his judgment it would reduce the price of paper.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like for him to draw an amendment which will give free paper to those newspaper men who know enough to know that that will reduce the price, and leave protection on those newspaper men who teach that tariff duties do not increase the domestic prices.

Mr. BROWN. I will leave it to the Senator from Texas to draw his own amendment.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator vote for it?

Mr. BROWN. I will decide that when the amendment is offered. I am not in a humor to have much opposition from that side of the aisle to my proposition.

Mr. BACON. I do not want the Senator to understand that my question indicates that. It was only intended as a pleasantry.

Mr. BROWN. I believe I ought to have a solid backing over on that side of the aisle on this amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have heard it repeatedly stated within a few days from the other side of the Chamber that a revenue duty of 10 per cent was certainly justifiable under any circumstances; and this is—if it has no other virtue—a revenue duty of 10 per cent.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and how much revenue do you get under the 10 per cent duty?

Mr. ALDRICH. We get a very great deal of revenue.

Mr. BROWN. On news print paper?

Mr. HALE. We get \$4,000,000.

Mr. BROWN. That does not come from news print paper.

Mr. HALE. In this whole schedule.

Mr. BROWN. I am talking about news print paper; I am not talking about other papers.

Mr. HALE. We get from four to five million dollars on the paper schedule.

Mr. BROWN. We are selling print paper in England to-day. Why? Because we can make it cheaper than it can be made in England. Doubtless we do not sell it to any great extent; but we sell it. Last year we exported a small amount. We exported news print paper to Africa. We exported even to Canada. I have the report of the exportations here, if there is any dispute about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. We imported 17,000,000 pounds.

Mr. BROWN. What is 17,000,000 pounds compared with 1,200,000 tons? Nothing. It comes over, when it does come, from Canada, because the price here has been boosted so high that the Canadian can pay \$6 and get over the wall, and then compete with us after paying his laborers more than we pay ours.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the Senator state whether the price has been boosted this high by the tariff?

Mr. BROWN. By the combination.

Mr. BAILEY. And aided by the tariff.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. BAILEY. Then why does the Senator want to reduce the tariff?

Mr. BROWN. You fellows say the tariff helps the combination; I am not certain about it. I know it does the public no good service on this article, therefore I want to take the tariff off.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows exactly the point in Africa to which this paper was exported last year. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. In addition to the cost of labor and the cost of the raw material, there are other advantages which exist in favor of the American mills. Let me enumerate some of them. One of the officers of the International Paper Company, which alone controls—owns fifteen paper mills, testified that the American mills have an advantage in freight rates to market on the finished product, as compared with the Canadian mills, equal to 75 cents per ton.

That testimony can be found on page 6316 of the hearings. It is admitted by that great company itself that it has an advantage on account of the freight rates alone of 75 cents a ton. That takes 75 cents of the duty off, does it not? I want to even up matters for our mills on as high a level as the mills of our competitors.

Here are those advantages: Not only have we the advantage of freight rates, but in the price of coal alone the Canadian mills have to pay from \$1 to \$1.50 more for a ton of coal.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator from Nebraska had better have a conference with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] on that subject. We are asked to put a high rate of duty on coal on the theory that Canadian coal would come in here and ruin our coal industry. I do not see that it costs them a dollar more for coal than coal costs in the United States. How would that proposition work?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, we know from experience, when we had coal on the free list a few years ago, that a million tons of it went into the port of Boston from Canada in competition with our American coal.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean to say that coal costs the paper miller more in the United States than it does in Canada?

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly coal is cheaper in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BROWN. In Nova Scotia; but that is not the Province of Quebec, where these mills are.

Mr. GALLINGER. But the Province of Quebec is in Canada.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; but Nova Scotia is a long way from the location of these mills.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is nearer to Quebec than it is to New England.

Mr. BROWN. How do they get it?

Mr. ALDRICH. Both by water transportation and by railway transportation. The Senator has not been there, apparently.

Mr. BROWN. No; and I am derided again because I have not been somewhere.

Mr. GALLINGER. You ought to go there.

Mr. BROWN. I should like to go there. But when I find on the record here testimony that coal costs the people up there more than it does us, and it is not disputed, I am inclined to take their word for it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why did we put coal on the free list when we were in distress?

Mr. BROWN. I do not want to get into a row with my friend from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. He is a "near-insurgent" now, and I do not want to offend him—

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nebraska is an "insurgent" without the "near."

Mr. BROWN. After he has been with us long enough we will take him into full membership.

Here is another advantage that we have over Canada. What are the articles that are used in the manufacture of print paper? There is machinery, there is structural steel, and penstock plates, there are belts, there is alum, there is wire, there are screen plates, there are felts, and there are pulp stones; nine articles. Where does Canada get those articles which are just as essential to the making of print paper as is wood? She imports them from the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator is equally astray on that proposition. Steel is produced in Canada in very large quantities and at less cost than it can be produced in the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Of course there is not much steel used. I do not suppose that amounts to very much; practically it may be a negligible quantity, but it is something. But does Canada produce her belting?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BROWN. And her alum, her wire, her screen plates, her felts, and her pulp stones?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HALE. She produces every one of them.

Mr. BROWN. Is it not funny, Mr. President, that we should get that kind of information here, when the Canadian manufacturers themselves testified that they could not get their machinery there, and that they had to come to America for it? The truth of the matter is, that the Canadian manufacturers did not know what they were talking about. They had not heard from the Senators from Rhode Island and Maine when they testified.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, when did the Canadian manufacturers so testify? That will not do.

Mr. BROWN. I will give the Senator the page from the record.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall be very glad to have it.

Mr. HALE. But does not the Senator from Nebraska know—

Mr. BROWN. Not much according to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. My form of inquiry is based on the supposition that the Senator does not know too much. But does not the Senator know that the development of Canada in the last ten or fifteen years, since the amplification of their great railway lines throughout the Dominion, has been very great, and that Canada is becoming a hive of industry and with a high protective tariff upon everything is producing the very articles to which the Senator has referred, particularly steel. She is not the Canada of a few years ago. She is not dependent upon us. She is becoming not only a great granary, but a most formidable competitor, a great manufacturing community, and a great commercial community. She is a different country; Canada is not what she was twenty years ago. The physical advantages, instead of being with us, are all with Canada. She has immense forests untouched by the hand of man, lying at near approach, and never visited by the ax; she has waterways and water power, and she has almost unlimited agricultural resources, capable of marvelous development in the future. So, I repeat, the physical advantages in this industry are all with Canada, and not with us. This industry is contending against these mighty forces which nature has arrayed for Canada and against us. This industry is fighting against all of these; and the Senator is fundamentally and profoundly wrong when he says that the advantages are with us.

Mr. BROWN. If it be true that they have to import the manufactured articles, they will have to pay freight from this country or from any other country to get them there. Is not that true?

Mr. HALE. If they do import them, undoubtedly.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly, they have to pay freight, and not only that, but they have the Canadian duty to pay on them. Nearly all their duties run from 15 to 62 per cent. They begin

on a level with our low duties, and run up to 62½ per cent. Mr. Campbell in his testimony said that these articles were purchased in this country.

Mr. HALE. Some of them.

Mr. BROWN. He said all of them.

Mr. HALE. He is wrong.

Mr. BROWN. And he discussed the advantages in favor of the American mills.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask the Senator if Mr. Campbell, whoever he may be, gave an estimate as to how much it would increase the cost of a ton of paper even if all the articles to which the Senator has referred were imported?

Mr. BROWN. There was an estimate made. It runs to at least \$2.

Mr. GALLINGER. In what?

Mr. BROWN. The advantage of the American mill in railroad freight of the finished product to the consumer, together with the coal freight to the mill, the coal duty in Canada, and the cheaper cost of labor in the United States is stated at a total of \$2.71, and, in addition to that, for cost of sulphur, cost of lime, cost of wires, cost of felts, cost of oils, cost of alum, cost of repair materials, cost of renewing materials, cost of belting, cost of pulp stones, cost of clay, cost of size, cost of color, cost of screen plates, and cost of finishing materials, the advantage in favor of the American mill is estimated at \$2 per ton of paper.

Mr. HALE. For all of those?

Mr. BROWN. All of those.

Mr. ALDRICH. How does the Senator explain the fact that the Mann committee that he is talking so much about decided to give the United States a duty of \$2 per ton to offset the advantage the other way.

Mr. BROWN. Because they were persuaded—

Mr. ALDRICH. They must have made a mistake as to the side of the ledger on which these amounts were posted.

Mr. BROWN. They were persuaded, just as I am afraid the Senate will be persuaded by the appeals of men whom we all respect and love, that their home industries will be stricken down if we do not give them the duty proposed, when, as a matter of fact, the testimony does not justify us in voting that duty. That is the trouble.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. If I recollect correctly, in the last Congress a committee was appointed by the House of Representatives to thoroughly investigate this subject, and that committee was engaged in that work for about nine months. That committee unanimously reported to the House that the duty ought to be reduced from \$6 to \$2 per ton, and the House in framing the bill made that change, placing the duty at \$2 per ton. I have read that report most carefully, and my recollection is that it was unanimous, every Republican and Democrat on the committee insisting that the duty ought to be reduced from \$6 to \$2 per ton. The Senator has moved, as I recollect, to put print paper on the free list. I understand him, however, to be willing to accept \$2 per ton as passed by the House. My recollection is that that committee said distinctly that labor in the United States did not cost quite as much as it did in Canada.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. CLAY. I think they did. I do not think I am mistaken.

Mr. BROWN. That is their statement.

Mr. CLAY. I have a synopsis of that report here. My recollection in regard to the scarcity of timber is that the committee stated that the International Paper Company owned enough lands now to supply that company for more than two hundred years.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CLAY. Yes.

Mr. OWEN. I would suggest that that one company has, according to the Manual of Statistics, 3,000,000 acres in Canada under their control and 1,000,000 acres of fee land which they have available for this purpose.

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission, my recollection is that all this trouble in regard to paper came from the fact that the International Paper Company closed down more than half of its plants, brought about a scarcity of paper, and in-

creased its price, and that that was the reason this investigation was made. With the permission of the Senate, I will read:

Paper makers control 5,000,000 acres of spruce land in the United States and 10,000,000 in Canada, a total of 23,437 square miles.

The International Paper Company has acquired 6,269 square miles of woodlands—1,426 in the United States and 4,843 in Canada (page 1029 of Paper Investigation). It figures that it has gained \$10,000,000 by their appreciation in values. Applying Forester Pinchot's formula (page 1370 of Paper Investigation) for paper-cutting needs, the International Paper Company has acquired two and one-half times as much woodland as is necessary for a perpetual supply of wood to insure its present output of paper. Instead of cutting all that it needs from that land, it buys three-fourths of its wood supply from outsiders (page 1055 of Paper Investigation), thereby artificially inflating wood prices and promoting its gigantic speculation in timber tracts. It pays a high price to outsiders, while refusing to cut from its own cheap lands—lands that are inventoried at \$1.70 per acre.

Mr. FRYE. By whom is that signed?

Mr. CLAY. It is signed by the chairman representing the American Newspaper Publishers Association, John Norris, who I understand to be a very honorable and upright man. It is true that he is representing the interests of the newspapers, but if we have reached the point in the Senate in the framing of this bill where we do not expect to consider the testimony of those who are interested, we have certainly changed front during the last two or three months.

Mr. BROWN. Recurring to the advantages which I undertook to detail which the American mill has over the Canadian mill, and in reply to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the manager of a Canadian paper mill company located in the Province of Quebec filed an affidavit with the Committee on Finance in which he states the advantages I have undertaken to enumerate. The original affidavit, I am informed, was delivered to the Senate. This affidavit was made by F. J. Campbell, who was the general manager, I understand, of the Windsor Mills at Quebec. In speaking of Mr. Mann's committee that went to Canada to find out what the cost of labor was in Canada, he states:

Mr. Mann's committee obtained our labor cost, but I do not think he got our actual cost of production, and while I do not like exposing details too greatly, I nevertheless advise you that our actual cost of producing news throughout the year 1908 was \$33.80 per ton at the mill. Of this I figure the labor cost from the rough wood was \$8.62 per ton.

I do not care so much about that, but here is a list he gave of the advantages the American mill has:

We buy our coal both here and in the United States, its cost running from \$4.50 to over \$5 per ton.

In comparing cost of supplies, I might say that our lime costs us \$5.60 per ton, but I do not know the price of this in the United States.

For our fast news machines we import felts, making them cost us 35 per cent more than they cost manufacturers in the United States.

Our wires cost us nearly 25 per cent more.

Our screen plates nearly 30 per cent more.

Our belting and repair materials 27½ per cent more; this being a very serious matter in the case of rubber-covered rolls, the work on them being largely done in Boston.

Our stones cost us 15 per cent more, and, as you know, our capital outlay is about 25 per cent more than in the United States, nearly all our paper-making machinery being of United States manufacture.

Senators, those are natural advantages; those are advantages that protect our mills and protect our people. The freight advantage alone, which I have not mentioned at all, is almost as much as the duty proposed by the House of \$2 per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. To illustrate one of the peculiarities of this discussion and contention, we have two different affidavits in relation to the cost of making paper in the Canadian paper mills, and they vary about \$6 a ton.

Mr. BROWN. The cost is different in different mills.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; in this same mill.

Mr. BROWN. You will find no difference. Does the Senator mean that he has testimony that disputes this statement I have just read? Have you not the testimony of Mr. Campbell?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so.

Mr. BROWN. Have you not also the testimony of Mr. Pottle?

Mr. ALDRICH. We have a great deal of testimony on this subject, which we are—

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator decline to tell me whether he has Mr. Pottle's testimony?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not sure about the gentleman's name in this case.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator has some affidavits.

Mr. ALDRICH. We certainly have two affidavits from this same company, or from the same mill, showing a difference in cost of production of \$6 a ton in the same year.

Mr. BROWN. It becomes very material who the witness is who makes the affidavit.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think very likely, as it seems to me in this case, it is very material who furnished the affidavit.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has been furnished with both of them. Now, what is the fact about it? We have the information first, of the House committee that went there; of the experts that it sent there, and of our American consul, who lives there and reports.

In addition to that we have the testimony which I have read of a general manager of a mill. Summon in to testify anyone you please and show me that the witness has sources of information better than the man who owns the mill.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator from Nebraska permit me for a moment?

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to inquire whether this testimony under oath on one side and the other side continually contradicting itself through these schedules has ever been brought to book by the Finance Committee holding to account for perjury somebody who contradicts somebody else on a vital fact.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is a student and he investigates subjects carefully. But if he had had more experience in taking testimony as to labor and the cost of labor and the different kinds of labor in other countries, he would have learned what every committee that has investigated has learned—that all these statements are various. They proceed on different bases as to different kinds of labor, and no committee will ever investigate or attempt to investigate the cost of labor in a foreign country, whether it be Canada or Germany or England or France or any other country, that it will not find itself beset by the plainest contradictions at every step of the investigation. That has always been so and always will be so; and therefore, when general conditions are established and when we know what is the demonstration of the difference between the pay of labor abroad and here; the conditions of labor; that our labor lives better, is housed better, has better accommodations, and has better life, showing that its wages are higher—that fundamental fact is better than all the investigations.

The Senator himself may start a committee as to the cost of labor in Germany—and he has taken an interest in that—and he will find himself beset by these contradictions at every turn of the way. It is really a useless task for anybody to undertake.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, while of course human beings with inaccurate powers of observation, with minds which draw inaccurate conclusions from given observations, will arrive at varying results, and therefore testimony may be innocently offered which is at variance with other testimony, both of the witnesses intending to speak the truth, that does not at all reach the suggestion which I made—whether or not any witnesses have been held to book for a deliberate false statement made to these committees. If there has been, I should like to know it.

Mr. ALDRICH. In this particular case we have no jurisdiction, I suppose, over Canadian general managers.

Mr. OWEN. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is sufficient for my purpose. I want to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. OWEN. I understand, then, that there is no answer.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can understand it that way; yes.

I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Has he in his possession a statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company as to the cost of making paper at their mills?

Mr. BROWN. I think I have.

Mr. ALDRICH. That was the only statement submitted by these contending factions to the Committee on Finance that was agreed upon by both parties. It was for June, 1908, I think.

Mr. BROWN. I am not certain without going through my papers whether I have that one or not. I have three or four mills in that country. But I want—

Mr. ALDRICH. There was one statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company showing to the minutest detail the cost of producing paper in their mills, and that statement was furnished both by the newspaper people and by the paper people, and that shows the cost in Canada to be \$27.57 a ton.

Mr. BROWN. I want to call the Senator's attention—

Mr. ALDRICH. That is based upon a cost of wood of \$5 a cord. That statement is undisputed. I think it is the only statement made by either party that has not been discredited by the other.

Mr. BROWN. Who are the people who agreed on this statement?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Norris presented it to us for the American Publishers' Association and Mr. Chisholm presented it to us as representing the paper manufacturers of the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Is Mr. Chisholm an officer of the association? I am trying to locate him.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Chisholm is an ex-president of the International Paper Company, and I presume the Senator from Nebraska will have no difficulty in locating him any more than I would have in locating Mr. Norris.

Mr. BROWN. I know Mr. Norris, and he has done a great work in letting in the light on these questions that have been mooted and disputed the last two years. He has come before this committee and the other committee indorsed by all the great newspapers of this country.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not in any way mentioning Mr. Norris with a view of deprecating his position or disparaging his character or anything else. I simply say I presume the Senator from Nebraska knows both of these gentlemen and knows who they are.

Mr. BROWN. I knew Mr. Norris, but I did not know the latter gentleman. But here is the difficulty that the committee finds itself in now. This report is made, based, I suppose, upon this undisputed and consented stipulation.

Mr. ALDRICH. In part.

Mr. BROWN. Where are we? We have the testimony that covers 3,500 pages taken by the sworn officers of this Government, Members of Congress. We have it laid aside. We have all the other testimony that comes from our other sources, official sources also, laid aside.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BROWN. And at the eleventh hour, just before the roll call, we are informed that two men have agreed as to what the cost was in one mill in Canada, and that fixes the cost of wood, and therefore we will write their agreement into the tariff law. The duty shall be based on that agreement.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

Mr. BROWN. I want something else than the agreement of two men on the cost of print paper in one mill to determine the cost of producing print paper in Canada.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the House committee the only testimony of any kind taken, showing the cost of the production of paper in the Dominion of Canada, was in one instance. There was no other attempt made to show the cost of producing print paper in Canada, and in that particular instance the testimony of that particular concern has been absolutely discredited.

Mr. BROWN. But the committee itself was there.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee themselves did not undertake to make any statement about the cost of production except one based upon this one mill in Canada, and the statement has been shown over and over again not to be accurate. There was no other testimony.

When the Finance Committee took up this matter I said to Mr. Norris, and I said to the representatives of the paper manufacturers of the United States, "so far as my action is concerned—and I think that is the position of the Committee on Finance—we must know what is the relative cost of producing print paper in Canada and the United States. We desire you to furnish us with testimony, not hearsay, not anything that the Mann committee has done, but new, original testimony showing the actual cost of production in the two countries." They have produced not one single particle of testimony, except this Belgo-Canada statement, that was not promptly disputed by the other side, and there has been no testimony submitted to the Committee on Finance, and there was none before the Mann committee that shows the relative cost of production, which both parties agree is correct, except this one statement of the Belgo-Canadian Company.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator inform the Senate that having gone through the Mann testimony on the basis of a personal examination of those volumes, he undertakes to say there is no testimony there about the cost of production?

Mr. ALDRICH. In Canada? I undertake to say exactly that. I have not read the three or four thousand pages of testimony, and I assume that the Senator from Nebraska has not.

Mr. BROWN. I may have missed a few pages, but I read hundreds of pages upon this subject.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not from any reliable source or from any source that pretended to be reliable.

Mr. BROWN. Why not reliable? The men who run the mills?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. BROWN. The men who own them?

Mr. ALDRICH. No. They are not there at all.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Rhode Island has gone over this testimony, so called, of the House committee. This is a matter of very serious import to my constituents, and I will not say as Macaulay said, that to know your English you must give your days and nights to Addison, but I have given a good many days to rummaging the testimony of the Mann committee, and the Senator from Rhode Island is precisely and exactly right. There is no instance, aside from that of the one mill, where the committee took testimony or showed anything they saw, beyond that one mill—

Mr. BROWN. That is the Booth mill?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Booth mill.

Mr. HALE. The Booth mill. If the Senator will read the report, he will be surprised and mortified, claiming as he does here that this whole thing was investigated, at the incomplete and the superficial nature of the examination made by that committee.

Mr. BROWN. It ought not to have taken the House committee ten months to make a superficial investigation and an inaccurate report. He is now contented that our finance committee should base its report upon an agreement between two men as to the cost in one mill. The agreement is not sworn to, even.

Mr. HALE. I do not know how you can get at what apparently is the presentation of two sides better than to take an admittedly competent and able man, representing the one side, and an equally admittedly competent and able man—and honest man—on the other side, where they agree upon certain figures.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Nebraska evidently does not understand my statement. I stated that at the beginning of this controversy I said to Mr. Norris, who represented the American Publishers' Association, who is their accredited representative—and the Senator from Nebraska knows that as well as I do; he is here appearing for the American Publishers' Association, and has been here all the time—I said to Mr. Norris: "This committee, so far as I am concerned, intend to base their action upon the relative cost of producing print paper in Canada and the United States, and I do not care to hear from you theories as to whether this thing or that thing is proper. I want you to furnish the committee the actual testimony as to the cost of producing paper in Canada and in the United States." I said the same thing to the representatives of the paper men, to Mr. Chisholm and the other gentlemen who appeared before us representing the American paper mills. I asked them to submit not theories, not talk, but actual facts as to the cost of producing paper in the United States and Canada. They came to us finally with affidavits stating what their view was—affidavits of the Canadian companies, of the Belgo-Canadian Company, and different affidavits of other people, as to the cost of producing paper in Canada.

Mr. BROWN. Did the affidavits agree?

Mr. ALDRICH. They did not agree, except in the one case.

Mr. BROWN. That is the case you pick out to fix the tariff on.

Mr. ALDRICH. We picked that out because both parties agreed that this was a credible witness. They furnished it. We did not pick it out. Both parties agreed that this witness was a credible witness, and the statement was furnished in minute detail showing the actual cost at every step.

The Senator says we based our report upon that. We did not base our report upon that. But what I am saying to the Senator is that that is the only item of uncontradicted evidence presented to the committee as to the cost of producing paper in Canada.

Mr. BROWN. I understood the Senator to say—and I still think he did—that when he found that these two forces had agreed upon the cost price in Canada the committee acted.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not say that; it was very strong evidence to my mind, however, as to the facts.

Mr. BROWN. As to that mill; but does the Senator from Rhode Island undertake to tell the country that he will determine the cost of making a ton of paper in Canada by finding out what it is at one mill?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly not. Then, why emphasize this agreement that you talk about?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no agreement about it. These gentlemen presented these affidavits. Among the affidavits presented was one as to the cost in one mill in one given month, and it was the only piece of uncontradicted testimony which appeared as to the cost of paper.

I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that we had very many other reasons for fixing the rate as we did, and when we come to occupy the floor ourselves, when we do not have to infringe upon the time of the Senator from Nebraska, we will show him, I think, that we did make an investigation which was much deeper than he thinks.

Mr. BROWN. I am a little suspicious of such investigations since the Senator has spoken so reliantly of the fact that he had found out to a dead certainty what was the cost of making a ton of paper in Canada, because one mill had said what it would cost. The mills in New England and other States vary from \$3 to \$6 in the cost of making a ton of paper. It is not uniform anywhere. If there is plenty of water and it runs the year round and the orders are for a kind of paper which fits the machine, it costs less. You can not figure the cost of this commodity at all by taking the cost of one mill or two mills or three mills. You have to take the average of all of them. That gives the condition in each country. The average of all mills in Canada shows the cost to be in excess of what it costs here. That is the truth.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. There was no testimony in the Mann report except as to one mill. There has been no testimony submitted to the Committee on Finance as to six mills—no testimony of any kind, whether it is reliable or unreliable.

Mr. BROWN. The House Committee went there and investigated all the mills, presumably. They say they did. They say, "We went to Canada and visited the forests and mills." Why does the Senator from Rhode Island impeach this committee; tell me?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not impeaching the committee. I state what is a fact, that the committee presented a report as to only one mill, and they did not themselves state what the cost of production was in any other mill in Canada.

Mr. BROWN. The committee reported in detail the cost of but one mill, as coming from the mill owners themselves. That is true. The Booth mill manager said, "Here are our books." He opened them up. He showed them the cost of production; every detail of everything. The International people on this side reported their mills differently; showed their books in some cases; in some they did not. But the committee say, "We investigated into the labor conditions in the mills," not in one mill alone, but only one mill was given in detail in the report to the House. That was all. It was a sample Canadian mill.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Mann committee made no statement as to the cost of any other mill. As to the cost in this country, the International Paper Company have submitted to the Committee on Finance their books as to the cost in every one of them, by items and in detail.

Mr. BROWN. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. ALDRICH. They have.

Mr. BROWN. I am very glad to hear it. The Senator no doubt has observed, if he has examined their statements, that the cost varies in different mills.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly, and in different seasons.

Mr. BROWN. And in different seasons?

Mr. ALDRICH. It does in every kind of manufacturing dependent as this upon seasons and high and low water. That is a self-evident proposition.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Rhode Island states that there were a number of estimates as to the cost of producing wood pulp in Canada, and that there is only one upon which an agreement was reached. What was the lowest estimate of all of those submitted, if the Senator remembers?

Mr. ALDRICH. When I address the Senate upon this subject, or when the Senator from Utah does, we will put in all these figures.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Utah is going to address the Senate, I will bide with pleasure the time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Our friends upon the other side of the Chamber desire, I think, to have a conference this afternoon at about this hour, and I therefore move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 18, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 17, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 14, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2493. An act to make Scranton, in the State of Mississippi, a subport of entry, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2493. An act to make Scranton, in the State of Mississippi, a subport of entry, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CORPORATION TAX.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 98), which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

[For message see Senate proceedings of June 16, 1909.]

BOLL WEEVIL.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave to print in the RECORD information on combating the boll weevil prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain information touching the boll weevil. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WAGES AND MANUFACTURES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

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

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. The request is for the present consideration of the privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and to that end I move that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution in order that it may be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been referred to a committee?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Yes; more than seven days ago.

The SPEAKER. To what committee?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. To the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. On account of the lapse of six days without report, the gentleman from Tennessee moves to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 72.

Resolved, That the President of the United States, if not incompatible with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, copies of all correspondence and papers received by the Department of State through diplomatic channels from any foreign government, except Germany, upon request or suggestion of any Member of Congress, or department, or other official of the United States Government, pertaining to wages or manufactures in the countries from which such information has been received.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not suppose the motion is debatable.

The SPEAKER. The motion to discharge is not debatable under the rules.

Mr. PAYNE. The motion to discharge the committee from the present consideration of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that that is the meaning of the gentleman's motion. The gentleman moves to discharge the committee from further consideration of this resolution, which was introduced on June 7 and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Of course, if the committee should be discharged, then it would be for the House to dispose of the resolution as might seem proper. The question is on the motion—

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The committee does not have to be discharged. The rule itself discharges the committee from the consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand that to be the case.

Mr. HAY. I understand it is a resolution of inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. A privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is a resolution of inquiry referred under the rules to the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, it takes a vote to discharge the committee from the consideration of that resolution.

The question is on the motion to discharge the committee.

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

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment:

In line 6, after the word "government," amend by inserting the words "or from our diplomatic or consular officials."

Also amend by inserting, at the end of the resolution, the following:

Together with all correspondence relating thereto.

I move the adoption of those amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 6, after the word "government," insert "or from our diplomatic or consular officials."

At the end of the resolution add:

Together with all correspondence relating thereto.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution was introduced and sent to the Committee on Ways and Means—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]?

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). I sent it with a letter asking information from the Secretary of State in regard to it, and yesterday I received this letter, which I will send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 14, 1909.

The Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 8th instant inclosing copy of a House resolution which has been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means calling for information pertaining to wages or manufactures in foreign countries other than Germany and furnished by the respective governments upon request.

In reply, I have the honor to inform you that the department has no correspondence or papers which answer precisely to the description contained in the resolution. The department has not failed to transmit to the Committee on Ways and Means copies of all reports on industrial conditions received in answer to the general circular issued to our consular officers under date of June 15, 1908, and also copies of such notes relative to tariff matters from the diplomatic representatives of foreign governments at this capital as have seemed to the department to pertain to the general subject under consideration. These documents, however, do not meet the requirements of the resolution.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

HUNTINGTON WILSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that a year ago, in June, under the direction of the chairman and clerk of the committee, circular letters were prepared with a good deal of care and elaboration and sent to our diplomatic officers abroad, asking them to gather such information as they were able on this subject, and from time to time the consuls and other diplomatic agents have sent in these reports to the State Department. They were submitted as confidential reports. The information was given as confidential information, to be transmitted to the Government, and when the information came to the Ways and Means Committee it was submitted to them as confidential and at the same time—

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

Mr. PAYNE. When I finish this statement.

And at the same time the names of the manufacturers were carefully cut out of these letters of information—these answers to questions. Even where they were carefully cut out it was not difficult in some cases to trace the source. The committee have treated these matters as confidential. They have been used to confirm or disaffirm statements made by parties here as to wages, and so forth, abroad, and have been kept upon the confidential files because of the nature of the transmittal of this information to the committee. And I would dislike very much to see this published, not for any other reason than because it was transmitted to the committee as confidential information. I do not think the House ought to cause it to be published under those circumstances.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I desire to ask the gentleman if it is not true, according to the terms of the correspondence, that only the names of the manufacturers or organizations or individuals furnishing this information were to be kept confidential, and not the information itself; but that the information, on the contrary, was to be laid before Congress for its consideration and information?

Mr. PAYNE. That was not my understanding of it, or the understanding of the committee. It was to be confidential information. Even if you give information of manufacturers in a particular town, without giving the names, you give the means of identifying about as fully as though you gave the names. The committee would have considered the resolution, but they had no time after the information was received from the State Department to get together and consider it. That is the reason that they are in laches in not reporting one way or another upon the resolution itself. We asked the information as soon after the resolution was introduced as possible, and only received the letter yesterday.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York what purpose the Committee on Ways and Means had in seeking this information, if they intended to keep it confidential from Members of the House of Representatives and Senate, whose rights and duties were equal to those of the members of the Ways and Means Committee in asking for that information and utilizing it?

Mr. PAYNE. The committee have never refused to allow any Member of the House to examine it, where application was made. There was no effort on the part of any Member of the Senate, so far as I know, to examine this information. Members can examine it, as the committee who received it, as confidential information.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from New York inform me whether the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means had the benefit of this information?

Mr. PAYNE. They had, if they asked for it; I do not know whether they asked for it or not.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Does the gentleman from New York know whether they knew of its existence?

Mr. PAYNE. I took particular pains, as far back as the fall of last year, to tell them what we had done and that these reports were coming in.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman from New York this further question?

Mr. PAYNE. I am just told by the clerk of the committee that some members of the minority did come and look over the files, as well as other Members of the House.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. There is some allusion in the letter just read from the Acting Secretary of State as to the whereabouts of this information. There seems to be some doubt as to whether it is in the possession of the Ways and Means Committee or the State Department.

Mr. PAYNE. All the copies of these reports that have been sent to the Ways and Means Committee are now in our files, in the possession of the committee, and can be seen at any time, and any one of them can be called up at any time on a moment's notice. They are all there.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York correctly states that during last year the Ways and Means Committee requested the assistance of the State Department to secure, through our consular service, certain information relating to the cost of production, wages, other facts, and data that might be of benefit to the Members of this Congress in connection with the framing of the present tariff bill. I see from the correspondence, a portion of which has just been sent to the Senate, a statement that the consular officers were directed by the Secretary of State, in a circular letter prepared in part by the clerk of the Ways and Means Committee, officials of the State Department, and the Department of Commerce and Labor, among other things, to secure this information from producers directly or from authentic statistical reports of the localities and for the year 1907. Elaborating further, the circular letter instructs them as follows:

You are instructed to obtain this information from the producing establishments in your district or from any other sources that may be available to you.

The letter of the Acting Secretary of State recites the fact that only the names of the manufacturers or organizations or persons furnishing this information to the officials of the consular service were to be kept secret and confidential, and there is no pretense in this entire correspondence that any secrecy should obtain with reference to this information which is sought save as to the identity of the parties furnishing it to the officials of our consular service.

Some days ago the Secretary of State transmitted to the Senate the information received through this medium from the German Government. This circular letter was sent by the State Department to our consular or diplomatic officials throughout the world, including Germany, and I understand from this correspondence that has been made public that our consular officials undertook to secure this information for Congress in all the countries except Germany. They made a like undertaking there, but were thwarted in their effort by the indisposition of boards of trade, manufacturers, and other business firms to disclose the cost of production, wages, prices, and other material facts sought. As a result of that failure, the Secretary of State instructed our ambassador to intercede with the German Government to exercise its good offices to procure this information, and through that means it was to be obtained by the Committee on Ways and Means and through the State Department.

This was done, and finally the information as to Germany has been laid before the Senate; but I reliably understand that the consular officials of almost every other country in the world, in response to this letter of instructions, have sent to the Department of State reports from their respective countries embracing the desired information.

But, Mr. Speaker, I offer these amendments just submitted in order to more clearly identify the character of the information and the nature of the documents or reports sought to be transmitted from the Department of State to the House of Representatives. When the resolution was framed, I was under the impression that the American Government, through diplomatic channels, had requested directly each of the foreign governments to secure and furnish the information, as had been done in the case of the German Government, but since reading the correspondence this morning, I find that this circular letter was sent only to the consular service, and that they have complied with its instructions and gathered, compiled, and collated the desired data and sent it to the Department of State.

I notice that this was sent in the case of Germany to the Finance Committee of the Senate and afterwards returned by that committee to the Department of State and in turn was transmitted to the Senate in response to a Senate resolution. I judge that, from the vague and indistinct character of the information that seems to exist relative to the whereabouts of these other documents and this information from other countries, that there is some question as to whether a portion or all of it is now in the possession of the Ways and Means Committee, or whether a portion or most of it yet remains in the possession of the State Department, or has been first sent to the Ways and Means Committee and afterwards returned to the Department of State, where it now is.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the two amendments offered, in order to recite that the information desired of the State Department is the reports of our consular officials, made in direct response to the circular letter sent by the Department of State at the instance of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Tennessee will yield for a moment—

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I desire to say further that many of these reports received from the consular agents contained in them the statement that the information was given to the consular agents confidentially and that they transmitted them under that statement, and that is the reason the Ways and Means Committee have considered it in that way. I think we had better continue that consideration if we ever expect to show our faces before the world and ask for further information in the future. When we get confidential communications we had better keep them confidential. As to the last suggestion, that, perhaps, there are other reports in the State Department that have not been transmitted, it is idle to make such a suggestion, as these reports have been transmitted from time to time to the Committee on Ways and Means by the department as fast as they have been received.

I want at the proper time to move to lay this resolution on the table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee has the floor, and he is going to move the previous question.

Mr. PAYNE. Any Member has a right to move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not after the previous question has been moved, and I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee to move the previous question.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I make that motion, Mr. Speaker, on the amendments and the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. I never can keep the order of these privileged resolutions in my head, but I desire to make a motion at the proper time to lay this resolution and amendments on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor. Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker, on the amendments and the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has given notice to the House that he desires to make a motion to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that the Speaker has no right to inform the House or to intimate to the House that if they vote down—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will be in order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has given notice that he desires to move to lay this resolution on the table, but the gentleman from Tennessee had the floor. The gentleman from New York could not take him from the floor within the hour to make that motion or for any other purpose except on a question of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest to the Speaker, that the Speaker should not intimate to the House that by defeating the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee the motion of the gentleman from New York would then be in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not attempting to do that, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] gave notice within time yielded to him—

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman did not give notice. He tried to take the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] from the floor to make the motion.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is entirely mistaken in that assertion. I said I proposed at the proper time to make that motion, and I asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], turning to him, in reference to it, what he wanted to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I would not suggest that my colleague would take advantage of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] by making a motion out of order, if he could do it. I would not think even that he would be guilty of anything like that. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York would let go of the House for a few minutes, we might get along. Now, I think a motion to lay upon the table takes precedence of a motion for the previous question, and I make that motion.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. I do not desire to yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of making that motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read section 4 of Rule XVI. The Clerk read as follows:

When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order; and no motion to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to postpone indefinitely, being decided, shall be again allowed on the same day at the same stage of the question.

The SPEAKER. It is evident that the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] under the rule takes precedence of the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it does not; that the latter clause of the rule refers to the order of precedence of the subsidiary motions. There is no ruling that when the previous question has been demanded it is in order to then lay the other motion on the table. If the previous question had been ordered, a motion to lay on the table would not be in order. I suggest that the latter part of the paragraph refers to the order of precedence of the subsidiary motions, and not to those first enumerated.

The SPEAKER. It is perfectly patent, as the Chair recollects the practice, that after the previous question is ordered then, under the rule, the motion to lay on the table would not be in order; but pending the motion for the previous question under the rule, it seems to the Chair that if at the proper time any Member sees proper to interpose the motion to lay upon the table, that motion takes precedence by the very terms of the rule. The recollection of the Chair is that this matter has been ruled upon from time to time by the Speaker.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. When the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] has yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] for the purpose alone of asking a question, is it then in the power of the Speaker, when the gentleman from New York has been yielded time only for that purpose, to recog-

nize the gentleman from New York for the purpose of making a motion to lay on the table, which would take the gentleman from Tennessee off his feet?

The SPEAKER. That is a question very interesting, indeed, if there was a fact pending to call for its decision.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I make the point that there is a point pending.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to what he has overlooked. It has been repeatedly held that a motion for the previous question can not be laid on the table, and the effect of this motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] would be to carry the motion for the previous question to the table. That being so, I call the attention of the Chair to the ruling of the Chair on page 565 of the Digest prepared for the Fifty-eighth Congress, third session. Evidently the gentleman's motion to lay on the table can not be admitted at this time. To make his motion in order it is necessary that the House defeat the demand for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands this to be the situation now: The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] called up a privileged resolution, took the floor, and was entitled to an hour. He yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] for debate only. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], so far as the Chair recollects, did not seek to make the motion to lay on the table, but gave notice that at the proper time under the rules he would make that motion. The gentleman from Tennessee resumed the floor, made some remarks, and then moved the previous question. By that act he yielded the floor in so far as to enable the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to come in with a preferential motion, or yielded it entirely, as the case may be; it is not material. Now, this preferential motion could not be made until the gentleman from Tennessee had yielded the floor by moving the previous question, and if it can not be made at that time, it can never be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; it can be made after the House refused the demand for the previous question. I call the attention of the Chair to a ruling in the—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that he is entitled to at least half the time on this question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I think the Chair is having more than half the time.

The SPEAKER. This preferential motion provided for expressly in the rule takes precedence of a motion for the previous question by the very terms of the rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not in this respect, Mr. Speaker. The rule has been that when a resolution is called up and the gentleman who calls it up tries without debate to demand the previous question, a motion to lay on the table by some other Member has preference, and the gentleman could be taken off the floor by the motion to lay on the table and thus shut out the demand for the previous question; but here is a rule which the House prints for the information and advice of the Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear any precedent which the gentleman has.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It provides that when a motion for the previous question—

The SPEAKER. Give the page.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Page 565 of the Digest, third session Fifty-eighth Congress: "A motion for the previous question may not be laid on the table." (955) 2-29; Journal, page 262; Globe, page 982.

The SPEAKER. It is not proposed by this motion to lay the motion for the previous question on the table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it does, Mr. Speaker. The motion carries everything to the table. It carries the main question, it carries the amendments, and it carries the incidental motion of the gentleman from Tennessee. There is only one time the motion to lay on the table would be in order. There having been no debate, a gentleman would be entitled to make that motion in preference to any other, or it would be in order if the previous question had not been demanded after debate had occurred; but the gentleman, having been recognized and having debated the question, then having demanded the previous question, the House is entitled to determine, first, whether it shall decide to vote on the main question, or if it does not determine to vote on the main question, then to take any other action that may be proper. Then the gentleman's motion to lay on the table would have preference over any other motion; but the Chair can not find, even with the assistance of the very distinguished aide who is at his side, any precedent that will sustain a ruling that after the previous question has been demanded a motion can be made to lay on the table before a vote is taken on that motion.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to this: A motion to lay on the table has precedence given it by the rule and may not be made after the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is one rule.

Mr. DALZELL. It may be made before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no—

Mr. DALZELL. Why, the rule expressly provides so; otherwise it is senseless.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That statement has reference to a well-known condition. A ruling had been made early in the practice of the House that a motion to lay on the table could be made after the previous question had been ordered, but the Speaker pointed out at this very session that that practice has been reversed, and a number of decisions are given here in the Digest to the effect that under the practice now the motion is not admissible.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman be kind enough to cite the precedents and pages?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, I have given the Chair a citation. Here is a later decision, in the Fifty-sixth Congress, that has been handed to me, where the previous question demanded on a resolution, and the yeas and nays ordered on that demand, a motion to lay the resolution on the table was not in order. That is in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. That is absolutely correct—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and absolutely in accordance with the position here.

The SPEAKER. Now, if the gentleman from New York will be kind enough to refer the Chair to the next precedent to which he desires to call attention. The Chair has the precedent which the gentleman has cited.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Here is this ruling. It may be that the House was dividing; I do not know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just sent to the Speaker's room for the volume referring to the second precedent mentioned by the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the first sustains the position taken by the gentleman from New York, I hope the Chair will not bother with the second.

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman completes his statement the Chair will make a ruling. The Chair caused to be read by the Clerk Rule XVI, clause 4. The Chair will read it again, and ask the attention of the gentleman from New York and the other Members of the House:

When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to adjourn, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer, or to amend, or postpone indefinitely; which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order.

Now, the rule speaks for itself. There can be no mistaking of its language. Now, on the first motion, the Chair again says the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] was entitled to an hour. The gentleman yielded the floor by moving the previous question and, then, what motion was in order? It was the motion to adjourn.

The gentleman could not have been taken off of his feet for an hour by a motion to adjourn unless he should yield. No motion to adjourn was made. The second motion is "to lay on the table." What is the third? It is "for the previous question." Now, the gentleman moved the previous question. Can it be contended for a moment that, pending that motion, it would not be in order to move to adjourn? Certainly not. By the express terms of the rule, the motion to adjourn would be in order. Again, "to lay on the table," which precedes the "previous question." Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] at that point interposes the motion, which is a preferential motion by the express terms of the rule, to lay on the table. If the gentleman could not make the motion at that time, he could not make it at any time until the previous question had been decided. This rule deprives the House of no power. It is a mere question of precedence of motions. If the House desires to dispose of this resolution by a motion to lay on the table, it has the opportunity under the rule to dispose of that business before it orders the previous question, which, if ordered, leads up to either the passage of the resolution or the defeat of the resolution. Now, the gentleman refers to a certain precedent.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers not to yield at present, but will yield in a moment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I simply want to ask a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain that a little later. The gentleman relies on this precedent, but the Chair wishes to

call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to it, as follows:

On January 28, 1847, the House was considering a motion to reconsider a vote limiting the time of debate on the naval appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. George W. Hopkins, of Virginia, moved the previous question on the motion.

Mr. Joseph M. Root, of Ohio, moved that the motion for the previous question be laid on the table.

The Speaker decided that a motion to lay on the table a motion for the previous question was not in order.

Mr. Root having appealed, the decision of the Chair was sustained, yeas 134, nays 1.

Now, that is not this case. This is not a motion to lay on the table a motion for the previous question, but to lay the resolution itself upon the table. Upon that point the Chair will read the following:

On February 19, 1837, the House was considering resolutions relating to the proposed censure of Mr. John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, for having presented certain petitions, when Mr. Aaron Vanderpool, of New York, moved the previous question on the resolutions, and, in accordance with the usage at that time, the demand for the previous question was seconded by a majority of the Members present. Thereupon Mr. William Kennon, of Ohio, moved that the resolutions lie upon the table. This motion was entertained and voted on by the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But, Mr. Speaker, that practice has been changed. The Chair will find in the Digest a number of decisions.

The SPEAKER. Not at all. The Chair knows of no such decision—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Chair itself—

The SPEAKER (continuing). And the Chair does not care to hear further upon this point of order unless the gentleman can cite a precedent that is in point. The precedent which he relied upon as being in point with such great confidence, when it is read and considered, is not in point, but, on the contrary, against the contention of the gentleman. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Georgia desires to ask a question.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It was in reference to the decision of the Chair. I wanted to suggest the preferential right of the motion to adjourn; and, second, to lay on the table and the previous question. The gentleman from New York made neither of the motions, and the gentleman from Tennessee called for the previous question. They are laid down in that order, just as I have named them.

The SPEAKER. Precisely. Now, then, let us see where that construction of the rule would take us. The gentleman from Tennessee had the floor for an hour. He could not be taken from the floor to enable anybody to move the previous question. But he moved the previous question, thereby yielding the floor; and then, for the first time, a Member had the right, under the rule, to make the preferential motion—the motion to lay the resolution on the table—the same right that he would have to move to adjourn, second only to the more preferential motion to adjourn. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, that the resolution lie on the table.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 102; noes 87.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point is sustained. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absentees—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I think that there will be a quorum next Monday; and I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yeas and nays!

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 88, nays 76, answered "present" 6, not voting 219, as follows:

YEAS—88.

Alexander, N. Y.	Dalzell	Hamilton	Kopp
Austin	Denby	Hammond	Kronmiller
Barnard	Dodds	Haugen	Langley
Bartholdt	Douglas	Hayes	Lenroot
Bennet, N. Y.	Driscoll, M. E.	Henry, Conn.	Longworth
Bingham	Dwight	Hill	Loudenslager
Brownlow	Ellis	Hinshaw	Lovering
Burke, S. Dak.	Elvins	Hubbard, Iowa	McGuire, Okla.
Butler	Englebright	Hull, Iowa	McKinney
Campbell	Esch	Humphrey, Wash.	Madison
Cole	Gaines	Kendall	Martin, S. Dak.
Cooper, Wis.	Gillett	Kennedy, Iowa	Miller, Minn.
Cowles	Graft	Kennedy, Ohio	Morgan, Mo.
Creager	Gronna	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Morgan, Okla.
Crumacker	Hamer	Knapp	Murdock

Murphy
Needham
Parker
Payne
Plumley
Reeder
Roberts

Scott
Smith, Cal.
Smith, Mich.
Sperry
Steenerson
Sterling
Swasey

Tawney
Taylor, Ohio.
Thistlewood
Thomas, Ohio
Tilson
Townsend
Volstead

Vreeland
Wheeler
Wiley
Wilson, Ill.
Wood, N. J.
Woods, Iowa
Woodyard

NAYS—76.

Alken
Alexander, Mo.
Ashbrook
Bartlett, Ga.
Beall, Tex.
Boehne
Borland
Burgess
Burleson
Burnett
Byrns
Candler
Clark, Mo.
Cline
Collier
Covington
Cox, Ind.
Craig
Cullop

De Armond
Dickson, Miss.
Dies
Edwards, Ga.
Fitzgerald
Floyd, Ark.
Garner, Tex.
Garrett
Gilmore
Hamlin
Hardy
Hay
Hedlin
Helm
Henry, Tex.
Hitchcock
Hobson
Howard
Hull, Tenn.

Humphreys, Miss.
Jamieson
Johnson, S. C.
Jones
Kinkead, N. J.
Latta
Lee
Livingston
Lloyd
Macon
Maguire, Nebr.
Martin, Colo.
Mays
Morrison
Oldfield
Page
Patterson
Pou
Ransdell, La.

Rauch
Richardson
Rothermel
Rucker, Colo.
Rucker, Mo.
Russell
Sherley
Sims
Sisson
Small
Spight
Stephens, Tex.
Taylor, Ala.
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas, Ky.
Thomas, N. C.
Ton Velle
Watkins
Wickliffe

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Bartlett, Nev.
Chapman

Goulden
Hardwick

Hawley

Loud

NOT VOTING—219.

Adair
Adamson
Allen
Ames
Anderson
Andrus
Ansberry
Anthony
Barchfeld
Barchley
Barnhart
Bates
Bell, Ga.
Bennett, Ky.
Booher
Boutell
Bowers
Bradley
Brantley
Broussard
Burke, Pa.
Burleigh
Byrd
Calder
Calderhead
Cantrill
Capron
Carlin
Carter
Cary
Cassidy
Clark, Fla.
Clayton
Cocks, N. Y.
Conry
Cook
Cooper, Pa.
Coudrey
Cox, Ohio
Cravens
Crow
Currier
Cushman
Davidson
Davis
Dawson
Dent
Denver
Diekema
Dixon, Ind.
Draper
Driscoll, D. A.
Durey
Edwards, Ky.
Ellerbe

Estopinal
Fairchild
Fassett
Ferris
Finley
Fish
Flood, Va.
Focht
Foelker
Fordney
Fornes
Foss
Foster, Ill.
Foster, Vt.
Foulkrod
Fowler
Fuller
Gallagher
Gardner, Mass.
Gardner, Mich.
Gardner, N. J.
Garner, Pa.
Gill, Md.
Gill, Mo.
Gillespie
Glass
Godwin
Goebel
Goldfogle
Good
Gordon
Graham, Ill.
Graham, Pa.
Grant
Greene
Gregg
Griest
Griggs
Guernsey
Hamill
Hanna
Harrison
Heald
Higgins
Hollingsworth
Houston
Howell, N. J.
Howell, Utah
Howland
Hubbard, W. Va.
Huff
Hughes, Ga.
Hughes, N. J.
Hughes, W. Va.
James

Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, Ohio
Joyce
Kahn
Keifer
Keliher
Kitchin
Knowland
Korbly
Kustermann
Lafean
Lamb
Langham
Lassiter
Law
Lawrence
Lever
Lindbergh
Lindsay
Lorimer
Lowden
Lundin
McCall
McCreary
McDermott
McHenry
McKinlay, Cal.
McKinley, Ill.
McLachlan, Cal.
McLaughlin, Mich.
McMorran
Madden
Malby
Mann
Maynard
Miller, Kans.
Millington
Mondell
Moon, Pa.
Moon, Tenn.
Moore, Pa.
Moore, Tex.
Morehead
Morse
Moss
Mudd
Nelson
Nicholls
Norris
Nye
O'Connell
Olcott
Olmsted
Padgett
Palmer, A. M.

Palmer, H. W.
Parsons
Pearce
Perkins
Peters
Pickett
Poindexter
Pratt
Pray
Prince
Pujo
Rainey
Randell, Tex.
Reid
Reynolds
Rhinoek
Riordan
Robinson
Rodenberg
Sabath
Saunders
Shackelford
Sharp
Sheffield
Sheppard
Sherwood
Simmons
Slayden
Slomp
Smith, Iowa.
Smith, Tex.
Snapp
Southwick
Sparkman
Stafford
Stanley
Stevens, Minn.
Sturgiss
Sulloway
Sulzer
Talbot
Tener
Tirrell
Underwood
Wallace
Wanger
Washburn
Webb
Weeks
Weisse
Willett
Wilson, Pa.
Young, Mich.
Young, N. Y.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GODWIN.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. GARNER of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILL of Maryland.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOULKROD with Mr. WILLET.

Mr. YOUNG of New York with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. WASHBURN with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. STURGISS with Mr. SULZER.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. PRAY with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. PERKINS with Mr. SHARP.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. PARSONS with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. OLCOTT with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. NYE with Mr. REID.

Mr. NORRIS with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. RAINEY.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. MILLINGTON with Mr. NICHOLLS.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas with Mr. MOSS.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. MOORE of Texas.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. MOON of Tennessee.

Mr. McCREARY with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. McHENRY.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. LAW with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. KNOWLAND with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. CALDER with Mr. KORBLY.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. A. M. PALMER.

Mr. FULLER with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.

Mr. CHAPMAN with Mr. ROBINSON.

Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. HOUSTON.

Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina.

Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BOOHER.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. McCALL with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. CRAVENS.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. CONRY.

Mr. MALBY with Mr. D. A. DRISCOLL.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. HUGHES of Georgia.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. NELSON with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. GILL of Missouri.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. McKINLAY of California with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Mr. LOUD with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. ESTOPINAL.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. CROW with Mr. DIXON of Indiana.

Mr. FISH with Mr. DENVER.

Mr. DUREY with Mr. DENT.

Mr. DIEKEMA with Mr. COX of Ohio.

Mr. DAVIS with Mr. CLAYTON.

Mr. DAWSON with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania with Mr. BYRD.

Mr. COCKS of New York with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. CASSIDY with Mr. BRANTLEY.

Mr. CARY with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. FORNES.

Mr. BATES with Mr. BELL of Georgia.

Mr. HIGGINS with Mr. KELIHER until June 10.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. SHEPPARD from June 9 until June 16.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas until tariff bill passes Senate.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I notice that I am recorded as paired with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. By agreement that pair was transferred to Mr. CAPRON.

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. McMorran with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Until further notice:

Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. BARNHART.

Mr. AMES with Mr. ANSBERRY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. HOWLAND with Mr. JAMES.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia with Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. GUERNSEY with Mr. GREGG.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GREENE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Pending the announcement of the vote the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. RODENBERG, for ten days, on account of sickness in the family.

To Mr. ADAMSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred by the Speaker as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Liberty*, Josiah Rich, master (S. Doc. No. 100)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the sloop *George*, John Grant, master (S. Doc. No. 101)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the ship *Minerva*, Solomon Hopkins, master (S. Doc. No. 102)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the schooner *Nancy*, Henry H. Kennedy, master (S. Doc. No. 103)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the brig *Anna*, Benjamin Chase, master (S. Doc. No. 104)—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a reply to the inquiry of the House of Representatives as to river and harbor expenditures (H. Doc. No. 59)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COWLES: A bill (H. R. 10757) to reenact sections 5506, 5511, 5512, 5513, 5514, 5515, and 5520 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which were repealed February 8, 1894—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10758) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Weston, W. Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 10759) to extend the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to each and every company and organization organized for the defense of the Union in Missouri during the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 10760) to provide for the erection of a statue or monument to the memory of Gen. John Sevier—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 10761) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 10762) to reduce postal rates, to improve the postal service, and to increase postal revenues—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 10763) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10764) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Lieut. Friend W. Jenkins—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A resolution (H. Res. 78) requesting certain information from the Postmaster-General—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, respecting national aid for the construction of main highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to remove the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOPP: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, respecting national aid for the construction of main highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to remove the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENROOT: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin respecting national aid for the construction of main highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to remove the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to enact a law providing for the physical valuation of railroads—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, relating to federal cooperation in the work of road improvement—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress to enact a law to prohibit railroads from increasing their rates and charges except upon notice—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, requesting the aid of Congress in the permanent construction of highways in the different States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, asking Congress for the speedy abolition of the tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 10765) granting an increase of pension to Beverly M. Stanton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting a pension to Thomas Cheatham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10767) granting a pension to Polly A. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10768) granting a pension to Mary A. Bronson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10769) granting a pension to Isaac Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) granting a pension to Burrell F. Badget—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 10771) granting an increase of pension to August Noll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10772) granting an increase of pension to Henry Krug—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNARD: A bill (H. R. 10773) to pay damages and losses sustained by certain citizens of the United States on account of naval operations in and about the town of Apia, in the Samoan Islands, by the United States and Great Britain in March, April, and May, 1899—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 10774) granting an increase of pension to Isaac E. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10775) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Frame—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10776) granting an increase of pension to Ellett L. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10777) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Grant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 10778) for the relief of Baxter Smith, administrator of the estate of Hugh C. Jackson, late of Davidson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CREAGER: A bill (H. R. 10779) to provide for the honorable discharge of David H. Mathews—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10780) to provide for the honorable discharge of F. M. Terry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 10781) granting a pension to Mary Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10782) to correct the military record of Shibley Shepherd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 10783) granting a pension to James H. Seward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10784) granting an increase of pension to Charles Finch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10785) granting an increase of pension to Judson M. Francis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10786) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. Hanchett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10787) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. McClintic—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10788) granting an increase of pension to David Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10789) for the relief of William McGee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10790) for the relief of Isaac Cornett, Fred Bengé, and James Bengé—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10791) for the relief of Hugh Washam—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10792) for the relief of Francis Williams—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10793) for the relief of John Downey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10794) for the relief of Henry Marlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10795) for the relief of John W. Hardwick—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10796) for the relief of C. B. Kinnett—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10797) for the relief of Jane Todd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10798) for the relief of the estate of M. G. Horton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10799) granting a pension to Catherine Bunch—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10800) granting a pension to George W. Estep, alias Milton Pickles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10801) granting a pension to Absalom Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10802) granting a pension to Mary A. S. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10803) granting a pension to Isham D. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10804) granting a pension to Columbus Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10805) granting a pension to Ellen M. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10806) granting a pension to Elizabeth Centers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10807) granting an increase of pension to James Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10808) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Wilder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10809) granting an increase of pension to John W. Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10810) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Price—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10811) granting an increase of pension to George F. Bretz—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10812) granting an increase of pension to Joseph K. Keeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10813) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Burris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10814) granting an increase of pension to Peter Broughton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10815) granting an increase of pension to Abner Dicken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10816) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Haynes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10817) granting an increase of pension to Green Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10818) granting an increase of pension to James K. P. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10819) granting an increase of pension to Henry Lemmert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10820) granting an increase of pension to Perry Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10821) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10822) granting an increase of pension to Preston Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10823) granting an increase of pension to John Loveless—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10824) granting an increase of pension to Governor H. Hood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10825) granting an increase of pension to John M. Sims—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10826) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Godby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10827) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Harper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10828) granting an increase of pension to Russell M. Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10829) granting an increase of pension to Counsel F. Dye—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10830) granting an increase of pension to James H. Carr, alias Joseph Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10831) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Ashinhurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10832) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred Childers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10833) granting an honorable discharge to Lewis Bryant—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 10834) granting an increase of pension to Eli Summer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10835) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10836) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10837) granting an increase of pension to R. S. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 10838) granting an increase of pension to George K. Redmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10839) granting a pension to L. W. Sieber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10840) for the relief of W. J. Kountz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10841) granting a pension to Elizabeth Higgenbotham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10842) granting a pension to Margaret A. Hazlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10843) granting an increase of pension to William Bright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10844) granting an increase of pension to Andrew D. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10845) granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. McClellan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10846) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Coates—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10847) granting an increase of pension to William Arbogast—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10848) granting an increase of pension to Anna K. Rhoades—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10849) granting an increase of pension to Rachel I. Holloway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10850) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10851) granting a pension to Celestia M. Lull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 10852) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cossins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10853) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Senter, late of Morristown, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10854) to pay to Nancy J. Gilliland the sum of \$173.13—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10855) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wickersham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10856) granting a pension to Susanna Vernon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10857) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Davenport—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10858) to grant title in fee to Fred G. Smith and Lulu Smith to the east half of the southwest quarter and the east half of the northwest quarter of section 7, township 24 north, range 13 west, sixth principal meridian, to which George Smith, deceased, made homestead entry—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: A bill (H. R. 10859) granting a pension to Sarah Holley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10860) granting an increase of pension to William B. McElden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10861) granting an increase of pension to William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10862) to correct the military record of Charles Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10863) to amend an act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 10864) granting a pension to Henry C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10865) granting an increase of pension to John Lees—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 10866) granting a pension to Celia Cornell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10867) granting an increase of pension to John B. Liddle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10868) granting an increase of pension to John Soehnlein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 10869) granting a pension to Charles W. Faux, alias Charles M. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10870) for the relief of J. K. Beltz—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 10871) granting a pension to Emma R. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10872) granting an increase of pension to Lewis C. Grubb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 10873) granting an increase of pension to John M. Squires—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10874) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Combs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 10875) for the relief of Elijah A. Kilburn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10876) granting a pension to Lovina Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10877) granting an increase of pension to Nannie Layman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10878) granting an increase of pension to William Redus—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 10879) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10880) granting a pension to Susan Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10881) granting an increase of pension to William W. Brubaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 10882) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Cannon—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WICKLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 10883) for the relief of Arthur B. Arbour, administrator of the estate of Frederick Arbour, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10884) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Ebert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Krug—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of Philadelphia Produce Exchange, against increase of duty on potatoes from 25 cents to 45 cents per bushel—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George K. Redmond—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of M. C. Bixby, Samuel Paxton, and Jonathan C. Crane—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., favoring a bill entitled "An act concerning baggage and excess baggage carried by common carriers, and prescribing duties of same," etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. George A. Hodges—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Thoburn Post, No. 72, Grand Army of the Republic, Martins Ferry, Ohio, against engraving of Jefferson Davis's portrait on silver service of battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Jones—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John Lees and Henry C. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Petition of Western South Dakota Stock Growers' Association, favoring retention of present duty on cattle, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Franterna Independent and Society Maria S. S. del Parmone, favoring October 12 as a holiday in honor of Columbus—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 18, 1909.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., of the city of Washington.

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

DEATH OF REV. EDWARD E. HALE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a note which, while framed in personal terms, as it relates to the action of the Senate, the Chair thinks it appropriate the Senate should hear.

The Secretary read as follows:

39 HIGHLAND STREET,
ROXBURY, June 15, 1909.

MY DEAR MR. VICE-PRESIDENT: The beautiful engrossed copy of the resolutions passed in the Senate last week has reached us, and I can not tell you what a treasure it will always be to us. I am sure the Senate knows how much my father cared for his relation to it, and this last mark of affection and appreciation would have moved him as it does my mother and all of us. Believe me,

Most truly, yours,

ELLEN DAY HALE.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented the petition of Charles A. Park, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the general land laws, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Brooklyn, Md., and a petition of sundry members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Linglestown, Pa., praying for the termination and abrogation of the extradition treaty with Russia; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, South Carolina, Arkansas, Michigan, Georgia, Alabama, California, Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Illinois, and of the Territory of Alaska, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C.; which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions of the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C.

At a meeting of the Tobacco Board of Trade of Winston-Salem, N. C., held June 10, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m., the following resolutions were adopted:

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States known as the "free-leaf bill," which has for its purpose the giving to tobacco growers the right to stem, twist, or otherwise manipulate their leaf tobacco and sell same free of the internal-revenue tax, we beg to earnestly protest against the passage of such a bill for the following reasons:

First. That the farmers now have the right under the law to sell their leaf tobacco in its natural state, and if they should be permitted to stem, twist, or otherwise manipulate the same without paying the internal-revenue tax it would open opportunities for others than those who are actually engaged in the production of tobacco to become directly or indirectly interested in farms, thereby defeating the object of this bill.

Second. It will induce the culture of tobacco in localities all over the country unsuited to its growth, and thereby place upon the market in these localities an inferior product at a low price, in competition with the product of the sections now engaged in the production of, and suitable to the growth of, tobacco, causing overproduction of the cheap grades and the lowering of prices, thereby materially injuring the present tobacco farmer.

Third. It will take away the safeguard of the Internal Revenue Department and offer temptations for thieving that would be disastrous to everyone in the tobacco business—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and would absolutely do away with the safeguard that now exists; and

Whereas a bill has been introduced to increase the tax on manufactured tobacco, therefore we hereby offer our earnest protest against this proposed increase, as it will further demoralize business, injuring everyone connected with the trade—farmers, dealers, and manufacturers—and we hereby request that you use your best efforts against the passage of this bill.

TOBACCO BOARD OF TRADE OF
WINSTON-SALEM, N. C.

F. A. COLEMAN.

C. I. OGHUM.

R. C. NORFLEET.

Mr. OVERMAN presented resolutions adopted by the Tobacco Board of Trade of Wilson, N. C., which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the Wilson Tobacco Board of Trade the following resolutions were offered and adopted:

Whereas a bill has been introduced to increase the tax on manufactured tobacco, therefore we hereby offer our earnest protest against