SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 21, 1909.*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

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

DEATH OF REV. EDWARD E. HALE.

Mr. PILES. I have a letter from Arthur Prague, manager of the Spokane Newsboys' Association, which I ask to have read at the desk.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

SPOKANE, WASH., *June 14, 1909.*

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

DEAR FRIEND: The Spokane newsboys wish to say that the loss of their friend from the national capital, the late honored Reverend Hale, has caused saddened hearts among them. They remember those they realize as their friends with love as well as friendship.

As ever, your true young friend,

ARTHUR PRAGUE,
Manager Spokane Newsboys' Association.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARNER presented petitions of sundry citizens of St. Louis, Jonesburg, Sturgeon, Riggs, Harrisburg, Woodlandville, Hartsburg, St. Charles, and Center, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of Local Union No. 109, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Aberdeen, Wash., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of Olympia, Wash., praying for the imposition of a tax of from $4 to $10 per capita on immigrants into the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented a memorial of Local Union No. 2, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Buffalo, N. Y., and a memorial of Local Union No. 417, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Dunkirk, N. Y., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a memorial of Local Union No. 109, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Aberdeen, Wash., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on cigars imported from the Philippine Islands, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2639) construing the provisions of section 2 of the pension act of June 27, 1890, and section 1 of the act of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2640) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Theobald; and

A bill (S. 2641) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Stephenson (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 2642) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Hamm; and

A bill (S. 2643) granting a pension to William H. Arvin (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a very interesting paper by Henry E. Davis, a prominent member of the Washington bar, on the political development of the District of Columbia, taken from the proceedings of the Washington Academy of Science.

I ask that it be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 110) and that 100 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the order was reduced to writing and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the paper entitled "The Political Development of the District of Columbia," by Henry E. Davis, be printed as a document, and 100 extra copies for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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.

Mr. STONE. Before the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] resumes the floor, as I suppose he intends to do, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance to the bill as passed by the House, so that it may be considered as pending.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary informs the Chair that there is already an amendment to the amendment pending.

Mr. STONE. I ask to have it read and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator simply desires that it be read and printed for information.

Mr. STONE. Yes; printed, if the printing would not preclude its consideration during the day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Of course it can be offered after the amendment to the amendment is disposed of. It can not now be offered. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Missouri will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "pickled" at the end of line 1 of the printed amendment it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the amendment and to insert:

Leather made from the hides of cattle; boots and shoes made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; harness made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; belts made of leather used for machinery.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal clerk informs the Chair that the first information received was an error; that the proposition the Senator from Rhode Island offered was a substitute, and that this is a second amendment to the substitute and would be in order. So it may be considered as pending.

Mr. McLAURIN. There is an amendment that I have offered to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understands; but the proposition submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island is a substitute. The Senator from Mississippi offers an amendment to it, and the Senator from Missouri now offers an amendment to that amendment; that is all.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the clerk is mistaken about the nature of the amendment which I offered. It was an amendment to the bill, and not a substitute.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Then the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would not now be in order. The Chair assumes that what the Senator from Missouri desires has been accomplished—to have it printed in the RECORD for information.

Mr. STONE. That is it; that is all.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed.

Mr. WARREN rose.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. This is rather an important matter, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Aldrich	Clapp	Gamble	Penrose
Bacon	Clark, Wyo	Hale	Perkins
Bailey	Clay	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Crawford	Hughes	Root
Briggs	Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bristow	Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Simmons
Brown	Cummins	Jones	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Curtis	Kean	Smoot
Burkett	Davis	Lodge	Stone
Burnham	Dick	McLaurin	Sutherland
Burrows	Fletcher	Nelson	Warner
Burton	Flint	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Foster	Overman	
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Page	

Mr. GALLINGER. Some days ago I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] was ill. I understand his illness continues, and I take the liberty to make that announcement now.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Wyoming will proceed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in the brief time that I occupied Saturday afternoon I was able to show to the Senate that instead of the accusation made by the tanners, by the leather trust, that the Senate had wronged them by some midnight practice, while the Dingley bill was in conference, in inserting the duty on hides, being true, it seems to me that the Senate has been injured and insulted by these people. I do not think

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

that everyone who has written in the interest of free hides has been guilty of any intention of that kind, but the leaders, those who have started this campaign, those who take the credit of this campaign and who have scattered this literature broadcast throughout the country, who have raised the fund, which has been no small amount I can assure you, and distributed it among the workers—those men know better, as I was able to prove on Saturday from their own text-book, issued twelve years ago. I showed that twelve years ago they were here in force, as they are now. They had their day in court. They had nearly four months in which to represent their side of the case before the Senate, and the Senate deliberately, as the Senate considers all legislation, after weighing all sides of the case, adopted the policy of a duty on hides.

I want to remark as I go along that the duty proposed was 20 per cent ad valorem when the bill passed the Senate not only upon the heavy hides that are now bringing duty, and which are not 23 per cent of the total importations, but upon all hides and skins, and it was intended to be so applied. In conference the duty was reduced to 15 per cent ad valorem. The duty was collected at that rate upon small skins as well as large until the following year, in September, something more than a year, when the importers took the case up with the custom-house and obtained a ruling that calfskins and kipskins, anything weighing, green, less than 25 pounds, should be declared free, and only those skins that weighed above 25 pounds and another lesser weight given for dry skins should be dutiable.

I was able to prove by the record, and I was substantiated by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, and I, furthermore, was able to prove by the tanners' own text-book that the one foundation upon which their contention is based and the only thing that they have in their favor apparently is this misrepresentation, to call it by no worse name. The leather-trust people know better. They are seeking to get the support of the people upon the ground that they have been wronged and that the Senate wronged them. Having done the Senate this injury, they then insulted the Members of the Senate by calling attention to these text-books with this extraordinary falsehood in them, and some of the witnesses appearing before the House committee testified there to this falsehood. Probably most of the people who have reported this are innocent and simply repeat what they have been told; but the originators are a guilty lot.

Further, regarding the effect, we should take the figures and not the say-so of some one who has in turn taken the say-so of some other man. The statement they make that the packers get all the benefit is false; the statement that the farmers do not receive any protective benefit is false; the statement that the tanning business is languishing is notoriously incorrect. They testified to the contrary themselves when they appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

I do not see the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] in his seat. He, with his usual industry and acuteness, brought up an alleged difference, and the authority therefor, when I was speaking Saturday, as to the percentage of value that a hide bears to a steer. I submitted it to the Senate, and I read one of several invoices I had in hand showing that my statement was correct—that the average value of a hide is from a tenth to a sixth of the total value of the steer. I am going to ask, without reading further in that line, that I may include in my remarks four or five of those invoices, which may show the fact in the case on animals, from small to great. These invoices do not represent any prepared testimony. The government inspectors discover at points where cattle are unloaded some steers and cows which have big jaws or swollen legs or something creating a suspicion that all may not be right. Such animals are cut out and taken to the nearest slaughtering establishment and slaughtered for the account of the owner, who may live a thousand or a hundred miles away. This is done under the supervision of the government officer whose duty it is to attend to it. These are the invoices of returns made to the farmers, and they show the price of each part of the animal, the hide in all cases being given as a separate matter as to both weight and value. In cases that I have seen, hides have run all the way from a tenth of the value to a fourth, but the average is from a sixth to a fifth in the hides that we are now discusing.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator will be complied with.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on January 22, 1909.

Owner, Iowa Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 743.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 387 pounds, $5.75	$22.24
By butter stock, 17 pounds, $7.61	1.30
By cowhide, 46 pounds, $10.80	4.97
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	29.11

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.23	
		2.20
Net proceeds		26.91

Owner, Johnson Brothers, Round Lake, Minn.

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on January 22, 1909.

Owner, Iowa Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 742.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 512 pounds, $5.37½	$27.50
By butter stock, 14 pounds, $7.61	1.06
By steer hide, 64 pounds, $10.80	6.91
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	36.07

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.23	
		2.20
Net proceeds		33.87

Owner, J. W. Eddy, Osceola, Iowa.

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on February 11, 1909:

Owner, Iowa Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 564.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 554 pounds, $6.62½	$36.70
By butter stock, 23 pounds, $7.65	1.76
By steer hide, 62 pounds, $11.15	6.92
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	45.98

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.17	
		2.14
Net proceeds		43.84

Owner, I. R. Void, Aredale, Iowa.

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 23, 1908:

Owner, Lee Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 8.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 765 pounds, $6.50	$49.72
By butter stock, 38 pounds, $8.55	3.25
By steer hide, 79 pounds, $11.38	8.99
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	62.56

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.18	
		2.15
Net proceeds		60.41

Radcliffe Brothers, Dexter, Kans.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator from Indiana with some glee undertook to traverse my statement, which was that no packers

were present before the Senate committee to give testimony, that none demanded that a duty on hides should prevail, and that, if they have any feeling in the matter, they have not expressed it. Yet in every single letter that I have received and every single circular that I have seen, in all the free-hide literature one can hardly read a dozen lines before one comes to the accusation that the Chicago packers are the ones who are fighting for a duty on hides. I challenged it on Saturday, I make the challenge again now, that there has not been a single representative of the packers who has appeared here before the Senate or its committee or before the House or its committee, asking to have the duty on hides retained—not a single one. There is not a consumer, to my knowledge, who has been here asking for free hides. There has been just one class of people here, the tanners, the leather trust, and the boot and shoe men, those who stand between the farmer and the consumer, and demand that they shall take extra toll from us now by denying to the farmer the benefit of a protective tariff, amounting to a dollar and a half to two dollars a hide, insisting upon the benefit of the 1 to 3 cents that it is claimed is added by the tariff to the cost of every pair of shoes; this without giving any compensation to the farmer and without giving even a promise of compensation in the way of lower prices to the wearer of boots and shoes or the man who uses harness or leather goods, in case the tariff on hides is removed.

So here we are between 11,000,000 farmers or more—perhaps 12,000,000—as against less than a quarter of a million of workers in all kinds of tanning and manufacturing of leather. The latter propose to rob directly these 11,000,000 or more of people, or so many of them as may raise cattle, for the benefit not of the millions of wearers of shoes; they promise nothing of that kind; but they want somewhere between the tanner and the manufacturer of shoes to put this amount of duty money into their own pockets. The tanners come before us with a lie in their mouths as to what we have done heretofore. They come here with statements that can not be substantiated as to their industry, whether it is languishing or not, and it finally ends with the straight proposition that they want to make 1, 3, or 5 cents, as the case may be, on each pair of shoes for which they sell the leather, without giving any consideration either to the producer of the hides or to the consumer of the leather.

Now, this man whose testimony the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] cites, Mr. Urion, is the only man who by any possible construction can be said to have the slightest connection with the packers, and this man, it seems, did not voluntarily appear. He was summoned; he was sent for by the House committee, was brought before the bar of the committee on the other side, and submitted to the usual questions. Almost the first statement he made was:

I represent Armour & Co., meat packers, of Chicago. I am here in response to the request of the committee, to be interrogated concerning the duty on hides. Armour & Co. are asking nothing in the readjustment of this tariff.

To make sure of that—as I said before, I am sorry the Senator from Indiana is not here—I am going to read from his testimony. Through all these hundreds of pages of testimony he is the only man who can in any way be connected with the packers. He says, after being sworn:

My name is Alfred R. Urion. I represent Armour & Co., meat packers, of Chicago. I am here in response to the request of the committee to be interrogated concerning the duty on hides.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed with your statement.

Mr. URION. I have prepared no statement, for the reason that after reading the proceedings—

I want you to mark this—

I concluded that only those who asked something at the hands of the committee in the readjustment of the tariff filed briefs or prepared statements.

He further says:

Armour & Co. are asking nothing in the readjustment of this tariff. However, I shall be very glad, and I think it is my duty, to give any information I may be able to give on the subject.

Now, I submit to the honorable Senate that this man did not come before this Congress asking for a tariff on hides. But he was interrogated. His testimony runs along over many pages. Here comes the difference between the Senator from Indiana and myself, who stated that it was 6 per cent. Mr. Urion stated that the value of a hide was 6 per cent of the animal. Now, here is what he said. I will read his own words. He says, answering a question always:

The average value of a hide, or the average of a hide, is about 6 per cent of the total of an animal.

And the weight is about 6 per cent. Then he goes on in various ways and comes to the price of hides. He says:

A year ago hides were down as low as 8 cents. To-day they are up as high as 14 or 15 cents. At that time the cellars of the packers were overflowing; there were no buyers, and, of course, as the demand increased the supply has decreased.

The chairman asks—and I may say, I think, without offense to the chairman of the committee on the other side—that he is opposed to the duty on hides, and always has been. He so states there. He volunteers it two or three times. So the questions asked of the witness by the chairman were naturally not in favor of a duty on hides, as the chairman himself announced that he was opposed to it; and, furthermore, he summoned this witness, and naturally would bring out whatever he could. He said:

When the buyer goes on the market to buy these cattle—

Speaking of the packers—

he is in competition with from 150 to 200 buyers in the Chicago yards. He buys them, expecting, of course, to be able, so far as his judgment goes in judging the markets, to make a profit. It often happens that the beef is sold at a loss, and if the by-products make no profit there is a total loss on the purchase, which often happens.

He is asked by the chairman:

It is stated that about 13,000,000 cattle are slaughtered annually, 5,000,000 by the packers. Do you think that is correct?

He replied:

No; that was correct according to the last statistics, but those statistics are two years old. It is my understanding and my best information that there are in the neighborhood, or was for the year ending June 30 last, about 17,000,000, of which the packers—and when I say "packers" I refer to the largest packers of Chicago—killed about a little over 7,000,000.

Then he is asked this question by Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You stated a moment ago that the amount of cattle killed was 17,000,000, and that the amount killed by the packers was 7,000,000. I want to know, with respect to all of these cattle that are killed, whether their skins go into hides?

He replied:

Certainly.

Then followed the questions and answers which I shall now read:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They go on the market as hides, and practically there is no material loss in the number?

Mr. URION. That is, only a small number. Those are what are known as "packers' hides." There are a large number of hides known as "country hides" in addition to the packers' hides.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The 17,000,000 cattle include the country hides?

Mr. URION. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They do include them?

Mr. URION. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. All the packers kill go into hides. Do all the country cattle killed go into hides?

Mr. URION. Certainly; if a steer dies on the place, the first thing a farmer does is to skin it, because the hide has a value, and he knows it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do you packers purchase those hides?

Mr. URION. No, sir; and I am glad to have an opportunity to correct a misstatement that has been made to the committee, viz, that the packers are engaged through their agencies in the country in buying hides.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will let me finish this one statement I will be glad to yield.

Mr. Urion further said:

I want to say for Armour & Co. that we buy no hides whatever, and we sell no hides excepting our own take-off—the hides which we strip from the cattle which we purchase; and I think that is true as to the other packers.

Mr. PAGE. Do you understand from the statement that the packers, then, confined themselves to the handling of their own hides and not to the handling of country hides?

Mr. WARREN. I am now quoting or cross-questioning a witness summoned by the Senator from Indiana, who takes a position opposite to me. I am reading here testimony given, I assume, under oath, remembering that the witness, Mr. Urion, was brought here under summons; that he stated that neither he nor his employers were here asking for anything; and I am assuming that he knows what he is talking about and that he is telling the truth. I have no personal knowledge whether Mr. Armour may buy a hide or not.

Mr. PAGE. I simply ask the Senator if he believes it to be the condition; that is all. I do not know.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the slightest doubt as to this testimony here from what I know personally.

Mr. PAGE. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. WARREN. He is asked whether the farmer gets any benefit. He volunteers nothing.

I quote further from the testimony:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do you know whether, if hides were placed on the free list, it would in any way affect the price of domestic hides?

Mr. URION. I think it would open—in the first place, in my judgment, and my judgment is no better than anyone else's—it would destroy the home consumption, the home production.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Have you considered the question as to whether the foreign freight rate and the domestic freight rate to the markets of consumption on the foreign hide would give any advantage in that market to the domestic hide?

Mr. URION. I do not think it would. I was looking for a table that I had. I cabled London on Monday to get the prices of hides there.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. You answered Mr. Underwood that the taking of the small duty, 15 per cent, off hides, would amount, according to your own statement, to only about 90 cents on a hide, or a steer, but that it would destroy the domestic production. What do you mean by that; that they would stop raising cattle?

Mr. URION. Not at all.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Quit skinning cattle?

Mr. URION. Not at all.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Or quit saving the skins?

Mr. URION. Not at all. But it would destroy the home market; it would open the home market to that extent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If it had any effect, it would reduce the price of hides, say, 90 cents on an average on each green hide?

Mr. URION. That would mean 90 cents of the farmers.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Do you think the farmers get all of that?

Mr. URION. Yes, sir. He would be the first one to call for it if he did not get it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Is the foreign price here plus the tariff on hides?

Mr. URION. No, sir; that is what I was looking for. I cabled to London to get the prices of hides there.

Now, Mr. President, as I have said, this is the only man who has uttered a word that I can find in the way of evidence before either the House or Senate. He was brought down here on a summons. He says frankly that he represents Armour & Co. because he works for them. He states frankly conditions as he understands them. He states the fact as to Armour & Co. that they do not buy hides, that they sell hides; and I may say further that from other witnesses it is found that when Armour & Co. sell hides to so-called Armour tanneries, their own tanneries or tanneries in which they own a controlling interest, the hides are charged at exactly the same price charged to every other consumer who comes to buy hides of Armour & Co.

Now, an intimation was furthermore volunteered that there were others who had appeared here, and the Senator from Rhode Island stated that three or four parties had been before the Senate committee and represented themselves to be cattle growers and farmers. There is nothing on the side of this question I have espoused about which there need be the slightest doubt. Those who are standing by a duty on hides are as honest to-day as they were in 1897. From the commencement of the consideration of the tariff bill they made known their wishes. They are as honest to-day, and therefore expect as honest treatment, as when the House and Senate proceeded to place a duty on hides, exactly as they did upon other items in the bill.

I have stated the foundation of the free-hides movement. It is all a fabrication, the tale that anybody was wronged, that a wrong was done so many years ago, and that we must now right that wrong in the way of restitution.

I do not allege that all of those who appeared before the committee or all of those who have written letters made that idiotic and untrue statement, but I do allege that the managers of this campaign did start it. They are responsible for it and have made the statement over and over again, and it has been included in nearly all of what you might term the authoritative statements and text-books of the free-hide advocates, and seems to be believed generally up and down this land by those who have signed these petitions.

The only persons who have appeared here before the Senate to my knowledge—somebody will correct me if he has different information—were Judge Cowan, who represents two associations, one the National Live Stock Association of America and the other the Home Cattle Growers' Association of Texas. Judge Cowan represented these associations as their attorney, and said so when he appeared before the committee. Also, Col. Ike G. Pryor—I do not believe he was before the House, but he appeared on this side. He is ex-president of the Cattle Growers' Association of that State. There were also Murdo McKenzie, of Colorado, who is vice-president of the National Live Stock Association of America, and the association's secretary, Mr. Tomlinson; also a Mr. Potter, of Kansas, who was a member of the executive committee.

And there has been a representative here, Mr. J. L. Kennedy, the Washington representative of both associations. He has been on the ground to answer questions and furnish any information wanted by Senators, and I will submit that his work has been of a painstaking, practical, and most useful nature—a work in which he believed he was doing right. He has been active and reasonably aggressive. There can be no fault found with the manner in which he has presented his case.

The American Live Stock Association is composed of the various constituent associations of cattle growers and farmers throughout the Nation. One of the principal associations is the Corn Belt and Meat Producers' Association of Iowa, which has many thousands of members. There are farmers' and cattle-growers' associations of my State, and there are those of all the other States. So the farmers, relying upon friendship of the dominant party, and also of the minority party in the Senate, do not come here individually, but only through their regular accredited representatives. They have not, as a class, written letters. They have written some, it is true, and have sent a few resolutions of committees, but they have relied upon the fairness of Congress, which gave them twelve years ago some little protection, of the greater portion of which, however, they were robbed or separated from by the construction placed upon the law by the custom-house officials. They have said that the farmers have a vote which weighs in the balance of this Nation and which Congress should not fail to consider. Their cause is a just one, as shown by the fact that there has been a duty upon hides for forty-two years, and there was a duty on hides imposed during all of the confederacy upon those who were in the opposition during the war. The farmers have every reason to believe that they will be taken care of, for they deserve to be well cared for, and they appear here only in a regular and recognized way through their accredited representatives. They do not come to Congress resting their case upon misrepresentations, and they do not come with the expectation that the Members of the Senate and House have such wretched memories that they themselves do not know what they did twelve years ago regarding the duty upon hides in the Dingley bill. It seems we have to have men from the outside show up the real wickedness of our actions in order that we may know that at the time mentioned we were engaged in the tricky, midnight business of which they accuse us.

Mr. President, the next prominent feature of nearly all this literature has been the letter of James G. Blaine. I am not one who would discredit James G. Blaine. I was one of his admirers and followers. There never was an opportunity that I had either to deposit a vote in his interests or to say a good word for him when I was not for Blaine. The fact is that many years ago, when he was very enthusiastic over a certain line of reciprocity, he made the statement that hides should be free, and wrote the letter referred to in support of the great scheme of reciprocity which has been discredited by Congress and this country since. What has been done here in this body in carrying out what he laid down as the great principle which we should follow? Mr. Blaine may have been right from his viewpoint, but that declaration, along with some others, was perhaps what kept Mr. Blaine from occupying the White House; and Mr. Blaine's proposition of reciprocity has been laid aside as one of those valuable but not usable ornaments of the Nation.

The statement that the packer gets all the benefit of a hide tariff, if you will stop for a moment to consider it, is ridiculous. It is asinine. You might just as well say that the packer gets all the benefit of the beefsteak; that he gets all the benefit of the loin; that he gets all the benefit of the tallow. These are all component parts of the animal, and there is no part of the animal more distinct, more easy to decide the value of, than the hide. The hide is on the outside; it is stretched over the frame of the animal; it can be seen and felt; and the one who deals in cattle can tell more accurately at a glance what that hide is worth than he can tell what any other part of the animal is worth. As I have stated, it is worth from a fifth to a sixth of the value of the whole animal, and one might just as truthfully say that the only thing about the animal that the packer pays for is the beefsteak, because the man who buys it may not eat any other portion of the animal. But allowing it to be true that the packer does not pay the farmer, if he has the power to take without paying therefor one-fifth or one-sixth of either part of the animal when it comes to him, to take arbitrarily that which is in plain sight, to take arbitrarily that which the farmer himself can as well butcher or have killed for him, selling the beef in competition with the packer, and selling the hides the same way—if he can do that, it certainly rests in the packer's power to give the farmer whatever he likes for any portion or all of the animal. If we are in that condition, that we are so truly subservient to the packers that they can give us any price which they desire, you could not benefit our condition by taking off this tariff on hides, because the packer would then have an excuse with which to meet the farmer and say: "I will give you five or six dollars less per head for your animals, because the tariff has been removed on hides," and the farmer and stockman would have to stand it.

The important part played by the value of hides in the sale of cattle is well illustrated in the table which I send to the desk for insertion in the RECORD. Note the differences between prices of branded and unbranded hides. Cattle bring just that much more or less, according to the condition of their hides; and if hides are branded, the extent of the mutilation is considered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Chicago packer hides—Monthly average prices of Chicago packer hides for 1908, with yearly comparisons.

	Native steers, heavy.	Butt branded steers.	Texas steers, heavy.	Texas steers, light.	Colorado steers.	Native cows, heavy.	Native cows, light.	Branded cows.	Native bulls.	Branded bulls.
	Cts.	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*
January	11.31	9.46	11.25	9.75	9.47	9.09	8.53	7.78	9.62	7.69
February	10.75	9.88	11.40	10.20	10.00	8.08	8.40	8.45	8.97	7.45
March	9.36	8.97	10.75	9.81	9.06	8.34	7.81	8.31	8.37	6.96
April	10.68	10.31	12.08	10.93	10.37	9.18	8.93	9.08	8.93	7.58
May	11.45	11.15	13.60	12.00	11.15	9.60	9.30	9.40	8.90	7.75
June	13.50	12.56	14.93	13.87	12.68	10.82	10.82	10.82	9.18	8.18
July	15.06	13.81	15.25	13.81	13.87	12.75	12.37	11.50	10.07	9.00
August	15.75	14.17	15.45	13.95	14.00	13.70	13.25	11.95	10.75	9.70
September	15.81	14.31	15.50	14.00	14.21	13.96	13.43	12.00	11.25	9.68
October	15.65	14.15	15.25	13.75	13.90	13.60	12.90	11.75	10.95	9.70
November	15.87	14.44	15.43	14.06	14.00	13.81	13.12	12.06	11.31	10.00
December	16.00	14.43	15.81	14.43	14.37	14.12	13.43	12.81	11.75	10.50
Average:										
1908	13.43	12.30	13.89	12.55	12.26	11.42	11.02	10.40	10.00	8.69
1907	14.56	12.20	14.09	13.23	11.82	13.12	12.72	11.88	11.85	9.99
1906	15.43	13.99	14.88	14.85	13.66	14.96	14.88	14.11	12.20	10.59
1905	14.36	13.26	14.45	13.91	13.13	13.18	13.10	12.90	10.80	9.78
1904	11.77	10.93	12.67	11.71	10.84	10.62	10.47	10.27	9.12	8.13
1903	11.72	10.62	12.71	11.14	10.47	9.92	9.59	9.19	9.61	7.68
1902	13.37	12.33	12.45	12.46	12.09	11.21	10.14	10.02	10.62	9.15
1901	12.40	11.46	12.93	11.52	11.23	10.68	10.12	9.91	10.17	8.52
1900	12.00	11.08	12.09	11.16	10.54	10.68	10.59	10.24	9.93	8.46

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I think the Senators who are advocating a duty on leather and shoes and at the same time advocating free hides ought to hear the speech of the Senator from Wyoming, and I suggest the point of order that there is no quorum at this time, in order that the Senator may have a fuller audience.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana 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	Clapp	Gallinger	Page
Bacon	Clark, Wyo.	Gamble	Paynter
Bailey	Clay	Heyburn	Penrose
Bankhead	Crawford	Hughes	Perkins
Borah	Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Piles
Brandegee	Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Root
Briggs	Cummins	Jones	Scott
Bristow	Curtis	Kean	Simmons
Brown	Daniel	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Davis	Lorimer	Smoot
Burkett	Depew	McCumber	Stone
Burnham	Dick	McEnery	Sutherland
Burrows	Dixon	Money	Warner
Burton	Dolliver	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	
Chamberlain	Frye	Overman	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I was about to remark, when the absence of a quorum was suggested, that if it lies with the packer to make exactly the price to the farmer that he sees fit without let or hindrance, and if he makes the prices that much lower, as he certainly will if this tariff is removed, it will have the same effect that any other deterrent measure has upon the growth of an industry; it will cause the farmers, who are now making only an equal return and little or no profit upon their cattle, to turn their industry in another direction. The number of cattle will be less, and the price of beef will rise that much higher. But, Mr. President, there is once in a while an honest man, who, when he is in opposition, does not creep under falsehoods, but who tells the truth; and I have here in my hand a statement, to which I wish expressly to call the attention of the Senate. It is a written statement signed by the chairman of a great convention and by its secretary. The chairman was Carl H. Krippendorf; the secretary, Benj. J. Wolf. They state that they represent over 700 firms of boot and shoe makers. Their meeting was at Cincinnati, Ohio, May 6, 1909. The statement says:

> Why should the farmer, if hides are placed on the free list, be compelled to sell his cattle for less than when there is a tariff on hides?
>
> What prevents the packer paying the farmer a fair price for his cattle and charging a little more for beef or the other by-products of cattle if (in order to make a fair profit) the world's price of hides makes it necessary? It should therefore not make any material difference either to the farmer or to the beef packer if the tariff on hides is retained or removed.
>
> If hides are placed on the free list he will have to pay a little more for his beef.
>
> Assuming that by placing hides on the free list the market price of hides would decline to this extent, the difference which would have to be charged to the price of beef would be less than one-fifth of a cent a pound, as an average steer * * *.

What! Raise the price of beef one-fifth of a cent a pound to every consumer in the United States with its ninety millions of people just to accommodate the leather trust and the comparatively small number of people—less than a quarter of a million—engaged in all the trades pertaining to the leather and the boot and shoe business, according to the census?

Monstrous!

This enterprising document, this set of resolutions duly signed by chairman and secretary of allied leather industries, quotes the Hepburn law to support its position.

> Equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Also—

> The duty on hides aids the big packers.

So, Mr. President, when you get down, as we would say in the Middle Western States, a little nearer the trail, where the representatives of 700 firms get together and resolve to adopt as their motto: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none;" and charge 90,000,000 people one-fifth of a cent a pound more for meat, you reach the milk in the cocoanut. And all this so that they can line the capacious pockets of a few men, to the detriment of the raiser of hides and the wearer of shoes. In all this there is no promise of lower shoes. They undertake to place themselves right with these eleven or twelve million farmers, by stating, "you shall have your price; you shall have that much more, one-fifth of a cent for beef, and we will make these 90,000,000 people contribute the one-fifth of a cent a pound for that which they must eat every day, in order that the people engaged in the tanning of leather and in the manufacturing of shoes may have the 1 or 2 cents, or 3 cents, or whatever it may be more of profit on a pair of shoes."

Has there ever been a more monstrous proposition before the Senate?

When they make the statement that not to exceed one-fifth of a cent a pound on beef to 90,000,000 people becomes necessary to enlarge the profits of tanners and shoemakers and those who are engaged in those industries, which, I believe, are more profitable than any other industries in this country, or in this part of the country at least, I want this Senate to demand the reason why. They enjoyed a continued period of prosperity under taxed hides—a measure of prosperity which they had never reached under free hides. I will not confine it to boots and shoes; I will not confine it to tanners; but I will take the entire hide and leather line, and show here, by the official figures of the United States, that they are not only making a large profit, but they are pushing their wares into every part of the world. They have increased in an almost geometrical progression in their exports. I want to absolve all those who have been imposed upon, as a few have been, by the leather trust, one of the most aggressive and soul-crushing trusts in this country.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that we should stand in opposition to the great meat trust that undertakes to control food products. There never has been a month or an hour that I have not stood in opposition to that trust, or that association which you call a trust, meaning four different firms, when there was tenable ground to stand on in opposition, but I am not going to undertake to go in complaint to the people who raised the price of hides—according to boot and shoe authority—from 4 cents to 13 cents to the farmer, with the aid of the Dingley law, and gave us competition with the leather trust, and gave to the country both ends of the benefit—those who grow the hides and those who use them. I am not going to come in here and align myself through legislation with the trusts which boldly proclaim a readiness to raise the price of beef to 90,000,000 people merely in order that they can get a little more profit on their boots and shoes, and which, at that, do not even promise to the consumer a lower price on boots and shoes.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas, with his usual ardor and industry, rose on Saturday at the proper place and time and had read a letter from a boot and shoe man. It was

open and positive. He said if you could take the tariff off of hides you could take it off of shoes. I want to compliment that Senator by telling him that, in all the tomes that I have gone through and in all the literature on this subject that I have examined, that is the only man, from first to last, who has avowed fairly and squarely that if you take the tariff off of hides you can take it off of boots and shoes.

It is true that perhaps scores of men appeared before the House and testified, as my good friend the Senator from Vermont will ascertain if he looks further in that book, that tariff might be taken off of shoes if taken off of hides, and it is also true that most of them appeared the second time and stated that they did not mean what they had said the first time; that they had changed their minds, or words to that effect; that they did not want a tariff on shoes; and they gave the very good reason—and I want to say it is a good one—that formerly they had, to use the phrase of the street, "a dead cinch" upon some of the shoe-manufacturing machinery because it was invented here; that they had obtained the right to use it in the making of shoes, and they could control the markets of the world; but now the machines were being sold in foreign countries, they were being accompanied by skilled workmen from this country, they were being set up abroad, and as leather was cheaper there than with the Yankee shoemaker and their foreign competitors now had the Yankee shoe machinery, they—the domestic shoe men—needed a duty to protect them from those foreign manufacturers; and I quite agree with them.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that I agree with them as to that, I say to you here, the time has passed in this country when there can be an oligarchy of manufacturers, so to speak, decreeing that the finished product of the farm shall be free and the finished product of the manufacturer shall bear a tariff.

I want to say to my friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who I am sorry is not in the Chamber, that he states what is a fact when he says that this country will not long support any tariff bill under which it is proposed to rob the agriculturist on the plea that his product is raw material. To the man who makes your clothes, Mr. President, the cloth is raw material; to the manufacturer who makes that cloth wool is the raw material; but to the man who raises the wool it is the finished product.

I want to say here that is simply the keystone of the arch of protection that these people propose to tear down when they undertake to call wool, coal, and hides "raw materials" and make them free, while protecting manufacturers of the same. Not only are the tanning industry and the great leather trust seeking to get free hides, but the nose of the camel is intruded into the tents in their desire to put every one of these items and others, especially the farmers' products, upon the free list.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at this moment—knows that his State legislature passed repeated resolutions calling for free wool, free coal, free iron, and perhaps other so-called raw materials. Strike down the tariff on hides, and you strike down the duty upon raw materials; and down with it soon goes the tariff on wool and the tariff on all the other materials of that kind.

Before I had the honor of sitting in this body I met, many a time, the representatives of the wool growers and woolen manufacturers. The latter then demanded free wool, just as strongly as those now approaching us are demanding free hides.

I have here in a Boston paper a very late expression of that sentiment. I ask the Secretary to read that portion marked between the blue lines, and I ask the attention of the Senate, because the article is not long.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

THE DUTIES ON RAW MATERIALS.

[From the Textile Manufacturers' Journal.]

There are duties on certain raw materials of manufacture, notably hides of cattle and wool of sheep, which were imposed under pretense of benefit to farmers, but which are doing them no good, while they are producing the opposite effect to that for which the protective tariff was devised. They are seriously hampering two of the most important manufacturing industries of the country.—New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that comes from a journal that is interested in these two particular matters. I could send to the desk article after article in the same tone respecting other demands for so-called free raw material. I have among others an article from a Philadelphia paper, which goes over the list of wool, hides, and various other materials that they are going to have free. But let me state to you, sir, that the day has passed when the United States Senate will consent to that kind of business. When the time comes to take the blanket off and go into free trade, who will have the most to lose? Will it be the farmer out in the western country? Will it be the man who raises a cattle hide and gets 60 or 70 or 80 or 90 cents or a dollar and a half or two dollars' benefit upon it through the 15 per cent duty against foreign hides, and turns around and pays ten or twenty times as much for taxed harness and shoes, and so forth? Is he going to raise his product and have it free, in order to enlarge the profits of a small group of men in another part of the country, and then be held up by a duty all along the line, when he buys the manufactured products of the same?

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States very wisely provided that there should be two Houses—that there should be a popular House, in which the States should be represented according to population, and that there should be another House, in which the various States should have equal representation. It is not strange that in the other House there may be propositions for free raw material incorporated in bills sent to this body, inasmuch as the State of New York has thirty-odd Members of that body, the State of Pennsylvania thirty-odd Members, and some of the New England States a score or so apiece, while the great body of Northwestern States have only one or two Members of Congress apiece. I think it was a wise provision originally incorporated into the Constitution and adhered to that there should be some protection to the States in the new and growing part of this country in this one body, where they can have sufficient representation meekly to present and support their rights.

That tariff bill which undertakes to make free raw material of the farmer's finished product, if carried through here once, will be the death knell of the protective tariff in the United States until there has been a new alignment and a new adjustment all around.

Mr. President, I know that statistics and tables of figures are dry, and I am only going to touch the high places, but I have several tables here which I have prepared with some care. I will read from them some figures, and I will ask that the tables and accompanying statements may be included in my remarks when printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Facts about farms.

[Census figures, from Statistical Abstract, 1908.]

	1890.	1900.
Number of farms	4,564,641	5,739,657
Persons engaged in agriculture	8,565,926	10,438,219
Value farms and farm property	$16,082,267,689	$20,514,001,838
Value of products	$2,460,107,454	$3,764,177,706
Value of live stock	$2,808,767,573	$3,075,477,703

INCREASE ABOVE FORMER YEARS.

The farm value of farm products this year is $290,000,000 above the value for 1907, $1,023,000,000 above that of 1906, $1,469,000,000 above that of 1905, $1,619,000,000 above that of 1904, $1,861,000,000 above that of 1903, and $3,061,000,000 above the census amount of 1899.

Expressed in the form of percentages of increase, the amount for 1908 was 4 per cent greater than that for 1907, 15 per cent over that for 1906, 23 per cent over that for 1905, 26 per cent over that for 1904, 31 per cent over that for 1903, and 65 per cent over that for the census year 1899.

A simple series of index numbers shows the progressive movement of wealth production by the farmer in another form. The value of products in 1899, the census year, being taken at 100, the value for 1903 stands at 125, for 1904 at 131, for 1905 at 134, for 1906 at 143, for 1907 at 159, and for 1908 at 165.

During the last ten years the wealth production on the farms of this country has exceeded the fabulous amount of $60,000,000,000.

Statistics of cattle.

NUMBER AND VALUE OF MILCH COWS AND OTHER CATTLE, 1867–1908.

[From Agricultural Yearbook.]

January 1—	Milch cows.			Other cattle.		
	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
1867	8,348,773	$28.74	$239,946,612	11,730,952	$15.79	$185,253,850
1868	8,691,568	26.56	230,816,717	11,942,484	15.06	179,887,797
1869	9,247,714	29.15	269,610,021	12,185,385	18.73	228,183,001
1870	10,095,600	32.70	330,175,234	15,388,500	18.87	290,400,588
1871	10,023,000	33.89	339,700,528	16,212,200	20.78	336,859,617
1872	10,303,500	29.45	303,438,398	16,389,800	18.12	296,931,664
1873	10,575,900	26.72	282,559,051	16,413,800	18.06	296,448,036
1874	10,705,300	25.63	274,325,680	16,218,100	17.55	284,705,983
1875	10,906,800	25.74	280,700,645	16,313,400	16.91	275,871,664
1876	11,085,400	25.61	283,878,869	16,785,300	17.00	285,387,123
1877	11,260,800	25.47	286,778,030	17,956,100	15.99	287,155,528
1878	11,300,100	25.74	290,897,809	19,223,300	16.72	321,345,691
1879	11,826,400	21.71	256,720,779	21,408,100	15.38	329,253,631

Statistics of cattle—Continued.

January 1—	Milch cows.			Other cattle.		
	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
1880	12,027,000	$23.27	$279,899,420	21,231,000	$16.10	$341,761,154
1881	12,368,653	23.95	296,277,060	20,938,710	17.33	362,861,509
1882	12,611,632	25.89	326,489,310	23,280,238	19.89	463,069,501
1883	13,125,685	30.21	396,575,405	28,046,077	21.81	611,549,109
1884	13,501,206	31.37	423,486,649	29,046,101	23.52	683,229,054
1885	13,904,722	29.70	412,903,093	29,866,573	23.25	694,382,913
1886	14,235,388	27.40	389,985,523	31,275,242	21.17	661,956,274
1887	14,522,083	26.08	378,789,589	33,511,750	19.79	663,137,926
1888	14,856,414	24.65	366,252,173	34,378,363	17.79	611,750,520
1889	15,298,625	23.94	366,226,376	35,032,417	17.05	597,236,812
1890	15,952,883	22.14	353,152,133	36,849,024	15.21	560,625,137
1891	16,019,591	21.62	346,397,900	36,875,648	14.76	544,127,908
1892	16,416,351	21.40	351,378,132	37,651,239	15.16	570,749,155
1893	16,424,087	21.75	357,299,785	35,954,196	15.24	547,882,204
1894	16,487,400	21.77	358,998,661	36,608,168	14.66	536,789,747
1895	16,504,629	21.97	362,601,729	34,364,216	14.06	482,999,129
1896	16,137,586	22.55	363,955,545	32,085,409	15.86	508,928,416
1897	15,941,727	23.16	369,239,993	30,508,408	16.65	507,929,421
1898	15,840,886	27.45	434,813,826	29,264,197	20.92	612,296,634
1899	15,990,115	29.66	474,232,925	27,994,225	22.79	637,931,135
1900	16,292,360	31.60	514,812,106	27,610,054	24.97	689,486,260
1901	16,833,657	30.00	505,093,077	45,500,213	19.93	906,644,003
1902	16,696,802	29.23	488,130,324	44,727,797	18.76	839,126,073
1903	17,105,227	30.21	516,711,914	44,659,206	18.45	824,054,902
1904	17,419,817	29.21	508,841,489	43,629,498	16.32	712,178,134
1905	17,572,464	27.44	482,272,203	43,669,443	15.15	661,571,308
1906	19,793,866	29.44	582,788,592	47,067,656	15.85	746,171,709
1907	20,968,265	31.00	645,496,980	51,565,731	17.10	881,557,398
1908	21,194,000	30.67	650,057,000	50,073,000	16.89	845,938,000

Imports and exports of live cattle, with average prices, 1892–1907.

Year ending June 30—	Imports.			Exports.		
	Number.	Value.	Average import price	Number.	Value.	Average export price.
1892	2,168	$47,466	$21.89	394,607	$35,099,095	$88.95
1893	3,293	45,682	13.87	287,094	26,032,428	90.68
1894	1,592	18,704	11.75	359,278	33,461,922	93.14
1895	149,781	765,853	5.11	331,722	30,603,796	92.26
1896	217,826	1,509,856	6.93	372,461	34,560,672	92.79
1897	328,977	2,589,857	7.87	392,190	36,357,451	92.70
1898	291,589	2,913,223	9.99	439,255	37,827,500	86.12
1899	199,752	2,320,362	11.62	389,490	30,516,833	78.35
1900	181,006	2,257,694	12.47	397,286	30,635,153	77.11
1901	146,022	1,931,433	13.23	459,218	37,566,980	81.81
1902	96,027	1,608,722	16.75	392,884	29,902,212	76.11
1903	66,175	1,161,548	17.55	402,178	29,848,936	74.22
1904	16,056	310,737	19.35	593,409	42,256,291	71.21
1905	27,855	458,572	16.46	567,806	40,598,048	71.50
1906	29,019	548,430	18.90	584,239	42,081,170	72.03
1907	32,404	565,122	17.44	423,051	34,577,392	81.73

Number, average price, and farm value of cattle in the United States January 1, 1908.

State or Territory.	Milch cows.			Other cattle.		
	Number.	Average price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Average price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
Maine	183,000	$31.00	$5,673,000	151,000	$16.00	$2,416,000
New Hampshire	128,000	32.50	4,160,000	103,000	17.00	1,751,000
Vermont	291,000	30.00	8,730,000	221,000	14.00	3,094,000

Number, average price, and farm value of cattle in the United States January 1, 1908—Continued.

State or Territory.	Milch cows.			Other cattle.		
	Number.	Average price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.	Number.	Average price per head Jan. 1.	Farm value Jan. 1.
Massachusetts	196,000	$40.00	$7,840,000	92,000	$17.00	$1,564,000
Rhode Island	26,000	42.50	1,105,000	10,000	19.00	190,000
Connecticut	138,000	37.50	5,175,000	83,000	19.00	1,577,000
New York	1,789,000	33.50	59,932,000	907,000	17.00	15,419,000
New Jersey	190,000	43.00	8,170,000	82,000	21.00	1,722,000
Pennsylvania	1,152,000	36.00	41,472,000	965,000	18.00	17,370,000
Delaware	37,000	$36.50	$1,350,000	22,000	$20.00	$440,000
Maryland	155,000	32.00	4,960,000	140,000	20.00	2,800,000
Virginia	288,000	28.00	8,064,000	561,000	19.00	10,659,000
West Virginia	247,000	33.00	8,151,000	549,000	22.00	12,078,000
North Carolina	294,000	24.00	7,056,000	450,000	12.00	5,400,000
South Carolina	138,000	27.00	3,726,000	223,000	12.00	2,676,000
Georgia	308,000	25.00	7,700,000	680,000	11.00	7,480,000
Florida	91,000	29.00	2,639,000	664,000	10.00	6,640,000
Ohio	928,000	36.00	33,408,000	1,050,000	21.00	22,050,000
Indiana	660,000	33.00	21,780,000	1,096,000	21.00	23,016,000
Illinois	1,184,000	35.00	41,440,000	2,164,000	22.00	47,608,000
Michigan	849,000	34.00	28,866,000	1,003,000	16.00	16,048,000
Wisconsin	1,392,000	30.50	42,456,000	1,137,000	13.00	14,781,000
Minnesota	1,040,000	28.00	29,120,000	1,279,000	12.00	15,348,000
Iowa	1,555,000	30.50	47,428,000	3,881,000	21.00	81,501,000
Missouri	965,000	28.50	27,502,000	2,349,000	20.00	46,980,000
North Dakota	224,000	27.50	6,160,000	642,000	16.00	10,272,000
South Dakota	618,000	27.50	16,995,000	1,426,000	18.00	25,668,000
Nebraska	879,000	29.00	25,491,000	3,265,000	19.00	62,035,000
Kansas	722,000	29.00	20,938,000	3,577,000	20.00	71,540,000
Kentucky	398,000	27.50	10,945,000	714,000	18.00	12,852,000
Tennessee	331,000	23.00	7,613,000	595,000	12.00	7,140,000
Alabama	283,000	21.00	5,943,000	539,000	8.00	4,312,000
Mississippi	330,000	20.00	6,600,000	589,000	8.00	4,712,000
Louisiana	190,000	24.00	4,560,000	480,000	10.00	4,800,000
Texas	1,072,000	26.00	27,872,000	7,825,000	12.00	93,900,000
Oklahoma	338,000	26.00	8,788,000	1,814,000	16.00	29,024,000
Arkansas	384,000	18.50	7,104,000	695,000	8.00	5,560,000
Montana	69,000	36.00	2,484,000	879,000	20.00	17,580,000
Wyoming	23,000	38.00	874,000	838,000	24.00	20,112,000
Colorado	144,000	37.00	5,328,000	1,454,000	20.00	29,080,000
New Mexico	25,000	38.00	950,000	939,000	17.00	15,963,000
Arizona	23,000	43.00	989,000	603,000	17.00	10,251,000
Utah	79,000	31.00	2,449,000	324,000	17.00	5,508,000
Nevada	17,000	45.00	765,000	367,000	20.00	7,340,000
Idaho	69,000	32.00	2,208,000	344,000	17.00	5,848,000
Washington	184,000	37.00	6,808,000	389,000	18.00	7,002,000
Oregon	158,000	35.00	5,530,000	758,000	17.00	12,886,000
California	410,000	36.00	14,760,000	1,155,000	19.00	21,945,000
United States	21,194,000	30.67	650,057,000	50,073,000	16.89	845,938,000

Number of cattle received at markets named.

	1895.	1905.	1907.
Chicago	2,757,298	3,791,304	3,927,248
Kansas City	1,689,652	2,422,582	2,670,260
Omaha	586,103	1,026,392	1,158,716
St. Louis	851,275	1,254,236	1,323,208
St. Joseph	49,202,	546,688	616,232
Total	5,933,530	9,041,202	9,695,664

The incidental branch of the live-stock industry, that of slaughtering and meat packing, not including retail butchering, ranks No. 1 in all of our industries in value of net products, the value in 1900 being $783,779,191. The present year it will reach $1,000,000,000.

Domestic exports of beef and its products from the United States.

[From Agricultural Department bulletins.]

Year ending June 30—	Cattle.		Beef, canned.		Beef, cured: Salted or pickled.		Beef, cured, other.		Beef, fresh.	
	Number.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
1890	394,836	$31,261,131	82,638,507	$6,787,193	97,508,419	$5,250,068	102,110	$9,223	173,237,596	$12,862,384
1891	374,679	30,445,249	109,585,727	9,068,906	90,286,979	5,048,788	1,621,833	147,518	194,045,638	15,322,054
1892	394,607	35,099,095	87,028,084	7,876,454	70,204,736	3,987,829	953,712	92,524	220,554,617	18,053,732
1893	287,094	26,032,428	79,089,493	7,222,824	58,423,963	3,185,321	898,920	87,776	206,294,724	17,754,041
1894	359,278	33,461,922	55,974,910	5,120,851	62,682,667	3,572,054	1,218,334	100,631	193,891,824	16,700,163
1895	331,722	30,603,796	64,102,263	5,720,933	62,473,325	3,558,230	821,673	73,569	191,338,487	16,832,860
1896	372,461	34,560,672	63,698,180	5,636,953	70,709,209	3,975,113	514,303	59,371	224,783,225	18,974,107
1897	392,190	36,357,451	54,019,772	4,656,308	67,712,940	3,514,126	939,448	83,701	290,395,930	22,653,742
1898	439,255	37,827,500	37,109,570	3,279,657	44,314,479	2,368,467	1,589,052	156,051	274,768,074	22,966,556
1899	389,490	30,516,833	38,385,472	3,503,293	46,564,876	2,525,784	1,579,313	145,996	282,139,974	23,545,185
1900	397,286	30,635,153	55,553,745	5,233,982	47,306,513	2,697,340	2,319,165	197,051	329,078,609	29,643,830
1901	459,218	37,566,980	53,445,521	5,307,501	55,312,632	3,145,219	789,285	72,677	351,748,333	31,851,361
1902	392,884	29,902,212	66,645,838	6,646,130	48,632,727	3,031,027	818,382	72,836	301,824,473	29,045,056
1903	402,178	29,848,936	76,307,114	7,916,928	52,801,220	3,814,671	1,126,032	102,184	254,795,963	25,013,323
1904	593,409	42,256,291	57,468,338	5,882,888	57,584,710	3,260,475	269,112	20,542	299,579,671	26,841,586
1905	567,806	40,598,048	66,688,568	6,588,958	55,934,705	3,095,304	136,476	14,057	236,486,568	22,188,365
1906	584,239	42,081,170	64,523,359	6,430,446	81,088,098	4,697,742	199,483	22,063	268,054,227	24,310,038
1907	423,051	34,577,392	15,809,826	1,615,808	62,645,281	3,740,212	1,053,287	107,956	281,651,502	26,367,287
1908	349,210	29,339,134	23,376,447	2,467,875	46,958,367	3,213,480	937,720	106,470	201,154,105	20,339,377

Domestic exports of beef and its products from the United States—Continued.

Year ending June 30—	Hides and skins, other than furs.		Oil, oleo.		Oleomargarine (imitation butter).		Tallow.		Total exports of beef and its products as far as ascertainable.
	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.
1890	.....	$1,828,635	68,218,098	$6,476,258	2,535,926	$297,264	112,745,370	$5,242,158	536,986,026
1891	.....	1,333,655	80,231,035	7,859,130	1,986,743	255,024	111,689,251	5,501,049	589,447,206
1892	.....	1,223,895	91,581,703	9,011,889	1,610,837	195,587	89,780,010	4,425,630	561,713,699
1893	.....	1,497,003	113,939,363	11,207,250	3,479,322	416,386	61,819,153	3,129,059	523,944,938
1894	.....	3,972,494	123,295,895	11,942,842	3,898,950	475,003	54,661,524	2,766,164	495,624,104
1895	36,002,859	2,310,323	78,098,878	7,107,018	10,100,897	992,464	25,864,300	1,293,059	432,799,823
1896	39,545,324	3,858,946	103,276,756	8,087,905	6,063,699	587,269	52,759,212	2,323,764	521,804,584
1897	31,119,166	2,388,530	113,506,152	6,742,061	4,864,351	472,856	75,108,834	2,782,595	606,547,427
1898	11,536,073	1,015,032	132,579,277	7,904,413	4,328,536	386,297	81,744,809	3,141,653	576,433,797
1899	10,140,840	929,117	142,390,492	9,183,659	5,549,322	509,703	107,361,009	4,367,356	623,970,458
1900	7,486,256	804,674	146,739,681	10,503,856	4,256,067	416,544	89,030,943	4,398,204	674,284,723
1901	11,161,749	1,064,952	161,651,413	11,846,373	4,990,699	484,501	77,166,889	3,848,561	705,104,772
1902	9,372,747	906,504	138,546,088	12,254,969	5,721,254	601,521	34,065,758	1,924,577	596,254,520
1903	12,859,549	1,224,409	126,010,339	11,981,888	7,645,652	798,273	27,368,924	1,623,852	546,055,244
1904	32,727,643	3,246,887	165,183,839	12,873,558	6,137,251	605,874	76,924,174	3,801,302	663,147,095
1905	10,268,722	1,051,641	145,228,245	11,485,145	7,863,164	711,038	63,536,992	3,022,173	575,874,718
1906	10,752,827	1,223,255	209,658,075	17,455,976	11,794,174	1,033,256	97,567,156	4,791,025	732,884,572
1907	15,396,806	1,760,032	195,337,176	16,819,933	5,397,609	520,406	127,857,739	7,182,688	689,752,420
1908	14,650,454	1,536,225	212,541,157	19,278,476	2,938,175	299,746	91,397,507	5,399,219	579,303,478

Mean prices of fresh beef in London in first week of each quarter, 1907–8.

[From Agricultural Department bulletins.]

[Cents per pound.]

Quarter beginning—	United States, refrigerated.		Argentina, refrigerated.		Argentina, frozen.	
	Hind quarter.	Fore quarter.	Hind quarter.	Fore quarter.	Hind quarter.	Fore quarter.
1907.						
January	11.3	7.4	7.9	6.3	7.2	6.1
April	11.0	7.3	8.7	6.1	6.5	5.2
July	11.6	7.9	8.9	6.6	7.6	6.1
October	12.7	7.8	9.1	5.4	7.2	4.9
1908.						
January	11.3	7.4	7.5	6.1	6.6	5.4
April	12.1	9.0	10.1	8.0	7.9	6.2
July	12.7	8.4	9.4	6.4	8.4	6.2

Agricultural exports (domestic) of the United States during the five years ending June 30, 1907.

Article exported.	1903.		1904.		1905.		1906.		1907.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
ANIMAL MATTER.										
Animals, live:										
Cattle ..... number..	402,178	$29,848,936	593,409	$42,256,291	567,806	$40,598,048	584,239	$42,081,170	423,051	$34,577,392
Hogs ..... do....	4,031	40,923	6,345	53,780	44,496	416,692	59,170	630,998	24,262	309,440
Horses ..... do....	34,007	3,152,159	42,001	3,189,100	34,822	3,175,259	40,087	4,365,981	33,882	4,359,957
Mules ..... do....	4,294	521,725	3,658	412,971	5,826	645,464	7,167	989,639	6,781	850,901
Sheep ..... do....	176,961	1,067,860	301,313	1,954,604	268,365	1,687,321	142,690	804,090	135,344	750,242
Other, including fowls	.....	149,590	.....	111,129	.....	205,497	.....	267,690	.....	355,148
Total	.....	34,781,193	.....	47,977,875	.....	46,728,281	.....	49,139,568	.....	41,203,080
Beeswax ..... pounds..	70,811	21,337	55,631	16,545	85,406	24,966	101,726	29,894	117,169	36,392
Dairy products:										
Butter ..... do....	8,896,166	1,604,327	10,717,824	1,768,184	10,071,487	1,648,281	27,360,537	4,922,913	12,544,777	2,429,489
Cheese ..... do....	18,987,178	2,250,229	23,335,172	2,452,239	10,134,424	1,084,044	16,562,451	1,940,620	17,285,230	2,012,626
Milk	.....	921,026	.....	1,367,794	.....	2,156,616	.....	1,889,690	.....	2,191,111
Total	.....	4,775,582	.....	5,588,217	.....	4,888,941	.....	8,753,223	.....	6,633,226
Eggs ..... dozens..	1,517,189	325,571	1,776,632	396,408	2,475,884	543,386	4,952,063	1,038,649	6,968,985	1,542,789
Egg yolks	.....	48,108	.....	28,294	.....	917	.....	54,851	.....	11,565
Feathers	.....	141,257	.....	157,035	.....	239,256	.....	263,377	.....	316,306
Fibers, animal:										
Silk waste ..... pounds..	149,400	19,968	227,139	30,814	72,451	9,806	71,368	13,781	129,078	37,709
Wool ..... do....	518,919	71,818	319,750	37,171	123,951	15,068	192,481	29,095	214,840	48,820
Total ..... do....	668,319	91,786	546,889	67,985	196,402	24,874	263,849	42,876	343,918	86,529
Glue ..... do....	2,569,164	253,768	2,656,057	258,511	2,824,202	279,534	3,157,837	298,796	3,481,715	331,998
Honey	.....	64,220	.....	69,317	.....	63,367	.....	111,945	.....	93,690
Packing-house products:										
Bones, hoofs, horns, and horn tips, strips, and waste	.....	193,817	.....	208,523	.....	181,203	.....	212,516	.....	172,208
Bristles	.....	515	.....	1,808	.....	1,497	.....	329	.....	2,732
Grease, grease scraps, and all soap stock	.....	2,926,565	.....	3,311,777	.....	3,710,907	.....	4,138,333	.....	5,473,623
Hair	.....	616,133	.....	724,514	.....	778,471	.....	854,038	.....	938,433
Hides and skins, other than furs, pounds..	12,859,549	1,224,409	32,727,643	3,246,887	10,268,722	1,051,641	10,752,827	1,223,255	15,396,806	1,760,032
Lard ..... do....	490,755,821	50,854,504	561,302,643	46,347,520	610,238,899	47,243,181	741,516,886	60,132,091	627,559,660	57,497,980
Lard compounds ..... do....	46,130,004	3,607,542	53,603,545	3,581,813	61,215,187	3,613,235	67,621,310	4,154,183	80,148,861	6,166,910

Agricultural exports (domestic) of the United States during the five years ending June 30, 1907—Continued.

Article exported.	1903.		1904.		1905.		1906.		1907.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
Packing-house products—Continued.										
Meat—										
Beef—										
Fresh ..... pounds..	254,795,963	$25,013,323	299,579,671	$26,841,586	236,486,568	$22,138,365	268,054,227	$24,310,038	281,651,502	$26,367,287
Cured—										
Salted or pickled ..... do....	52,801,220	3,814,671	57,584,710	3,260,475	55,934,705	3,095,304	81,088,098	4,697,742	62,645,281	3,740,212
Other ..... do....	1,126,032	102,184	269,112	20,542	136,476	14,057	199,483	22,063	1,053,287	107,956
Total ..... do....	53,927,252	3,916,855	57,853,822	3,281,017	56,071,181	3,109,361	81,287,581	4,719,805	63,698,568	3,848,168
Canned ..... do....	76,307,114	7,916,928	57,468,338	5,882,883	66,688,563	6,588,958	64,523,359	6,430,446	15,809,826	1,615,808
Total beef ..... do....	385,030,329	36,847,106	414,901,831	36,005,491	359,246,317	31,836,684	413,865,167	35,460,239	361,159,896	31,831,263
Canned meat, n. e. s.	.....	1,831,940	.....	2,254,235	.....	1,974,693	.....	1,593,497	.....	745,247
Mutton ..... pounds..	6,144,020	532,476	465,255	40,618	640,837	52,503	516,345	51,163	822,998	83,874
Pork—										
Fresh ..... do....	20,966,113	2,035,491	18,633,820	1,669,818	14,946,284	1,291,794	13,444,438	1,261,412	11,467,779	1,143,886
Cured—										
Bacon ..... do....	207,336,000	22,178,525	249,665,941	24,446,752	262,246,635	25,428,961	361,210,563	35,845,793	250,418,699	26,470,972
Hams ..... do....	214,183,365	25,712,633	194,948,864	22,293,867	203,458,724	21,562,204	194,267,949	20,075,511	209,481,496	23,698,207
Salted or pickled ..... do....	95,287,374	9,959,762	112,224,861	9,527,388	118,887,189	9,412,034	141,820,720	11,681,634	166,427,409	15,167,058
Total cured ..... do....	516,806,739	57,850,920	556,839,666	56,268,007	584,592,548	56,403,199	697,299,232	67,602,938	626,327,604	65,336,237
Canned ..... do....	13,590,897	1,369,687	9,479,312	963,321	10,254,239	993,394	12,699,800	1,215,857	2,710,369	287,460
Total pork ..... do....	551,363,749	61,256,098	584,952,798	58,901,146	609,793,071	58,688,387	723,443,470	70,080,207	640,505,752	66,767,583
Sausage and sausage meat, pounds	5,264,648	585,088	5,562,349	602,528	6,061,508	671,241	7,926,786	881,686	8,000,973	925,877
Total meat	.....	101,052,708	.....	97,804,018	.....	93,223,508	.....	108,066,842	.....	100,353,844
Oils—										
Lard oil ..... gallons..	356,658	306,334	376,826	244,499	260,697	154,409	298,103	180,474	234,730	144,063
Oleo oil ..... pounds..	126,010,339	11,981,888	165 183,839	12,873,558	145,228,245	11,485,145	209,658,075	17,455,976	195,337,176	16,819,933
Other ..... gallons..	221,669	159,505	452,481	273,481	377,777	217,596	338,687	224,991	503,234	292,381
Total oils	.....	12,447,727	.....	13,391,538	.....	11,857,150	.....	17,861,441	.....	17,256,377
Oleomargarine (imitation butter) pounds.	7,645,652	798,273	6,137,251	605,874	7,863,164	711,038	11,794,174	1,033,256	5,397,609	520,406
Sausage casings	.....	1,964,524	.....	2,353,167	.....	2,646,868	.....	2,572,479	.....	3,422,271
Tallow ..... pounds.	27,368,924	1,623,852	76,924,174	3,801,302	63,536,992	3,022,173	97,567,156	4,791,025	127,857,739	7,182,688
Other	.....	2,101,785	.....	2,062,813	.....	2,267,359	.....	2,633,986	.....	2,708,632
Total packing-house products	.....	179,412,354	.....	177,441,554	.....	170,308,231	.....	207,673,774	.....	203,456,136
Poultry and game	.....	1,079,056	.....	1,009,304	.....	897,425	.....	1,397,004	.....	1,086,618
Quills	.....	3,976	.....	23,164	.....	1,618	.....	150	.....	.....
Silk waste. (*See* Fibers, animal.)										
Wool. (*See* Fibers, animal.)										
Total animal matter	.....	220,998,208	.....	233,034,209	.....	224,000,796	.....	268,804,107	.....	254,798,329

CONSUMPTION OF MEAT IN MANY COUNTRIES.

The United States by far exceeds all other countries outside of Australasia in per capita meat consumption, and it is followed in order by Cuba, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Denmark, Belgium, and Sweden.

Per capita consumption of meat, by principal countries.

[Expressed in pounds, probably of dressed weight for domestic slaughter unless otherwise stated.]

Country.	This bulletin and other authorities.	Royal Statistical Society, 1902.	Ostertag, for 1890.[a]	Mulhall, published in 1899.
Argentina	.....	.....	.....	140
Austria-Hungary	.....	.....	64	.....
Australian Commonwealth	.....	262.6	246	[b] 208
Belgium	.....	70	.....	.....
Belgium and the Netherlands	.....	.....	69	.....
Canada	.....	.....	.....	129
Cuba	124	.....	.....	.....
Denmark	.....	76	.....	.....
France	[c] 78.9	80	74	75
Germany	.....	99	70	[d] 74 [e] 66
1906	98.7	.....	.....	.....
1905	101.1	.....	.....	.....
1904	108.5	.....	.....	.....
1894 (Lichtenfeld)	88	.....	.....	.....
Great Britain	.....	.....	105	[f] 115
Greece	.....	.....	.....	68
Italy	46.5	.....	23	27
Netherlands	.....	.....	.....	48
New Zealand	.....	212.5	.....	.....
Poland (Russian)	.....	.....	.....	62
Portugal	.....	.....	.....	44

[a] Quoted by Ostertag as the estimate of the "Statistisches Amt" in England for 1890. Handbook of Meat Inspection, p. 3.
[b] Including New Zealand.
[c] Imbart de la Tour.
[d] 1899.
[e] 1883.
[f] 1895.

Per capita consumption of meat, etc.—Continued.

Country.	This bulletin and other authorities.	Royal Statistical Society, 1902.	Ostertag, for 1890.[a]	Mulhall, published in 1899.
Russia	.....	.....	48	[b] 50
Spain	.....	.....	49	.....
Sweden	.....	62	.....	.....
Sweden and Norway	.....	.....	87	74
Switzerland	.....	.....	.....	75
United Kingdom	.....	[d] 121.3	.....	[c] 108 [e] 93
United States:				
Dressed	185.8	[f] 150	120	141
Dressed and extra edible parts	220.5	.....	.....	.....
Edible dressed and extra edible parts	182.6	.....	.....	.....

[a] Quoted by Ostertag as the estimate of the "Statistisches Amt" in England for 1890. Handbook of Meat Inspection, p. 3.
[b] Excluding Poland.
[c] 1895.
[d] 1898–1902.
[e] 1875.
[f] 1885. Stated to be on authority of the United States Department of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 14, 1909.

Hon. F. E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your inquiry by telephone, I take pleasure in giving you the following information:

According to estimates of the Bureau of Statistics of this Department, the number of cattle in the United States on January 1, 1897, was 46,450,135, and the number on January 1, 1909, was 71,099,000.

The Bureau of Animal Industry of this department estimates that there are slaughtered annually in the United States about 13,000,000 adult cattle and 5,500,000 calves, and that consequently those numbers of hides are produced. The American National Live Stock Association estimates that in addition to these there are annually produced

about 1,000,000 "fallen hides;" that is, hides taken from cattle which die or are killed by accident. The total of these estimates gives 19,500,000 as the total annual hide production of the country.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, there were slaughtered by Armour & Co., Swift & Co., Morris & Co., and National Packing Company, under the inspection of the Bureau of Animal Industry, 4,045,357 adult cattle and 1,026,707 calves, making a total of 5,072,064 cattle. During the same period there were slaughtered at all establishments under federal inspection 7,116.275 adult cattle and 1,995,487 calves, a total of 9,111,762. By deducting from these figures the slaughter by the four firms above named it will be seen that the slaughter by all other establishments under federal inspectiin amounted to 3,071,918 adult cattle and 968,780 calves, a total of 4,040,698.

Very respectfully,

M. M. HAYS, *Acting Secretary.*

UNOFFICIAL ESTIMATES—HIDES—PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION, AND SOURCE OF SUPPLY, CENSUS OF 1905, (CALENDAR YEAR 1904).[a]

The consumption of hides by the tanning industry was in number 17,581,013, valued at $89,126,593. On the basis of the estimated average value per pound of the cattle hides produced by the slaughtering and meat-packing establishments—9.66 cents per pound—the quantity consumed by the tanneries is estimated at 922,635,538 pounds.

The production of hides reported by the slaughtering and meat-packing establishments and the wholesale slaughtering establishments was 456,443,857 pounds, valued at $44,206,107. This, however, included calfskins. The production of cattle hides by these establishments, based upon the number slaughtered, is estimated at 447,530,167, pounds, valued at $43,225,601.

The importation of cattle hides for consumption for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, was 83,652,950, valued at $10,815,206, composed of buffalo hides, 7,887,971 pounds, valued at $997,518, and other cattle hides (not including calfskins), 75,764,979 pounds, valued at $9,817,688. This leaves 391,452,421 pounds as the estimated production of the retail slaughtering and butchering establishments, not included in the factory census, and hides from all other sources.

Hides—Consumption and production, census of 1905.

	Pounds.	Per cent.
Cattle hides consumed by tanneries, 1904	922,635,538	100.0
Imports for consumption, year ending June 30, 1904	83,652,950	9.1
Domestic production, 1904	838,982,588	90.9
Slaughtering and meat-packing and wholesale slaughtering establishments	447,530,167	.....
Retail slaughtering establishments and all other sources	391,452,421	.....

UNOFFICIAL ESTIMATES.

At the census of manufactures of 1905 (calendar year 1904) the number of calf and kip skins tanned and finished, as reported by the leather tanneries, was 12,355,765, valued at $23,372,365.

The imports for consumption of calfskins, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, have been as follows:

Year ending June 30—	Pounds.	Value.
1904	34,501,775	$5,862,988.99
1905	50,144,313	9,775,400.02
1906	56,102,594	11,466,027.64
1907	48,991,055	11,163,702.51

An estimate of the number of calves slaughtered in the United States, based upon the number of calfskins tanned, census of 1905, is 8,906,000, and an estimate based upon the statistics for cows and calves on farms and ranges, census of 1900, is nearly 10,000,000; a mean can be taken of approximately 9,400,000.

The deductions are as follows:

Calf and kip skins tanned and finished (1904)	12,355,765
Estimated weight, average of 10 pounds ... pounds	123,557,650
Calfskins, raw or uncured, imported for consumption, year ending June 30, 1904 ... pounds	34,501,775
Domestic supply ... do	89,055,875
Number of calves slaughtered, estimated at 10 pounds per skin	8,905,587
Source of domestic supply:	
Slaughtered in slaughtering and meat-packing, and wholesale slaughtering establishments, census of 1905	1,568,130
Slaughtering on farms and ranges, estimated number, census of 1900, 3,000,000 plus an estimated increase of 15 per cent to 1905	3,550,000
Balance slaughtered by retail slaughtering establishments and butchers	3,887,457
Total	8,905,587
Number of cows and calves on farms and ranges, as reported at the census of 1900:	
Dairy cows, 2 years and over	17,139,674
Other cows, 2 years and over	11,592,142
	28,731,816

[a] Imports, from report of Bureau of Statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor. The Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, year ending June 30, 1904, page 793.

Domestic production from reports of the Bureau of the Census; Bulletin No. 72, Leather Tanned, Curried and Finished; Bulletin 83, Slaughtering and Meat Packing.

Estimated number of calves dropped (allowing approximately 16 per cent for barren cows, etc.)	24,000,000
Calves under 1 year, on farms and ranges	15,333,099
Difference, representing calves slaughtered on farms or ranges or shipped away during the year	8,666,901
Add estimated increase, 1900 to 1905, of 15 per cent	1,300,000
	9,966,901

HISTORY OF THE HIDE DUTY.

Hides were free until 1842, when the Whig tariff made them dutiable at 5 per cent ad valorem. This was continued in the Walker (Democratic) tariff of 1846. The duty was reduced to 4 per cent in 1857 and restored to 5 per cent in the Morrill tariff of 1861; raised to 10 per cent later that year, and so continued until 1872, when hides were placed in the free list. There they remained until 1892, when a duty of 1½ cents a pound was imposed if they were imported from countries which failed to enter into reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States. A duty of 15 per cent was imposed by the Dingley law in 1897, which has remained to this day.

DECISIONS REGARDING HIDES AND SKINS.

Two kinds of dried skins and hides—the one being known as "flint dried," the other as "salt dried." Flint-dried skins or hides are cured by being dried in the sun, being sometimes arsenicated or preserved with the use of arsenic. The dividing line between what is known commercially as a "skin" and a "hide" of this kind of merchandise is 12 pounds. Dry-salted skins and hides, however, are subjected to salt in order to preserve them, and then are exposed to the sun and dried, the skin thus absorbing in its pores a considerable amount of salt, the Treasury decision on this matter stating the quantity of salt thus absorbed to be "no less than about 3 pounds." And the dividing line in trade and commerce, therefore, between what is commercially known as "dried salted skin" and "dried salted hide" is 15 pounds, those weighing 15 pounds or over being known as "hides" and those weighing less than 15 pounds as "skins." (Decision of United States General Appraisers at New York, February 5, 1890.)

"Hides" are separated from "skins" by weight. If more than 12 pounds in weight they are known as "hides;" if less they are known as "skins." (Decision United States circuit court of appeals, second district, February 1, 1906. Before Judges Lacombe, Townsend, and Coxe, circuit judges.)

Hides of American cattle, the growth of the United States, are dutiable as hides of cattle, and not free under paragraph 493, where the cattle had been exported alive, slaughtered in England, and the hides reimported after being salted and disinfected. (Treasury decision 4305, G. A. 4574.)

(Green salted hides under 25 pounds come in as skins, free.)

SOME FACTS ABOUT HIDES.

Since 1897, the year when hides were placed on the dutiable list, the number of cattle in the United States has increased from 46,000,000 to 71,000,000. (Reports of Bureau of Statistics, United States Department of Agriculture).

Hide production in the United States in 1908:	
Cattle hides	13,000,000
Calf hides	5,500,000
Fallen hides (taken from cattle which die or are killed by accident)	1,000,000
Grand total	19,500,000
Cattle and calves slaughtered during the fiscal year 1908 by Armour & Co., Swift & Co., Norris & Co., and National Packing Company (these are the four concerns alleged to constitute the so-called "meat trust"). (Figures are furnished by the Bureau of Animal Industry):	
Cattle	4,045,357
Calves	1,026,707
Total	5,072,064
Estimated number of cattle and calves slaughtered by independent packers, local butchers, and on the farm:	
Cattle	9,000,000
Calves	4,500,000
Total	13,500,000

The total slaughter by independent packers, local butchers, and farmers of 13,500,000 head of cattle and calves is 73 per cent of the grand total slaughter of the United States of 18,500,000 head.

According to Bulletin No. 83 of the Department of Commerce and Labor there are 929 packing establishments in the United States. The so-called "big packers" have 38 slaughtering establishments.

This slaughter by independent establishments, local butchers, etc., is carried on in every State and in nearly every community, and in each of them there is a hide buyer and a market for hides. The tanners and leather people have full opportunity to buy from these independent slaughterers and hide dealers 14,500,000 hides of cattle and calves, which is 74 per cent of the total hide production of this country.

For example, there are slaughtered at Cincinnati, Cleveland, and throughout the State of Ohio approximately 627,000 head of cattle and calves, and the so-called "meat trust" have not a slaughtering establishment in that State. In the State of Indiana there are slaughtered annually approximately 595,000 head of cattle and calves, and no meat trust is interested in the slaughter. In Pennsylvania there are slaughtered about 509,000 head of cattle and calves annually and in New York about 1,928,000.

In 1908, 44 per cent of the cattle received at the Chicago markets were sold out alive and were bought by numerous independent buyers. According to statistics of two bureaus of the Department of Commerce and Labor, namely, Census and Bureau of Statistics, the imported hides bear the relation stated below to the domestic production:

	Pounds.	Per cent.
Cattle hides consumed by tanneries, 1904	922,635,538	100
Average imports, 1898-1908	128,879,885	14
Domestic production	793,755,653	86

For so much of that 14 per cent of imported hides as are manufactured into shoes and other articles for export the manufacturer receives a rebate of 99 per cent of the 15 per cent duty. Therefore for the purposes of his export trade he has, under the Dingley law, practically free trade in hides.

It takes from 1½ to 2 pounds of dry hides to furnish the sole leather for an average pair of shoes—say 2 pounds, for example. The average value per pound of imported dutiable hides during 1907 was 15.3 cents, and the duty per pound would be 2.3 cents, and for 2 pounds 4.6 cents. No one seriously claims that the removal of the present 15 per cent duty on hides would cheapen shoes to the consumer 4.6 cents per pair, or any amount. The difference would be absorbed by the tanner and shoe manufacturer.

The average weight of cattle hide is 6½ to 7½ per cent of the total weight of the live animal, and the per pound value of the hide is double that of the per pound value of the balance of the carcass, making the total value of the hide from 13 to 15 per cent of the gross value of the animal.

Since 1897 the average price of American green hides has fluctuated between 8½ cents and 13½ cents per pound, and the price to-day ranges from 10 to 12½ cents per pound, according to quality. During the same period the foreign hide market has also averaged higher.

Branded hides sell from 1 to 3 cents a pound less than unbranded hides. Purchasers of live cattle pay from 10 to 40 cents a hundred less for branded than for unbranded cattle. There is in all hide markets a distinction made in the quotations of "clear" hides and "branded" hides. These facts show beyond controversy that there is everywhere a recognized distinction between the hide value and the meat value in an animal, and successfully answer the contentions of the tanners and shoe manufacturers, and prove that the raiser of live stock does benefit by the duty on hides (See table inserted prior to this statement, showing difference in prices of branded and unbranded hides.)

The average duty on all dutiable articles under the Dingley law, year by year, from 1898 to 1907, has been as follows (taken from reports of Government):

	Per cent.
1898	48.08
1899	52.07
1900	49.24
1901	49.64
1902	49.78
1903	49.03
1904	48.78
1905	45.24
1906	44.16
1907	42.55

The duty on hides during those years has been 15 per cent ad valorem, which is vastly less than the average protection accorded other dutiable articles.

Argentine hides produce more leather per pound than American hides, and if the duty on hides is reduced, the American tanners will buy Argentine hides in preference to American produce. The United States produces from 85 to 90 per cent of the leather consumed. Free hides would mean an absolute loss of approximately 2 cents per pound on the 793,755,653 pounds of hides produced in this country, or $15,875,113 annually. The value of the cattle in the United States, exclusive of any investments in land, is estimated by the Government at $1,700,000,000, almost five times as much as the total capital invested in the tanneries and the boot, shoe, and other leather manufactures. The live stock and meat industry is the largest single industry in the United States, and upon it depends the prosperity of this country. Is it to be sacrificed for the benefit of a few tanners and leather manufacturers? Are the live-stock raisers and farmers to be punished simply because a few independent tanners can not get all the hides they want on their own terms?

The yearly average duty collected on hides during the last ten years was $2,344,827.95, the average yearly drawback during the same period has been $630,128.05, and the average net revenue collected has been $1,806,701.53. In order to save this amount of revenue, which the Treasury needs, the tanners and boot and shoe men ask the live-stock industry to stand a shrinkage of $15,875,113 per annum.

Number of hides and skins produced, 1900.

Class of animals.	Number of hides and skins.
CATTLE.	
Calves under 1 year	5,831,000
Steers:	
1 and under 2 years	1,687,000
2 and under 3 years	2,336,000
3 years and over	1,966,000
Total steers	5,989,000
Bulls 1 year and over	649,000
Heifers 1 and under 2 years	1,687,000
Cows 2 years and over	4,413,000
Total cattle, except calves	12,738,000
Total cattle	18,569,000
SHEEP.	
Lambs under 1 year	12,665,000
Sheep, except lambs	11,783,000
Total sheep	24,548,000

Consumption of beef hides, 1900.

Item.	Number of hides.
Cattle slaughtered (calves not included)	12,738,000
Imported hides, computed from dry weight, average of 1899–1901	3,130,000
Total	15,868,000
Deduct:	
Domestic exports, hides and skins, all kinds except furs, average of 1899–1901	130,000
Foreign exports (reexports) of "hides and skins" not deducted, partly because the above deduction necessarily includes skins, and also hides other than those of cattle, and partly because the statistics of foreign exports do not separate cattle hides	0
Consumption	15,738,000

Hides—Green, salted, packers'; heavy native steers.

[Price per pound in Chicago on the 1st of each month, 1890 to 1896, and average monthly price, 1897 to 1908. Quotations from the Shoe and Leather Reporter.]

Month.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
January	$0.0925-$0.0950	$0.0950-$0.0975	$0.0975	$0.0900	$0.0675-$0.0700	$0.0800	$0.0850
February	.0900- .0925	.0875- .0900	.0950	.0900	.0650	.0775	.0800
March	.0800- .0813	.0900	.0850	.0875	.0575- .0625	.0750	.0800
April	.0800- .0813	.0888- .0900	.0750	$0.0750- .0800	.0550	.0875	$0.0650- .0675
May	.0800- .0825	.0888- .0900	.0775	.0750	.0550	$0.0925- .0975	.0675- .0700
June	.0800- .0825	.0900	$0.0725- .0750	.0675	.0500- .0513	.1250	.0825- .0850
July	.0875- .0900	.0925	.0800- .0900	.0650	.0500- .0550	.1350	.0850- .0875
August	.1050- .1075	.0975	.0800- .0925	.0600- .0625	.0550- .0600	.1325- .1350	.0700
September	.1075- .1100	.0975- .1000	.0950- .0975	.0600	.0675- .0725	.1200	.0750
October	.1050- .1075	.1025- .1050	.0900	.0750	.0800	.1200	.0875
November	.1000- .1025	.1025	.0900	.0775	.0775	.1000- .1100	.0925
December	.0975- .1000	.1025	.0925	.0725	.0775	.0800	.0975
Yearly average	.0933	.0951	.0870	.0749	.0641	.1028	.0811

Month.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
January	$0.0920	$0.1116	$0.1149	$0.1355	$0.1194	$0.1327	$0.1311	$0.1100	$0.1380	$0.1537	$0.1627	$0.1116
February	.0921	.1130	.1172	.1315	.1165	.1242	.1243	.1075	.1349	.1509	.1620	.1037
March	.0922	.1100	.1160	.1224	.1097	.1206	.1183	.1052	.1300	.1424	.1531	.0944
April	.0888	.1061	.1168	.1223	.1054	.1189	.1130	.1071	.1311	.1433	.1441	.1050
May	.0873	.1168	.1192	.1184	.1119	.1255	.1166	.1094	.1345	.1484	.1437	.1175
June	.0931	.1242	.1194	.1118	.1207	.1285	.1186	.1118	.1342	.1490	.1488	.1325
July	.0995	.1222	.1204	.1045	.1295	.1319	.1168	.1131	.1413	.1502	.1472	.1500
August	.1056	.1176	.1233	.1087	.1258	.1458	.1137	.1186	.1525	.1572	.1411	.1563
September	.1105	.1173	.1281	.1130	.1292	.1491	.1194	.1175	.1519	.1645	.1411	.1575
October	.1117	.1181	.1325	.1162	.1375	.1454	.1134	.1231	.1534	.1633	.1470	.1565
November	.1125	.1111	.1358	.1267	.1400	.1444	.1085	.1369	.1566	.1637	.1364	.1581
December	.1102	.1128	.1382	.1217	.1389	.1382	.1086	.1395	.1577	.1650	.1185	.1600
Yearly average	.0996	.1151	.1235	.1194	.1237	.1338	.1169	.1166	.1430	.1453	.1455	.1336

Imports into the United States of hides and skins (not including goatskins), other than furs, 1898–1908.

[From Statistical Abstract of the United States.]

Year ending June 30—	Cattle hides.			
	Dutiable.		Nondutiable. [a]	
	Pounds.	*Dollars.*	*Pounds.*	*Dollars.*
1898	126,243,595	13,624,989	54,607,534	7,667,342
1899	130,396,020	13,621,946	66,965,785	9,877,771
1900	163,865,165	19,408,217	100,070,795	16,539,807
1901	129,174,624	14,647,413	77,989,617	12,995,567
1902	148,627,907	17,474,039	89,457,680	15,054,400
1903	131,644,325	16,159,902	102,340,303	16,942,982
1904	85,370,168	10,989,035	103,024,752	17,045,304
1905	113,177,357	14,949,628	126,893,934	22,868,797
1906	156,155,300	21,862,060	158,045,419	30,246,198
1907	134,671,020	20,649,258	135,111,199	30,841,989
1908	98,353,249	12,044,435	120,770,918	25,400,575
Averages:				
1898–1903 (expansion)	138,325,273	15,822,751	81,905,286	13,179,645
1904–5 (depression)	99,273,762	12,969,332	114,959,343	19,957,050
1906–7 (expansion)	145,413,160	21,255,659	146,578,309	30,544,094

[a] Includes flint-dried skins (arsenicated) of cattle weighing less than 12 pounds, dry salted skins weighing less than 15 pounds, and green salted hides weighing less than 25 pounds, but does not include goatskins.

Duty, drawback, and net revenue on cattle hides during the years 1898 to 1908, inclusive.

[From Statistical Abstract of the United States.]

Year ending June 30—	Duty paid.	Drawback.	New revenue.
1898	$1,824,269.45	$26,934.75	$1,797,334.70
1899	1,951,918.17	337,013.21	1,614,904.96
1900	2,727,435.99	800,179.14	1,927,256.85
1901	2,230,838.03	760,420.86	1,470,417.17
1902	2,650,420.05	693,823.10	2,010,596.95
1903	2,417,458.84	724,266.21	1,693,192.63
1904	1,621,827.28	631,443.91	990,383.37
1905	2,185,381.53	565,514.99	1,919,866.54
1906	3,284,521.11	683,992.39	2,600,528.72
1907	3,115,390.94	907,386.83	2,208,004.11
1908	1,786,654.14	845,433.24	941,220.90
Total	25,796,115.53	6,931,408.63	19,873,716.90
Yearly average	2,345,101.41	630,128.05	1,806,701.53

International trade in hides and skins.[a]

EXPORTS.

[Substantially the international trade of the world. This table gives the classification as found in the original returns, and the summary statements for "All countries" represent the total for each class only as far as it is disclosed in the original returns.]

[From Agricultural Yearbook, 1907.]

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
			Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Argentina	Jan. 1	Cattle, dried	58,550,351	51,239,825	50,466,002	53,457,674	51,149,435
		Cattle, salted	77,917,955	63,424,770	64,809,273	90,239,588	72,476,948
		Goat	3,025,215	3,113,899	3,961,693	4,205,350	4,164,487
		Horse, dried	4,354,053	2,870,826	2,152,791	2,801,828	680,007
		Horse, salted	4,187,878	4,921,984	4,591,961	1,731,726	3,507,399
		Kid	1,075,505	815,695	1,049,508	971,729	944,222
		Sheep	91,282,374	92,442,005	81,571,014	66,535,492	52,428,116
Austria-Hungary	do	Calf, dried	8,363,895	6,681,327	6,139,211	6,855,933	12,382,700
		Calf, salted	3,299,437	5,505,382	6,623,787	9,100,680	
		Cattle, dried	7,717,941	6,801,038	6,274,354	5,676,240	16,000,926
		Cattle, salted	10,025,959	12,569,873	9,172,109	13,682,766	
		Goat	2,079,840	2,004,442	2,542,591	1,977,987	2,542,150
		Horse, dried	1,802,940	1,313,514	1,033,747	2,297,437	5,281,392
		Horse, salted	869,062	2,162,293	2,495,853	3,808,485	
		Kid	1,362,015	1,431,241	2,120,626	1,836,009	[b] 1,836,009
		Lamb	5,084,079	4,232,874	3,187,442	3,535,111	3,518,356
		Sheep	3,073,243	4,034,017	3,575,676	4,251,393	5,056,962
Belgium	do	Hides and skins	90,233,439	91,087,316	90,367,454	101,081,934	102,400,208
Brazil	do	Deer	339,935	265,401	262,167	176,295	.....
		Goat	3,271,247	4,193,246	5,556,633	3,361,740	3,842,815
		Hides, dried n. e. s.[c]	14,334,210	16,401,080	23,845,672	17,328,272	21,667,230
		Hides, salted, n. e. s.[c]	44,873,097	46,006,347	48,004,782	42,135,260	50,567,124
		Horse	([d])	88,194	245,716	28,936	18,660
		Lamb	33,881	67,298	289,196	5,143	64,218
		Sheep	615,134	598,573	1,042,429	959,755	869,285
		Other	8,426	9,262	28,911	33,113	.....
British India	Apr. 1	Hides and skins	102,390,104	104,922,115	120,635,178	166,161,155	174,292,118
Canada [e]	July 1	do	23,096,000	23,647,000	29,418,000	31,760,000	33,019,183
Cape of Good Hope	Jan. 1	Calf	13,710	69,317	90,391	96,562	.....
		Cattle	2,587,990	1,189,172	2,049,386	2,970,438	2,884,161
		Goat	4,491,204	5,217,449	4,928,951	5,461,295	18,750,766
		Sheep	14,204,556	12,602,310	11,602,058	11,713,890	
		Hides, n. e. s.[c]	13,940	8,545	637	.....	.....
China	do	Hides	39,360,667	32,309,600	37,330,133	51,043,990	56,615,924
Cuba	do	Cattle	3,605,188	2,351,012	2,438,844	4,622,643	6,957,223
		Other	10,453	84,032	52,482	198,299	207,823
Denmark	do	Hides and skins	14,895,515	15,520,748	16,166,351	19,345,629	18,442,353
Dutch East Indies	do	do	13,530,863	13,729,290	13,940,625	14,039,571	[b] 14,039,571
Egypt	Jan. 1	Cattle and calf	4,337,137	4,331,513	6,841,357	4,547,315	5,748,384
		Sheep and goat [f]	681,118	697,529	1,084,797	2,620,849	5,075,462

[a] See "General note," p. 615.
[b] Year preceding.
[c] N. e. s.=not elsewhere specified.
[d] Not separately stated.
[e] Estimated.
[f] Number of pounds computed from stated number of hides or skins.

International trade in hides and skins—Continued.

EXPORTS—continued.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
			Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
France	Jan. 1	Calf	(a)	(a)	21,348,790	17,430,187	23,497,700
		Goat	(a)	(a)	7,613,556	10,333,449	8,400,500
		Kid	1,014,770	1,198,100	875,649	626,944	937,800
		Lamb	903,981	1,146,708	1,096,486	1,446,190	1,325,000
		Large	61,585,683	48,863,350	53,066,971	61,880,962	69,136,300
		Sheep	9,624,639	8,517,409	9,047,394	10,009,143	11,967,300
		Other	27,562,511	27,052,872	3,035,932	7,776,412	6,723,900
Germany [b]	do	Calf, green	10,596,516	9,076,870	8,618,308	10,235,619	15,596,157
		Calf, dried	11,096,965	7,410,396	9,228,989	9,504,125	1,269,421
		Cattle, green	73,594,692	65,404,300	65,279,298	65,859,114	78,564,351
		Cattle, dried	10,400,084	9,406,240	9,416,161	11,561,258	1,870,181
		Goat, with hair on	3,516,593	3,350,364	4,021,451	3,744,110	3,162,310
		Goat, without hair	11,023	12,566	15,432	19,401	36,597
		Horse, green	9,690,416	10,715,124	8,345,156	16,149,958	17,739,050
		Horse, dried	1,488,561	1,711,448	1,782,878	1,629,216	316,804
		Sheep	585,548	811,521	385,147	823,206	137,568
		Other	711,432	607,814	698,865	604,507	610,235
Italy	do	Cattle and calf	20,757,839	24,070,283	23,639,941	19,357,463	25,858,232
		Sheep and goat	4,583,409	4,329,437	4,125,950	4,616,038	4,502,500
		Other	571,658	765,665	695,338	2,737,700	910,729
Korea	do	Cattle	3,981,600	5,525,600	4,755,600	2,273,200	2,209,733
		Skins	3,954,667	5,421,200	4,660,533	5,507,867	[c] 5,507,867
Mexico	July 1	Alligator	343,013	263,545	176,853	131,074	174,093
		Cattle	14,808,550	11,692,993	13,122,915	15,690,473	19,715,538
		Deer	723,398	627,292	583,367	636,765	843,980
		Goat	6,518,637	5,798,853	5,934,593	7,098,634	7,705,458
		Horse	41,213	35,020	28,418	50,243	.....
		Sheep	2,273	2,657	1,466	16,885	27,655
Netherlands	Jan. 1	Hides, dried	20,012,580	20,607,052	23,647,466	22,724,931	24,050,349
		Hides, fresh	271,541	414,482	301,548	236,435	237,965
		Hides, salted	32,387,467	33,893,118	31,865,968	32,383,298	34,507,035
		Sheep	3,227,362	2,309,591	2,708,125	1,664,492	1,322,985
New Zealand	do	Calf [d]	50,152	23,136	29,862	103,286	276,056
		Hides [d]	855,722	1,013,593	1,041,637	1,926,182	2,554,873
		Sheep	13,795,190	15,074,406	12,833,612	12,599,222	14,364,574
Peru	do	Hides and skins	5,324,480	6,009,920	6,717,760	6,954,866	[c] 6,954,866
Russia	do	Hides, large	9,601,743	12,774,759	16,666,202	14,284,165	[e] 31,093,121
		Hides, small	19,764,247	19,949,000	24,406,908	24,540,778	[e] 26,326,231
		Sheep and goats	15,289,329	17,884,900	22,220,675	19,206,232	[e] 35,462,770
Singapore	do	Hides	6,216,267	8,694,400	6,919,733	7,268,133	[c] 7,268,133
Spain	do	Goat	3,158,648	2,628,269	2,014,515	1,748,702	1,017,973
		Sheep	5,714,217	5,210,152	6,305,843	8,383,804	8,042,360
		Other	2,355,431	4,248,659	5,965,921	9,359,902	12,536,488
Sweden	do	Hides and skins	11,427,951	13,025,348	12,647,729	15,709,468	16,247,694
Switzerland	do	Hides	12,836,632	12,201,260	11,750,194	12,095,438	13,414,023
		Skins	4,976,493	5,041,530	5,544,404	6,062,490	5,744,584
United Kingdom	Jan. 1	Hides	21,075,264	17,451,168	21,128,464	29,427,328	31,359,776
		Skins [e]	32,681,620	44,795,145	49,864,593	46,964,937	37,835,419
United States	July 1	Hides and skins	12,859,549	32,727,643	10,268,722	10,752,827	15,396,806
Uruguay	do	Calf	2,083,720	2,967,990	2,074,655	1,795,344	[c] 1,795,344
		Cattle, dried	22,575,437	15,019,462	13,852,273	14,056,903	[c] 14,056,903
		Cattle, salted [e]	33,994,970	35,823,436	41,159,472	30,875,494	[c] 30,875,494
		Goat	1,277	1,414	9,539	34	[c] 34
		Horse, dried [e]	483,696	397,568	1,607,872	515,104	[c] 515,104
		Horse, salted [e]	1,946,505	1,751,352	504,196	124,608	[c] 124,608
		Lamb	358,738	608,383	406,598	346,719	[c] 346,719
		Sheep	14,670,201	19,397,852	16,033,901	14,990,823	[c] 14,990,823
Venezuela	do	Cattle	4,346,829	8,366,624	[f] 6,356,726	7,929,730	[c] 7,929,730
		Deer	100,654	.....	.....	349,459	[c] 349,459
		Goat	1,412,091	1,650,675	[f] 1,531,383	1,479,815	[c] 1,479,815
		Sheep	28,997	.....	.....	.....	.....
Other countries		Hides:					
		Cattle	16,437,548	17,486,222	12,706,880	46,832,873	[e] 46,343,144
		Horse	33,486	80,026	348,784	471,232	[e] 384,143
		Large (not otherwise classified)	1,611,336	3,148,588	6,198,614	303,172	[e] 245,841
		Small (not otherwise classified)	501,523	1,352,037	1,915,667	.....	.....
		Unclassified	14,424,497	14,085,945	8,906,979	14,384,816	[e] 20,335,396
		Skins:					
		Calf	2,392,438	1,799,084	2,183,255	2,435,640	[e] 2,448,174
		Deer	1,745,289	1,303,750	1,372,926	859,467	.....
		Goat	3,948,484	6,536,130	4,427,066	8,010,735	[e] 4,897,210
		Kid	66,932	21,786	40,836	1,040,412	[e] 1,634,845
		Sheep	3,173,604	3,313,301	2,942,913	11,014,904	[e] 12,771,969
		Sheep and goat, mixed	7,500,393	6,048,093	8,084,693	19,280,233	[e] 17,082,052
		Unclassified	147,072	73,145	66,311	5,805,481	[e] 1,381,611
		Hides and skins, unclassified	5,471,773	6,441,858	5,393,110	8,597,283	[e] 7,849,669
Total			1,313,009,102	1,318,431,233	1,342,565,755	1,516,304,852	1,570,003,744
RECAPITULATION.							
All countries		Hides:					
		Cattle	340,545,094	306,300,567	301,859,293	365,728,394	351,033,767
		Cattle and calf, mixed	25,094,976	28,401,796	30,481,298	23,904,778	31,606,616
		Horse	24,897,810	26,047,349	23,137,372	29,608,773	28,567,167
		Large (not otherwise classified)	72,798,762	64,786,697	75,931,787	76,468,299	100,475,262
		Small (not otherwise classified)	20,265,770	21,301,037	26,322,575	24,540,778	26,326,231
		Unclassified	206,661,884	203,086,590	214,743,213	230,954,083	261,949,137
		Skins:					
		Alligator	343,013	263,545	176,853	131,074	147,093
		Calf	37,896,833	33,533,502	56,337,248	57,557,376	57,265,552
		Deer	2,909,276	2,196,443	2,218,460	2,021,986	1,193,439
		Goat	31,434,259	34,507,307	42,557,403	47,441,252	37,249,349
		Kid	3,519,222	3,466,822	3,210,970	4,475,094	5,352,876
		Lamb	6,380,679	6,055,263	5,855,371	5,333,163	5,254,293
		Sheep	159,997,338	164,313,794	148,049,578	142,963,009	121,979,597
		Sheep and goat, mixed	28,054,249	28,959,959	35,516,115	45,723,352	80,873,550
		Unclassified	41,759,852	55,331,020	60,135,841	64,340,775	50,469,481
		Hides and skins, unclassified	310,450,085	339,879,542	316,032,378	395,112,666	410,260,334
Total			1,313,009,102	1,318,431,233	1,342,565,755	1,516,304,852	1,570,003,744

[a] Not separately stated.
[b] Not including free ports prior to March 1, 1906.
[c] Year preceding.
[d] Estimated.
[e] Number of pounds computed from stated number of hides or skins.
[f] Average, 1902 and 1903.

International trade in hides and skins—Continued.

IMPORTS.

Country.	Year beginning—	Kind of hides and skins.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
			Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Austria-Hungary	Jan. 1	Calf, dried	942,035	1,245,171	1,496,718	1,056,896	3,415,400
		Calf, green	1,066,155	1,716,078	1,449,759	994,505	
		Cattle, dried	22,938,651	22,300,192	29,398,855	25,180,311	75,516,461
		Cattle, green	18,459,961	18,503,392	27,347,454	17,540,414	
		Goat	1,027,354	1,100,547	1,588,430	1,410,076	1,243,407
		Horse, dried	679,685	583,784	560,856	360,676	992,521
		Horse, green	75,178	125,223	153,662	224,871	
		Kid	776,688	844,591	1,046,093	723,557	[a] 723,557
		Lamb	9,869,872	9,627,600	10,328,434	8,602,435	10,548,675
		Sheep	5,477,163	5,391,403	5,041,309	5,061,592	6,856,374
Belgium	do	Hides, raw	115,127,382	128,694,622	122,539,211	135,911,437	142,197,407
British India	Apr. 1	Hides and skins	10,407,488	12,729,808	12,456,304	17,574,316	17,962,909
Denmark	Jan. 1	Do	8,013,801	5,766,189	6,962,196	7,848,454	10,294,482
Finland	do	Hides, dried	714,805	1,560,180	1,869,515	1,898,433	2,631,124
		Hides, green	3,789,873	5,907,507	5,780,115	4,263,421	5,529,891
		Sheep	23,420	45,380	89,521	55,061	68,050
France	do	Calf	([b])	([b])	7,090,953	7,980,756	9,035,400
		Goat	([b])	([b])	17,899,172	23,110,243	23,276,400
		Kid	5,300,740	4,714,701	4,372,843	4,544,123	4,935,700
		Lamb	212,442	441,758	370,533	378,553	374,600
		Large	80,509,184	89,049,162	85,214,688	98,515,340	106,831,100
		Sheep	3,848,128	3,032,612	2,630,226	2,532,200	3,201,300
		Other	28,625,723	28,990,427	2,063,720	3,209,189	1,674,900
Germany [c]	do	Calf, dried	23,886,198	18,793,521	21,104,405	22,145,869	18,811,819
		Calf, green	16,023,193	22,039,386	24,738,945	32,244,140	38,531,942
		Cattle, dried	46,048,822	60,664,363	63,954,541	70,228,234	77,797,583
		Cattle, green	122,198,450	146,242,719	152,057,850	143,851,586	177,694,958
		Goat, with hair on	8,591,191	9,266,908	11,272,453	11,042,952	14,541,907
		Goat, without hair	153,001	25,794	61,068	38,140	1,543
		Horse, dried	3,721,181	4,427,101	4,666,964	4,592,889	6,688,823
		Horse, green	28,144,866	30,128,805	27,629,866	25,891,742	30,573,918
		Sheep	562,840	737,005	1,126,562	746,485	882,510
		Other	2,207,268	3,032,017	3,515,711	3,340,443	2,157,002
Greece	do	Hides	5,565,407	5,674,975	7,004,659	6,055,809	5,286,284
Italy	do	Cattle and calf	33,054,118	32,555,653	42,876,591	39,240,949	44,294,383
		Sheep and goat	9,236,484	9,197,903	9,[illegible],520	8,740,884	11,596,532
		Other	287,703	136,687	89,287	181,881	277,782
Japan	do	Cattle	4,395,787	4,516,054	9,871,720	7,402,046	5,450,564
		Deer	353,188	437,982	373,908	426,217	700,708
Netherlands	do	Hides, dried	26,123,959	28,746,002	28,190,550	29,700,509	30,643,584
		Hides, fresh	14,218	3,486	1,080	15,141	5,404
		Hides, salted	21,767,787	24,734,682	25,207,165	21,586,003	27,913,694
		Sheep	2,578,768	1,631,356	2,084,239	2,367,808	2,094,329
Norway	do	Hides and skins	5,880,102	5,555,934	6,890,458	8,722,279	10,507,626
Portugal	do	Hides, dried	6,659,709	6,188,733	5,829,003	4,216,487	[a] 4,216,487
		Hides, green	1,455,366	507,616	243,906	181,630	[a] 181,630
		Hides, n. e. s.	2,222	990	825	414	[a] 414
Roumania	do	Buffalo	422,935	160,214	39,361	83,987	[a] 83,987
		Calf	29,674	65,731	13,406	13,728	[a] 13,728
		Cattle	5,045,606	3,468,799	2,444,346	2,252,952	[a] 2,252,952
		Horse	2,491	8,014	22	3,490	[a] 3,490
		Sheep, lamb, and goat	722,428	610,125	400,000	157,536	[a] 157,536
		Other	820,025	158,376	163,773	132,822	[a] 132,822
Russia	do	Hides, dry	12,831,961	12,279,363	10,412,368	12,668,515	[d] 7,764,252
		Hides, green	52,627,183	55,754,913	48,126,842	51,753,326	[d] 45,538,241
Singapore	do	Hides	10,275,333	10,258,000	10,554,133	8,191,200	[a] 8,191,200
Spain	do	Hides and skins	25,794,130	22,716,150	17,857,559	14,247,484	17,280,965
Sweden	do	do	15,676,710	15,172,306	19,782,796	18,939,762	21,290,081
United Kingdom	do	Goat [e]	3,546,428	3,557,151	5,517,464	3,756,596	9,329,915
		Hides	73,656,912	62,491,856	61,636,848	60,628,848	70,661,696
		Sheep [e]	44,636,946	44,909,414	34,490,368	34,694,106	42,124,265
		Other	1,054,534	3,124,408	1,386,550	377,900	782,536
United States	July 1	Cattle	131,640,325	85,370,168	113,177,357	156,155,300	134,671,020
		Goat	85,114,070	86,338,547	97,803,571	111,079,391	101,201,596
		Other	102,340,303	103,024,752	126,893,934	158,045,419	135,111,199
Other countries		Hides:					
		Cattle	5,100,292	5,441,221	7,289,141	7,143,387	[d] 3,467,039
		Large (not otherwise classified)	412,785	438,504	1,054,916	328,180	[d] 5,190
		Small (not otherwise classified)	1,499	7,011	17,289	9,368,570	[d] 14,679,557
		Unclassified	5,590,463	8,100,685	4,932,465		
		Skins:					
		Calf	135,079	13,933	153,261	128,604	.....
		Deer	5,670	9,886	21,014	.....	.....
		Goat	142,253	423,808	452,838	665,581	[d] 127,892
		Sheep	397,783	1,533,850	1,534,647	741,964	[d] 646,355
		Sheep and goat, mixed	25,854	22,447	10,416	3,849	[d] 61,619
		Unclassified	1,249,139	1,348,347	1,277,800	2,003,073	[d] 1,850,918
		Hides and skins, unclassified	2,365,315	3,330,259	1,321,133	839,318	[d] 903,410
Total			1,268,461,682	1,287,754,237	1,365,305,461	1,466,343,284	1,556,494,545
RECAPITULATION.							
All countries		Hides:					
		Buffalo	422,935	160,214	39,361	83,987	[a] 83,987
		Cattle	355,827,894	346,506,908	405,541,264	429,754,230	476,850,577
		Cattle and calf, mixed	33,054,118	32,555,653	42,876,591	39,240,949	44,294,383
		Horse	32,623,401	35,272,927	33,011,370	31,073,068	38,258,752
		Large (not otherwise classified)	80,921,969	89,487,666	86,269,604	98,843,520	106,836,290
		Small (not otherwise classified)	1,499	7,011	17,289	346,439,743	365,440,865
		Unclassified	336,202,580	350,903,610	332,328,685		
		Skins:					
		Calf	42,082,334	43,873,820	56,047,447	64,564,498	69,808,289
		Deer	353,188	437,982	373,908	426,217	700,708
		Goat	98,574,297	100,712,755	134,594,996	151,102,979	149,722,660
		Kid	6,077,428	5,559,292	5,418,936	5,267,680	5,659,257
		Lamb	10,082,314	10,069,358	10,698,967	8,980,988	10,923,275
		Sheep	57,525,048	57,281,020	46,996,872	46,200,216	55,873,183
		Sheep and goat, mixed	9,984,766	9,830,475	10,407,936	8,902,269	11,815,687
		Unclassified	1,249,139	1,348,347	1,277,800	2,003,073	1,850,918
		Hides and skins, unclassified	203,473,102	203,737,313	199,383,421	233,459,267	218,375,714
Total			1,268,461,682	1,287,754,237	1,365,305,461	1,466,343,284	1,556,494,545

[a] Year preceding.
[b] Not separately stated.
[c] Not including free ports prior to March 1, 1906.
[d] Preliminary.
[e] Number of pounds computed from stated number of hides or skins.

Leather—tanned, curried, and finished.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY, WITH PER CENT OF INCREASE, 1850 TO 1905.

	Census.							Per cent of increase.					
	1905.[a]	1900.	1890.	1880.	1870.	1860.	1850.	1900 to 1905.	1890 to 1900.	1880 to 1890.	1870 to 1880.	1860 to 1870.	1850 to 1860.
Number of establishments	1,049	1,306	1,787	5,628	7,569	5,188	6,686	[b]19.7	[b]26.9	[b]68.2	[b]25.6	45.9	[b]22.4
Capital	$242,584,254	$173,977,421	$98,088,698	$73,383,911	$61,124,812	$39,025,620	$22,774,795	39.4	77.4	33.7	20.1	56.6	71.4
Salaried officials, clerks, etc., number	3,251	2,442	[c]2,635	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)	33.1	[b]7.3	.....	.....	.....	.....
Salaries	$4,451,906	$3,158,842	[c]$2,735,890	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)	40.9	15.5	.....	.....	.....	.....
Wage-earners, average number	57,239	52,109	42,392	40,282	35,243	26,246	25,595	9.8	22.9	5.2	14.3	34.3	2.5
Total wages	$27,049,152	$22,591,091	$21,249,989	$16,503,828	$14,505,775	$8,175,508	$6,541,678	19.7	6.3	28.8	13.8	77.4	25.0
Men 16 years and over	54,517	50,402	41,733	39,081	34,423	25,858	25,129	8.2	20.8	6.8	13.5	33.1	2.9
Wages	$26,321,552	$22,140,234	$21,094,335	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)	18.9	5.0	.....	.....	.....	.....
Women 16 years and over	1,814	1,173	264	475	353	388	466	54.6	344.3	[b]44.4	34.6	[b]9.0	[b]16.7
Wages	$525,031	$339,167	$82,699	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)	54.8	310.1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Children under 16 years	908	534	395	726	467	(d)	(d)	70.0	35.2	[b]45.6	55.5	.....	.....
Wages	$202,569	$111,690	$72,955	(d)	(d)	(d)	(d)	81.4	53.1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Miscellaneous expenses	$12,498,501	$7,023,416	$5,397,672	(e)	(e)	(e)	(e)	78.0	30.1	.....	.....	.....	.....
Cost of materials used	$191,179,073	$155,000,004	$122,946,721	$156,384,117	$118,569,634	$49,812,659	$26,429,881	23.3	26.1	[b]21.4	31.9	138.0	88.5
Value of products, including custom work	$252,620,986	$204,038,127	$172,136,092	$200,264,944	$157,237,597	$75,698,747	$43,457,898	23.8	18.5	[b]14.0	27.4	107.7	74.2

[a] Exclusive of the statistics of 12 establishments engaged primarily in the manufacture of other products. These establishments made leather to the value of $154,932.
[b] Decrease.
[c] Includes proprietors and firm members, with their salaries; number only reported in 1900 and 1905, but not included in this table.
[d] Not reported separately.
[e] Not reported.

Capital, with per cent each item is of total, 1905 and 1900.

	1905.		1900.	
	Amount.	Per cent of total.	Amount.	Per cent of total.
Land	$9,842,911	4.0	$14,179,485	8.2
Buildings	35,684,642	14.7	20,785,412	11.9
Machinery, tools, and implements	32,889,457	13.6	15,022,239	8.6
Cash and sundries	164,167,244	67.7	123,990,285	71.3
Total	242,584,254	100.0	173,977,421	100.0

Sole-leather exports.

[From Statistical Abstract of the United States.]

Year.	Pounds.	Dollars.
1884	22,421,293	4,613,106
1885	27,313,766	5,416,830
1886	24,265,880	4,825,615
1887	30,530,488	5,695,151
1888	28,712,673	4,959,363
1889	35,558,945	5,890,509
1890	39,595,219	6,420,134
1891	37,501,278	6,168,362
1892	37,053,381	5,783,555
1893	33,570,037	5,192,063
1894	42,877,497	6,481,257
1895	45,364,349	6,919,372
1896	41,818,503	7,474,021
1897	38,384,314	6,510,404
1898	37,813,019	6,644,553
1899	37,120,912	6,280,904
1900	34,060,296	6,433,303
1901	35,180,266	6,577,732
1902	36,454,284	6,569,857
1903	37,428,437	6,920,467
1904	36,830,717	6,978,497
1905	44,107,054	9,444,873
1906	40,548,767	8,186,279
1907	31,900,868	7,024,313
1908	31,189,897	6,593,950

In the House debate a free-hide advocate, for the purpose of making it appear that there had been a great falling off in exports of sole leather under the Dingley law, quoted the figures in the above table for the years 1895–1908, inclusive. He started in with the year of greatest volume of exports. Reading the table from 1895 back to 1884, it will be seen that the period of protected hides has the advantage in the comparison with the period of free trade in hides. The duty on hides became effective in July, 1897. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 357, Mar. 31, 1909).

Leather and manufactures of.

SOLE LEATHER.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe:	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Austria-Hungary	75,849	41,508	61,064	88,480	34,755
Belgium	723,331	857,533	1,568,116	1,476,465	1,006,483
Denmark	201,048	467,089	278,047	68,547	12,660
France	.....	.....	30,601	33,070	1,800

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

SOLE LEATHER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe—Continued.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Germany	10,375	41,931	23,341	131,845	165,430
Greece	5,186	.....	10,171	5,908	.....
Italy	86,694	83,554	51,356	27,862	10,768
Netherlands	206,584	169,156	35,236	131,457	99,290
Norway	1,307,985	763,553	764,029	805,299	370,865
Portugal	.....	100	.....	.....	.....
Russia in Europe	8,213	.....	.....	9,890	.....
Spain	.....	.....	.....	.....	21,250
Sweden	111,447	77,091	143,806	310,919	56,936
Switzerland	6,830	.....	.....	16,721	.....
Turkey in Europe	133,691	89,933	231,583	200,953	128,363
United Kingdom	30,630,314	24,090,449	31,629,136	24,696,636	25,633,544
North America:					
Bermuda	3,829	2,626	3,532	1,666	2,345
British Honduras	1,041	1,820	2,673	2,080	874
Canada	74,655	151,434	160,782	155,475	149,305
Newfoundland and Labrador	444,842	461,709	559,705	636,584	592,623
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	300	.....	5,800	.....	.....
Guatemala	3,494	11,786	2,080	46	167
Honduras	796	640	.....	67	400
Nicaragua	921	1,370	.....	6,051	2,609
Panama	206	1,286	681	.....	1,643
Salvador	31,532	23,373	794	1,545	5,117
Mexico	80,103	11,691	3,027	3,491	3,937
West Indies—					
British	12,432	5,562	5,645	2,520	3,348
Cuba	3,405	15,941	720	24,404	20,343
Danish	3,161	4,901	5,216	4,254	9,040
Dutch	172	.....	.....	130	98
French	.....	.....	.....	.....	83
Haiti	3,991	.....	600	.....	.....
Santo Domingo	1,163	.....	.....	.....	.....
South America:					
Brazil	1,275	.....	.....	.....	.....
Colombia	7,782	324	129	.....	195
Guiana—					
British	1,323	1,578	836	1,079	556
Dutch	142	.....	.....	.....	.....
Peru	1,119	962	.....	1,000	1,110
Uruguay	.....	370	250	.....	.....
Venezuela	5,031	595	.....	476	49
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	116,233	210,915	28,994	84,051	58,436
China—Russian	36,325	.....	.....	.....	.....
East Indies—					
British India	1,517	202	.....	21,699	.....
Dutch	.....	34,992	.....	.....	.....
French	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,775
Hongkong	3,152	2,215	963	1,722	10,143
Japan	2,141,722	16,029,446	4,637,071	2,638,502	2,599,158
Korea	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,790
Russia—Asiatic	135	40	36,025	20,299	25,977
Siam	.....	375	.....	.....	.....
Turkey in Asia	12,348	12,272	.....	1,968	.....
All other Asia	1,076	.....	.....	.....	.....
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	120,298	101,970	56,441	61,174	13,392
New Zealand				19,076	19,420
French Oceania	2,206	1,708	446	375	726
Philippine Islands	11,551	36,039	15,468	22,328	47,229

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

SOLE LEATHER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Africa:					
British Africa—	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
South	191,459	296,405	193,182	184,054	73,845
Portuguese Africa	280	560	110		
Turkey in Africa—					
Egypt	2,153	50	1,111	700	
Total	36,830,717	44,107,054	40,548,767	31,900,868	31,189,897
RECAPITULATION.					
Europe	33,507,547	26,681,897	34,826,486	28,004,052	27,542,144
North America	666,043	694,139	751,255	838,313	791,952
South America	16,672	3,829	1,215	2,555	1,910
Asia	2,312,508	16,290,457	4,703,053	2,768,241	2,699,279
Oceania	134,055	139,717	72,355	102,953	80,767
Africa	193,892	297,015	194,403	184,754	73,845
Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$14,376	$8,060	$12,116	$19,366	$7,071
Belgium	145,451	175,904	316,903	340,205	244,694
Denmark	41,452	93,857	57,111	316,561	3,314
France			5,679	6,944	450
Germany	2,145	8,506	4,834	29,012	38,087
Greece	1,017		1,951	1,182	
Italy	16,857	16,372	10,131	6,101	3,642
Netherlands	40,412	32,779	7,512	31,273	23,300
Norway	264,188	154,987	158,480	174,657	82,017
Portugal		24			
Russia in Europe	1,432			2,017	
Spain					4,260
Sweden	21,946	14,055	29,857	69,041	12,569
Switzerland	1,395			4,419	
Turkey in Europe	24,531	16,835	45,222	40,285	25,104
United Kingdom	5,611,423	4,449,410	5,956,092	5,163,448	5,159,280
North America:					
Bermuda	989	705	965	420	618
British Honduras	194	378	537	405	188
Canada	16,980	33,301	46,408	47,315	42,570
Newfoundland and Labrador	80,157	84,218	107,348	125,911	114,882
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	65		1,092		
Guatemala	1,185	3,390	392	9	35
Honduras	155	194		16	84
Nicaragua	290	415		1,335	724
Panama	55	408	280		528
Salvador	9,539	6,947	200	455	1,632
Mexico	19,097	3,049	789	983	1,216
West Indies—					
British	2,768	1,214	1,369	711	908
Cuba	649	3,066	145	7,392	6,971
Danish	672	1,136	1,176	1,000	2,151
Dutch	41			44	24
French					19
Haiti	757		150		
Santo Domingo	284				
South America:					
Brazil	273				
Colombia	1,617	95	41		58
Guiana—					
British	281	295	179	260	135
Dutch	47				
Peru	335	259		231	266
Uruguay		86	50		
Venezuela	960	156		138	15
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	34,744	69,652	9,829	23,357	16,467
China—Russian	9,138				
East Indies—					
British India	423	70		4,166	
Dutch		8,218			
French					506
Hongkong	910	709	300	508	2,531
Japan	524,267	4,146,428	1,333,130	828,202	746,641
Korea					1,071
Russia—Asiatic	45	11	9,837	6,197	7,201
Siam		105			
Turkey in Asia	2,273	2,114		403	
All other Asia	195				
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	34,509	30,608	18,020	17,870	4,173
New Zealand				4,702	5,748
French Oceania	701	570	163	117	239
Philippine Islands	3,332	10,267	4,978	7,046	15,270
Africa:					
British Africa—					
South	43,493	65,888	42,738	40,449	17,291
Portuguese Africa	57	120	25		
Turkey in Africa—					
Egypt	395	12	250	160	
Total	6,978,497	9,444,873	8,186,279	7,024,313	6,593,950
RECAPITULATION.					
Europe	6,186,625	4,970,789	6,665,888	5,904,511	5,603,788
North America	133,877	138,421	160,851	185,996	172,550
South America	3,513	891	270	629	474
Asia	571,995	4,227,307	1,353,096	862,833	774,417
Oceania	38,542	41,445	23,161	29,735	25,430
Africa	43,945	66,020	43,013	40,609	17,291

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

UPPER LEATHER—KID, GLAZED.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$2,675	$10,439	$3,095	$119,151	$17,258
Belgium	74,902	44,592	50,930	43,757	24,203
Denmark	3,758	4,747	15,632	158,839	57,852
France	88,374	57,209	6,328	170,769	60,618
Germany	75,563	85,591	72,697	800,613	217,164
Greece	691			1,100	5,230
Italy	255	4,981	2,460	45,839	7,836
Netherlands	141,210	169,182	248,864	546,978	342,542
Norway	1,141	78		4,999	6,186
Portugal	178	117			
Roumania				738	
Russia in Europe		375		4,847	28,182
Spain	46,231	67,063	67,428	83,503	69,758
Sweden	11,645	22,695	17,296	17,629	15,827
Switzerland		679			1,190
Turkey in Europe	3,526	473	279	3,681	2,760
United Kingdom	919,920	981,150	1,283,379	2,113,685	1,686,615
North America:					
Bermuda		87			43
Canada	1,925	37,154	79,358	54,827	49,776
Newfoundland and Labrador		2,622	8,677	9,011	15,831
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	2,690	3,943	606	884	474
Guatemala			198	3,986	4,520
Nicaragua	2,053	1,848	226	1,623	2,575
Panama		144	460		993
Salvador		355		1,440	14
Mexico	3,987	1,679	3,270	22,248	17,023
West Indies—					
British	1,057	2,227	1,155	483	374
Cuba	1,518	5,406	6,284	23,585	14,186
Danish					36
Dutch	135		90		
Haiti	38	363	175	188	805
Santo Domingo				223	267
South America:					
Argentina	1,352	1,707	770	7,789	6,864
Brazil	3,974	7,127	2,606	15,375	12,879
Chile	3,375	2,427	6,089	40,985	22,770
Colombia	277	431	10,881	6,222	2,724
Ecuador					1,250
Guiana—British	11			291	165
Peru	278	1,030	813	3,187	838
Uruguay	4,972	349		6,083	20,459
Venezuela	248	429	2,245	1,234	488
Asia:					
Chinese Empire		345			
East Indies—					
British India	120				
Dutch	220				
Japan		453		3,413	846
Turkey in Asia	180				202
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	113,370	55,546	27,875	39,761	156,156
New Zealand				10,326	21,932
Philippine Islands				295	
Africa:					
British Africa—					
South			2,264		
Turkey in Africa—Egypt	330	1,161			258
Total	1,512,179	1,576,204	1,922,430	4,369,587	2,897,969
RECAPITULATION.					
Europe	1,370,069	1,449,371	1,768,388	4,116,128	2,543,221
North America	13,403	55,828	100,499	118,498	106,917
South America	14,487	13,500	23,404	81,166	68,437
Asia	520	798		3,413	1,048
Oceania	113,370	55,546	27,875	50,382	178,088
Africa	330	1,161	2,264		258

PATENT OR ENAMELED.

Europe:					
Austria-Hungary		$294	$100	$140	
Belgium	$49,235				
Denmark	20	1,035	1,128	905	$450
France	1,211	300	915		4,987
Germany	809		390	652	1,882
Italy	4,647	4,323	7,363	11,089	11,201
Netherlands	17,315	12,870	15,396	8,667	7,384
Norway	92				299
Russia in Europe	250			150	
Spain	5,544	14,383	80	934	10,180
Sweden			329		130
Turkey in Europe	3,700				300
United Kingdom	50,977	60,598	15,453	18,379	5,909
North America:					
Bermuda	150		26	50	54
Canada	13,223	31,194	41,411	53,501	39,223
Newfoundland and Labrador	141			151	102
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	68			59	
Honduras		14			
Mexico	1,812	1,602	630	299	3,594

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

PATENT OR ENAMELED—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
North America—Con.					
West Indies—					
British	$535	$208	$1,243		$186
Cuba	1,090	6,030	12,644	$15,189	6,382
French	119		270		
Haiti	63		201		105
Santo Domingo			17		368
South America:					
Argentina				978	1,440
Brazil	1,800		221		800
Chile			1,777	2,897	2,923
Colombia			14,941	206	213
Guiana—					
British				294	
Dutch				291	
Peru	626	1,321	265	1,035	271
Uruguay		213			
Venezuela	1,141	2,334		138	143
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	215	70	410	215	
East Indies—British India	749	225	465	520	338
Japan	2,713	2,110	1,210	170	765
Turkey in Asia	359	705	751		
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	9,402	17,802	18,879	21,718	23,783
New Zealand				1,782	2,945
Philippine Islands		884	539		608
Africa:					
British Africa—South		1,780	3,756	2,014	1,864
Turkey in Africa—Egypt	2,904	6,025	2,780	14,665	2,345
Total	170,940	166,320	143,590	157,088	131,154
RECAPITULATION.					
Europe	133,830	93,803	41,154	40,916	42,702
North America	17,201	39,048	56,442	69,249	50,014
South America	3,567	3,868	17,206	5,839	5,790
Asia	4,036	3,110	2,836	905	1,103
Oceania	9,402	18,686	19,418	23,500	27,336
Africa	2,904	7,805	6,536	16,679	4,209

SPLITS, BUFF, GRAIN, AND ALL OTHER UPPER.

Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$32,428	$58,954	$108,280	$147,706	$139,117
Azores, and Madeira Island	360	877	1,058	2,905	2,100
Belgium	639,722	500,589	507,060	570,513	424,316
Denmark	183,319	253,701	367,927	599,658	406,371
France	435,458	486,280	1,323,190	1,268,305	727,926
Germany	719,118	994,494	1,539,733	1,595,919	945,521
Gibraltar				2,563	
Greece	2,039	1,164	4,389		3,700
Italy	66,377	58,253	165,032	220,688	64,432
Malta, Gozo, etc	671				200
Netherlands	1,133,402	950,135	940,764	1,189,143	618,281
Norway	6,792	9,181	1,773	7,146	9,310
Portugal	3,876	5,350	1,754	741	384
Roumania	1,724	3,232	830	1,636	
Russia in Europe	2,472	1,783	1,460	3,556	64,517
Spain	129,837	162,038	174,331	122,351	170,224
Sweden	68,607	70,903	42,805	68,168	49,824
Switzerland	15,977	6,415	8,923	21,678	8,402
Turkey in Europe	42,181	45,544	24,888	33,652	13,151
United Kingdom	9,785,782	9,535,252	9,355,322	9,652,816	9,429,241
North America:					
Bermuda	868	603	939	255	242
British Honduras		475			42
Canada	161,549	237,619	309,716	256,776	196,153
Newfoundland and Labrador	5,193	3,658	9,047	6,895	7,842
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	29,504	43,488	63,322	75,235	76,324
Guatemala	34,534	38,651	48,087	47,089	48,515
Honduras	806	1,227	1,357	2,880	5,435
Nicaragua	17,946	17,521	28,039	30,972	43,135
Panama	3,612	5,442	2,412	6,774	5,729
Salvador	13,978	30,084	41,640	62,126	96,837
Mexico	26,936	36,807	39,171	30,986	37,045
Miquelon, Langley, etc	164	90	111	64	
West Indies—					
British	14,845	16,342	12,443	4,153	7,835
Cuba	143,731	205,191	211,515	126,334	137,936
Danish	2,020	1,559	2,131	1,988	1,307
Dutch	2,441	3,317	2,492	991	1,574
French	1,314	332	897	905	123
Haiti	26,929	24,291	40,129	46,042	35,978
Santo Domingo	6,846	16,221	18,669	23,242	22,314
South America:					
Argentina	112,350	241,767	322,386	229,076	310,864
Bolivia			443	1,120	5,298
Brazil	110,225	96,489	155,974	137,079	155,095

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

SPLITS, BUFF, GRAIN, AND ALL OTHER UPPER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
South America—Con.					
Chile	$32,732	$35,238	$46,877	$47,651	$49,297
Colombia	39,910	22,902	41,954	32,080	65,460
Ecuador	10,404	12,225	11,064	31,084	31,787
Guiana—					
British	1,494	999	1,288	1,711	2,671
Dutch	404	183	1,013	731	686
French					50
Paraguay	19,824	17,555	23,286		
Peru				35,520	41,517
Uruguay	10,521	25,506	68,814	68,838	33,048
Venezuela	54,531	40,424	45,968	18,798	49,573
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	4,429	22,500	59,490	70,637	11,626
East Indies—					
British India	9,749	7,631	3,756	4,405	7,888
Straits Settlements	3,153	2,049	1,251	150	2,119
Other British			200		
Dutch	1,828	1,706	6,127	1,514	245
Hongkong	388	100	1,081	5,386	6,009
Japan	53,699	210,188	469,498	296,124	128,722
Korea				616	2,324
Russia—Asiatic		470	1,407	225	
Siam		170		65	
Turkey in Asia	21,145	2,271	5,408	846	2,344
All other Asia	610	962		340	
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	747,868	444,440	583,068	469,144	522,224
New Zealand				58,913	50,066
French Oceania		168	380	415	247
Philippine Islands	16,829	22,835	29,616	17,814	48,198
Africa:					
British Africa—South	10,184	6,391	11,810	2,066	7,113
East				209	
Canary Islands	2,235	3,420	2,900	3,404	3,432
French Africa	983			700	100
Portuguese Africa	232		10		155
Turkey in Africa—Egypt	19,962	12,139	5,307	10,184	2,956
All other Africa	465				
Total	15,049,602	15,057,791	17,242,011	17,779,716	15,342,497
RECAPITULATION.					
Europe	13,270,142	13,144,145	14,509,518	15,509,144	13,077,017
North America	493,306	682,918	832,117	723,707	724,366
South America	392,395	493,288	719,067	603,688	745,346
Asia	95,001	248,047	548,218	380,288	161,277
Oceania	764,697	467,443	613,064	546,326	620,735
Africa	34,061	21,950	20,027	16,563	13,756

ALL OTHER LEATHER.

Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$1,923	$2,165	$1,815	$16,382	$2,658
Azores, and Madeira Islands			26		330
Belgium	19,699	13,617	9,664	7,871	20,993
Denmark	1,529	2,726	4,740	681	870
France	8,096	18,084	23,704	16,946	15,015
Germany	28,265	42,390	75,561	47,710	129,789
Greece			71	3,761	599
Italy	2,101	1,317	2,211	3,249	9,149
Malta, Gozo, etc	94				
Netherlands	13,374	17,802	42,164	71,732	91,445
Norway	20	461	325		897
Portugal				407	541
Roumania				1,762	167
Russia in Europe			90	8,301	2,147
Spain	303	697	395	4,179	12,510
Sweden	1,658	673	2,836	2,827	4,622
Switzerland	834	2,168	4,020		148
Turkey in Europe		221		5,999	3,185
United Kingdom	588,432	495,078	620,596	1,051,644	689,084
North America:					
Bermuda	203	567	358	452	403
British Honduras	1,093	460	497	652	467
Canada	272,437	336,504	455,090	685,792	543,087
Newfoundland and Labrador	781	312	88	169	311
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	2,148	832	1,239	881	784
Guatemala	57	46	25	42	609
Honduras	107	284	291	439	298
Nicaragua	1,822	1,712	1,808	5,877	2,905
Panama	105	36	401	2,114	3,648
Salvador	637	1,690	822	1,378	
Mexico	29,827	36,989	45,592	42,391	28,690
West Indies—					
British	7,238	3,100	11,490	37,566	25,995
Cuba	4,255	19,939	37,626	156,221	65,816
Danish	489	489	30		115
Dutch	470	90	966	3,620	3,448
French	428	279	162		507
Haiti	4,796	4,687	1,663	4,476	13,430
Santo Domingo	1,571	4,897	2,632	12,815	12,659

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

ALL OTHER LEATHER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
South America:					
Argentina	$6,193	$5,247	$4,150	$4,277	$9,463
Brazil	818	1,409	249	5,784	4,106
Chile	281	415	6,848	32,950	13,491
Colombia	8,385	4,904	2,269	14,757	24,210
Ecuador	80	537		19	
Guiana—					
British	464	245	296	236	548
Dutch	238	110	293	1,362	673
Paraguay					315
Peru	214	17	1,968	884	9,592
Uruguay	1,206	399	1,503	2,530	594
Venezuela	11,532	9,755	14,395	57,539	33,832
Asia:					
Aden				25	
Chinese Empire	1,770	5,934	3,220	5,459	1,152
East Indies—					
British India	1,976	1,311	1,807	1,357	3,447
Straits Settlements	450	230		2,894	362
Other British		307	132		
Dutch	196	122	1,308	1,180	2,799
Hongkong	200	301	87	400	202
Japan	8,818	694,083	304,058	170,398	34,181
Korea		68			1,112
Russia—Asiatic				269	465
Turkey in Asia	100			2,656	750
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	59,505	50,001	87,359	112,047	101,914
New Zealand				22,446	20,852
Philippine Islands	5,577	685	20,903	48,367	40,522
Africa:					
British Africa—South	36,669	25,973	22,124	26,310	10,294
Liberia			104		40
Portuguese Africa				42	
Turkey in Africa—Egypt		789	466	14,989	1,857
Total	1,140,364	1,813,154	1,822,537	2,727,513	2,004,022

RECAPITULATION.

Europe	667,228	597,399	788,218	1,243,451	984,149
North America	328,464	412,913	560,780	954,885	703,172
South America	29,411	23,038	31,971	120,338	96,824
Asia	13,510	702,356	310,612	184,638	44,470
Oceania	65,082	50,686	108,262	182,860	163,288
Africa	36,669	26,762	22,694	41,341	12,119

BOOTS AND SHOES.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe:	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*
Austria-Hungary	6,991	8,880	20,277	41,257	47,938
Azores, and Madeira Island	159	244	323	405	37
Belgium	23,174	19,315	32,034	20,658	32,206
Denmark	14,080	12,904	29,589	9,356	8,291
France	30,817	21,292	40,220	87,697	73,654
Germany	166,606	137,229	227,565	164,480	211,153
Gibraltar		5		50	
Greece		72			100
Italy	3,022	3,993	11,838	14,282	14,343
Malta, Gozo, etc	42	35			
Netherlands	7,712	6,686	8,241	6,671	9,291
Norway	3,842	5,927	7,013	5,057	5,978
Portugal			840	428	2,865
Roumania		258			96
Russia	1,668	3,952	3,569	3,211	3,570
Servia					180
Spain	4,023	1,196	74	1,714	389
Sweden	637	1,721	1,120	874	90
Switzerland	1,772	3,449	6,961	9,623	11,190
Turkey in Europe	77	910	1,129	1,060	2,976
United Kingdom	849,817	921,831	866,211	848,605	817,302
North America:					
Bermuda	51,841	55,909	47,788	40,776	40,352
British Honduras	77,474	55,191	41,910	57,342	63,951
Canada	499,493	588,297	640,456	692,900	654,612
Newfoundland and Labrador	15,943	25,704	26,967	21,985	23,117
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	1,019	2,286	1,213	3,039	2,143
Guatemala	1,581	4,122	3,701	7,170	5,145
Honduras	32,689	23,608	17,842	29,303	32,167
Nicaragua	35,602	32,406	29,517	26,910	19,994
Panama	37,979	97,907	218,883	292,310	322,278
Salvador	89	372	242	170	683
Mexico	496,183	683,840	848,398	810,859	786,380
Miquelon, Langley, etc	420	168	144	72	
West Indies—					
British	331,680	356,106	356,756	453,376	399,562
Cuba	1,005,278	1,379,933	1,448,092	1,275,687	1,976,901
Danish	27,944	35,677	27,296	43,064	33,541
Dutch	11,132	13,353	4,166	11,270	9,492
French	481	26	299	521	786
Haiti	9,517	1,423	1,883	1,125	2,065
Santo Domingo	36,737	68,783	59,102	65,977	72,072

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

BOOTS AND SHOES—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
South America:	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*	*Pairs.*
Argentina	10,339	31,157	35,811	53,555	36,289
Bolivia	256	267	2,322	3,118	6,294
Brazil	12,572	14,485	36,085	32,796	51,146
Chile	5,104	6,259	10,817	13,387	11,774
Colombia	112,363	82,251	37,749	26,217	31,949
Ecuador	12,068	13,334	6,921	16,846	35,043
Guiana—					
British	39,286	34,824	33,309	46,874	32,171
Dutch	7,179	6,553	8,979	6,859	12,870
French				72	103
Paraguay		12		616	72
Peru	7,080	13,646	21,643	26,302	44,739
Uruguay	755	841	2,828	2,742	3,572
Venezuela	238	2,488	1,085	94	325
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	6,028	8,066	16,430	8,659	12,426
China—Japanese					55
East Indies—					
British India	6,777	13,885	14,124	7,206	6,000
Straits Settlements	1,220	3,497	2,253	797	2,495
Other British		357	446	366	170
Dutch	620	1,007	1,711	1,405	1,904
Hongkong	4,736	6,033	7,514	13,939	10,350
Japan	1,922	6,469	3,393	1,865	3,952
Korea	211	775	243	177	238
Russia—Asiatic	502	1,353	188	467	1,863
Siam		218	284	69	82
Turkey in Asia	82	616	412	816	708
All other Asia	80	56	76		
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	443,083	256,463	208,065	108,260	89,992
New Zealand				80,623	46,822
All other	60	312	16	14	10
French Oceania	4,350	2,744	3,686	2,810	3,124
German Oceania	797	798	369	428	229
Philippine Islands	55,519	102,329	100,733	268,334	350,389
Africa:					
British Africa—					
West	1,705	2,270	1,825	2,342	2,958
South	112,633	116,377	68,399	41,740	53,808
East	131	6			
Canary Islands		94		18	112
French Africa		232	204		361
German Africa		84	36		50
Liberia	935	984	922	1,377	816
Portuguese Africa	345	3,619	2,650	1,434	963
Turkey in Africa—Egypt	5,857	5,928	9,062	12,006	9,399
All other Africa	177				
Total	4,642,531	5,315,699	5,672,249	5,833,914	6,552,412

RECAPITULATION.

Europe	1,114,439	1,149,899	1,257,004	1,215,428	1,241,649
North America	2,673,082	3,425,111	3,774,655	3,833,856	4,445,141
South America	207,240	206,117	197,549	229,478	266,347
Asia	22,178	42,332	47,074	35,766	40,242
Oceania	503,809	362,646	312,869	460,469	490,566
Africa	121,783	129,594	83,098	58,917	68,467

ALL OTHER.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$16,458	$21,423	$42,094	$120,330	$140,440
Azores, and Madeira Island	215	732	1,105	1,636	81
Belgium	52,749	40,800	53,272	55,351	86,466
Denmark	26,360	20,680	38,542	22,645	23,001
France	87,553	64,723	126,239	262,485	238,702
Germany	352,619	327,784	387,025	495,891	589,238
Gibraltar		20		218	
Greece		200			150
Italy	4,797	6,941	22,597	40,120	29,973
Malta, Gozo, etc	64	75			
Netherlands	12,549	11,339	14,680	17,539	24,162
Norway	7,556	14,430	11,229	13,735	15,622
Portugal			1,550	1,701	3,725
Roumania		880			333
Russia	3,233	6,870	8,309	8,506	10,112
Servia					457
Spain	7,755	1,142	110	4,024	881
Sweden	1,547	2,759	2,117	1,380	220
Switzerland	4,789	7,320	16,233	28,454	31,170
Turkey in Europe	230	639	3,295	2,883	9,113
United Kingdom	1,868,894	1,943,845	1,862,747	1,986,090	1,950,261
North America:					
Bermuda	51,068	53,494	47,089	40,426	49,482
British Honduras	95,634	64,017	54,936	94,513	105,038
Canada	852,522	1,013,142	1,124,066	1,192,732	1,215,248
Newfoundland and Labrador	17,271	25,773	26,616	23,021	27,986
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	1,329	2,709	1,561	5,255	3,787
Guatemala	2,114	4,973	6,893	13,663	10,531
Honduras	43,832	32,427	24,702	49,045	56,178
Nicaragua	51,829	53,958	44,562	48,109	34,631
Panama	39,436	117,274	285,360	420,894	508,043
Salvador	64	500	321	283	914

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

ALL OTHER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
North America—Con.					
Mexico	$786,502	$1,116,598	$1,529,364	$1,569,321	$1,548,545
Miquelon, Langley, etc	1,337	491	575	291	.....
West Indies—					
British	292,955	309,089	350,829	417,774	395,059
Cuba	979,303	1,322,030	1,769,796	2,145,415	2,577,966
Danish	29,602	33,705	26,805	44,987	34,970
Dutch	10,364	13,850	4,047	11,061	9,341
French	497	31	455	1,220	951
Haiti	8,912	1,581	2,639	1,148	2,327
Santo Domingo	35,629	73,000	66,733	88,021	79,666
South America:					
Argentina	30,264	75,130	99,033	145,961	94,661
Bolivia	361	471	5,358	8,911	13,078
Brazil	25,190	33,379	90,046	90,652	151,407
Chile	10,852	14,904	21,955	31,024	28,196
Colombia	141,153	113,254	55,260	40,546	59,338
Ecuador	13,800	17,354	7,768	19,084	51,178
Guiana—					
British	38,248	30,491	28,312	41,492	29,726
Dutch	7,955	7,465	9,315	10,813	11,734
French	.....	.....	.....	117	186
Paraguay	.....	24	.....	2,048	199
Peru	12,889	28,459	38,393	59,908	99,185
Uruguay	1,980	2,142	6,810	7,931	9,373
Venezuela	211	2,394	1,060	126	441
Asia:					
Chinese Empire	11,574	16,129	29,766	17,175	26,112
China—Japanese	.....	.....	.....	.....	52
East Indies—					
British India	13,301	21,880	22,449	13,738	13,939
Straits Settlements	1,925	5,636	3,379	1,220	5,339
Other British	.....	415	599	444	505
Dutch	935	2,353	4,246	3,332	6,233
Hongkong	8,008	12,073	12,978	13,395	21,357
Japan	3,100	12,818	5,314	2,420	5,781
Korea	470	899	713	660	258
Russia—Asiatic	1,029	2,353	424	1,041	4,011
Siam	.....	398	281	94	166
Turkey in Asia	143	2,200	617	1,263	2,235
All other Asia	187	123	102	.....	.....
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	829,082	499,702	367,458	202,605	184,593
New Zealand				155,694	96,004
All other	126	421	36	12	38
French Oceania	4,923	3,491	3,599	3,317	3,935
German Oceania	1,403	1,410	798	918	392
Philippine Islands	100,787	168,032	180,213	429,918	565,487
Africa:					
British Africa—					
West	2,266	3,580	2,903	3,305	3,759
South	211,650	243,948	153,467	86,309	135,212
East	123	5	.....	.....	.....
Canary Islands	.....	178	.....	46	155
French Africa	.....	152	478	.....	1,295
German Africa	.....	168	62	.....	220
Liberia	1,225	1,537	1,395	2,087	1,310
Portuguese Africa	667	10,331	6,854	4,156	2,998
Turkey in Africa—					
Egypt	15,310	10,748	22,814	35,020	24,707
All other Africa	325	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	7,238,940	8,057,697	9,142,748	10,666,949	11,469,559

RECAPITULATION.

Europe	2,447,368	2,472,608	2,591,144	3,062,988	3,154,107
North America	3,300,200	4,238,642	5,367,349	6,167,179	6,660,657
South America	282,903	325,467	363,310	458,613	548,702
Asia	40,672	77,277	80,868	54,782	85,988
Oceania	936,321	673,056	552,104	792,464	850,449
Africa	231,476	270,647	187,973	130,923	169,656

HARNESS AND SADDLES.

Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$155	$715	$802	$1,850	$2,816
Azores and Madeira Islands	.....	15	41	113	166
Belgium	596	448	541	2,614	2,241
Denmark	3,346	3,805	5,196	3,638	6,573
France	2,694	3,732	4,557	2,353	6,584
Germany	7,432	8,599	17,022	11,373	19,885
Gibraltar	104	50	.....	.....	.....
Greece	251	.....	.....	.....	.....
Italy	717	512	593	499	1,099
Malta, Gozo, etc	240	22	.....	.....	25
Netherlands	717	1,419	2,221	3,695	3,329
Norway	777	345	545	511	1,269
Portugal	130	94	20	30	145
Russia in Europe	1,878	549	81	251	917
Spain	55	575	131	32	552
Sweden	1,070	1,156	1,644	1,686	1,834
Switzerland	.....	.....	.....	109	7
Turkey in Europe	.....	159	.....	30	.....
United Kingdom	15,112	10,647	14,146	9,218	10,273
North America:					
Bermuda	2,116	4,049	2,119	747	768
British Honduras	1,651	1,070	1,544	1,644	1,741
Canada	138,150	119,847	147,894	197,590	89,204

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

HARNESS AND SADDLES—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
North America—Con.					
Newfoundland and Labrador	$756	$1,025	$716	$909	$2,195
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	2,219	2,249	2,596	2,693	2,400
Guatemala	1,136	2,781	4,423	4,624	687
Honduras	3,112	2,462	2,044	4,280	5,934
Nicaragua	1,246	1,694	1,193	1,366	1,524
Panama	1,519	8,082	18,331	11,900	7,797
Salvador	4,322	339	355	386	1,136
Mexico	44,798	78,664	81,427	95,422	59,884
West Indies—					
British	7,683	7,564	9,677	12,894	9,969
Cuba	46,453	57,497	90,089	167,229	112,998
Danish	1,442	763	1,207	945	691
Dutch	1,597	523	455	679	836
French	1,457	1,007	744	500	716
Haiti	1,394	1,214	2,057	2,771	2,367
Santo Domingo	784	784	4,724	5,926	1,525
South America:					
Argentina	67,293	59,539	91,251	84,145	80,136
Bolivia	.....	421	534	5,171	7,042
Brazil	2,377	1,611	2,271	3,595	8,345
Chile	2,737	6,942	6,510	8,719	8,023
Colombia	11,672	8,039	5,596	5,739	5,378
Ecuador	4,501	2,039	3,942	2,921	4,530
Guiana—					
British	197	451	374	271	278
Dutch	1,042	204	119	148	58
French	166	56	76	186	41
Paraguay	.....	.....	17	.....	.....
Peru	2,957	4,724	6,990	8,493	9,266
Uruguay	459	236	872	3,443	719
Venezuela	2,497	2,623	3,197	2,799	2,173
Asia:					
Aden	315	75	.....	162	151
Chinese Empire	2,115	15,084	1,640	5,765	1,551
China—					
Japanese	.....	.....	.....	.....	226
Russian	570	.....	.....	.....	.....
East Indies—					
British India	2,710	1,125	1,604	10,217	2,936
Straits Settlements	446	911	634	579	194
Other British	70	61	198	.....	.....
Dutch	501	1,741	304	956	1,860
Hongkong	518	252	296	92	.....
Japan	8,988	20,716	10,169	2,582	6,127
Korea	489	26	54	197	14
Russia—Asiatic	69	84	970	9,447	9,421
Siam	.....	113	124	75	353
Turkey in Asia	253	184	554	1,086	326
All other Asia	2,092	239	40	.....	.....
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	28,137	23,340	23,798	25,484	19,831
New Zealand				6,773	8,121
All other	51	.....	224	.....	.....
French Oceania	3,038	1,974	1,379	2,049	2,572
German Oceania	1,098	1,084	720	208	86
Philippine Islands	98,740	13,871	99,384	21,834	65,569
Africa:					
British Africa—					
West	581	579	715	729	625
South	13,979	7,956	6,392	1,936	1,992
East	100	604	32	109	297
Canary Islands	.....	100	30	282	138
French Africa	1,711	530	453	213	418
German Africa	.....	.....	.....	230	273
Liberia	.....	.....	.....	59	.....
Portuguese Africa	484	174	282	208	410
Spanish Africa	.....	.....	15	9	.....
Turkey in Africa—					
Egypt	213	396	680	.....	176
Tripoli	.....	100	.....	.....	.....
All other Africa	71	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	560,346	502,660	691,575	767,418	609,743

RECAPITULATION.

Europe	35,274	32,842	47,540	38,002	57,715
North America	261,835	291,614	371,595	512,505	302,372
South America	95,898	86,885	121,749	125,630	125,989
Asia	19,136	40,611	16,587	31,158	23,159
Oceania	131,064	40,269	125,505	56,348	96,179
Africa	17,139	10,439	8,599	3,775	4,329

ALL OTHER.

Europe:					
Austria-Hungary	$12,080	$11,036	$2,157	$5,536	$9,554
Azores, and Madeira Islands	25	8	141	229	1,124
Belgium	21,623	10,063	4,227	13,455	9,017
Denmark	10,565	8,469	4,480	18,567	6,687
France	10,700	4,068	9,282	20,378	17,896
Germany	63,857	122,230	164,933	295,215	252,322
Gibraltar	.....	199	.....	.....	.....
Greece	1,471	1,411	145	100	.....
Italy	5,451	1,656	4,741	3,612	2,255
Malta, Gozo, etc	.....	239	.....	218	.....

Leather and manufactures of—Continued.

ALL OTHER—continued.

Exported to—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Europe—Continued.					
Netherlands	$21,686	$5,798	$11,569	$76,885	$9,636
Norway	3,205	844	943	2,113	1,490
Portugal	404	93			38
Roumania				294	204
Russia in Europe	1,240	4,411	1,727	28,391	11,322
Spain	581	971	1,056	179	3,534
Sweden	7,030	8,601	2,900	12,551	3,530
Switzerland	3,968	1,395	579	5,652	1,388
Turkey in Europe	36	2,653	26	3,237	
United Kingdom	176,296	210,061	178,240	270,440	202,782
North America:					
Bermuda	1,671	1,450	1,296	1,505	1,651
British Honduras	576	1,239	885	1,278	1,659
Canada	480,039	492,060	557,622	599,253	499,511
Newfoundland and Labrador	3,700	7,360	3,192	5,222	2,379
Central American States—					
Costa Rica	3,475	1,742	4,198	3,608	4,526
Guatemala	2,147	4,329	2,351	4,317	3,566
Honduras	1,255	1,242	1,274	1,938	3,256
Nicaragua	6,253	7,698	6,954	5,178	6,394
Panama	3,122	6,699	16,075	30,297	22,188
Salvador	8,469	5,446	2,480	1,316	3,682
Mexico	148,523	117,573	191,673	246,365	173,921
Miquelon, Langley, etc.		24			
West Indies—					
British	5,467	6,957	5,738	10,609	14,592
Cuba	77,820	69,031	74,163	66,489	59,745
Danish	450	763	575	1,142	454
Dutch	1,402	1,970	806	786	1,417
French	21	70	543	207	115
Haiti	4,152	1,190	1,782	1,514	2,825
Santo Domingo	2,919	4,793	11,466	7,531	6,571
South America:					
Argentina	14,308	9,692	7,191	21,033	12,702
Bolivia	12		51	345	1,216
Brazil	6,064	3,682	5,069	5,666	6,422
Chile	8,589	5,607	10,549	12,571	9,500
Colombia	8,878	10,643	3,795	5,354	12,095
Ecuador	3,466	3,194	2,698	4,741	6,106
Guiana—					
British	1,993	1,223	875	1,790	599
Dutch	63	710	378	538	593
French	8			16	40
Paraguay			270	14	400
Peru	3,651	3,100	6,347	4,784	17,497
Uruguay	1,847	1,621	563	423	2,157
Venezuela	7,756	5,846	10,466	6,036	5,176
Asia:					
Aden		198			
Chinese Empire	14,639	4,925	4,779	9,954	5,176
East Indies—					
British India	7,128	8,336	12,599	15,698	8,780
Straits Settlements	737	996	2,599	2,264	119
Other British	1,902	1,604	42	332	15
Dutch	127	772	313	2,175	1,843
Hongkong	1,744	2,187	6,618	1,923	527
Japan	22,665	32,678	15,149	28,938	27,011
Korea	1,422	1,292	215	463	1,732
Russia—Asiatic	12		129	258	323
Siam		52	337	56	135
Turkey in Asia	146	1,462	570	531	119
All other Asia	2,403	50			
Oceania:					
British—					
Australia and Tasmania	69,680	58,181	44,289	49,200	54,054
New Zealand				13,637	15,802
All other		62			
French Oceania	62	194	47	277	304
German Oceania		15	53		
Philippine Islands	43,310	10,646	71,302	31,118	83,092
Africa:					
British Africa—					
West	45		61	42	42
South	12,353	18,276	11,276	13,558	23,354
East			215		393
Canary Islands	11				32
French Africa		410			29
Liberia	18		8	125	78
Portuguese Africa	46	1,286	425	886	874
Turkey in Africa—					
Egypt	2,973	3,854	2,191	4,032	157
All other Africa	10				
Total	1,329,747	1,318,046	1,491,688	1,984,385	1,639,725

RECAPITULATION.

Europe	340,218	394,206	387,146	757,052	532,779
North America	751,461	731,036	883,073	988,555	808,452
South America	56,635	45,328	48,252	63,311	74,503
Asia	52,925	54,552	43,350	62,592	45,780
Oceania	113,052	69,098	115,691	94,232	153,252
Africa	15,456	23,826	14,176	18,643	24,959

ANOTHER COLLECTION OF INTERESTING INFORMATION REGARDING THE LEATHER TRUSTS AND TANNERS WHO ARE LEADING THE CAMPAIGN FOR FREE HIDES.

The National Association of Tanners was organized last year for the avowed purpose of promoting sentiment favorable toward free hides. This association of tanners published what is denominated as "The Free Hide Text-Book," published in Chicago, November, 1908.

In that Free Hide Text-Book, the officers and executive committee are shown on the first page as follows:

President, Fred Vogel, jr., of Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis. This concern, the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, is incorporated in Wisconsin and has plants located at Milwaukee, Wis., and Cheboygan, Mich. Its capital stock is $6,000,000; and, according to Moody's Manual for 1908, page 2458, its surplus on November 1, 1907, was $3,500,000.

Treasurer, J. D. Neilson, of the American Oak Leather Company, Cincinnati, Ohio. The American Oak Leather Company is incorporated in Ohio; and, according to Moody's Manual, is said to be one of the largest tanneries in the United States. It controls the Oak Extract Company, of Newport, Pa., and the Ohio Falls Oak Leather Company, of Louisville, Ky., and on January 1, 1907, acquired the plant of the American Oak Tanning Company at Decatur, Ala. Its capital stock amounts to $4,830,000, and its surplus is given as $960,543.

General secretary, John E. Wilder, of Wilder-Manning Tanning Company, Chicago, Ill., another very large concern.

Executive committee.—There are 12 members of the executive committee and of these 12, 6 represent large tanning interests and the tanning trusts, as follows:

H. H. Bechtel, representing the American Oak Leather Company, of Cincinnati, previously referred to.

August Vogel, of Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, Milwaukee, also referred to previously as another Vogel—Fred Vogel—is the president of this association of tanners.

F. L. Roenitz, of the American Hide and Leather Company. The American Hide and Leather Company was incorporated May 3, 1899, and the duration of the corporation is perpetual. It is authorized to manufacture and cure and trade in skins, hides, and leather of all kinds, and to slaughter live stock. This company acquired by absolute conveyance the factories and good will of 21 different concerns; also owns the control of the Pennsylvania Hide and Leather Company. According to Moody's Manual, the capacity of this concern is 5,000,000 calfskins and 2,750,000 hides per annum, this being approximately 75 per cent of the entire annual production of upper leather in the United States. The American Hide and Leather Company is said to be capitalized for $35,357,337. This concern is recorded as one of the big trusts in the leather trade.

A. Augustus Healy, of the United States Leather Company, of New York. This concern has common stock, $62,882,300; preferred stock, $62,282,300; bonds, $4,680,000. In the balance sheet of this company, as shown in Moody's Manual, the good will, etc., listed as an asset is valued at $62,882,300, or the total amount of its common stock. The United States Leather Company is said to do approximately 60 to 70 per cent of the tanning of hides in the United States. It is the concern that buys substantially 75 per cent of all the Argentine hides imported into this country. It not only maintains an independent hide buyer in the Argentine, but buys through all the other local concerns located there. It is the largest trust in the leather business, and its vice-president, Mr. Healy, is the leader in the propaganda for free hides and published the first article demanding free hides in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

T. E. McVitty, of Leas & McVitty, Philadelphia. This concern was incorporated in April, 1902, in New Jersey. Its plants are located at Salem, Buena Vista, and Bluff City, Va. Capital stock, $1,000,000; surplus, $1,000,000.

Nathan Allen, of N. R. Allen & Sons, Kenosha, Wis. N. R. Allen & Sons is one of the constituent companies of the United States Leather Company, it being owned by that concern.

From the foregoing it will be noted that six members of the executive committee and the two important officials, president and treasurer, are representatives of the great leather trusts of the country, and it has been estimated that the business done by their concerns represents between 80 and 90 per cent of the tanning business of the United States, both on domestic and imported hides.

Leas & McVitty (Incorporated).—Incorporated in April, 1902, in New Jersey for the purpose of tanning oak, sole, and belting leather. Plants located at Salem, Buena Vista, and Bluff City, Va. Capital stock, $1,000,000; par, $100. Dividends, formerly 10 per cent per annum, are now paid at the rate of 12 per cent per annum; payments quarterly, January 1. Surplus, $1,000,000. No bonds. Transfer office, 419 Market street, Camden, N. J. Officers and directors: T. E. McVitty, president; D. P. Leas, first vice-president; A. E. McVitty, second vice-president; L. P. Leas, secretary and treasurer. Annual meeting, first Tuesday in May. Office, 305 Vine street, Philadelphia, Pa.

American Oak Leather Company.—Incorporated in Ohio and operates a large plant at Cincinnati. It is said to be one of the largest independent tanneries in the United States. Company controls the Oak Extract Company, of Newport, Pa., and the Ohio Falls Oak Leather Company, of Louisville, and on January 1, 1907, acquired the plant of the American Oak Tanning Company, at New Decatur, Ala.

Capital stock.—Authorized, $5,000,000 common and $2,500,000 cumulative preferred; par $100. No bonds. Dividends at the rate of 5 per cent per annum are paid on the preferred quarterly, January 1, and on the common at the rate of 6 per cent per annum. Transfer office, Cincinnati, Ohio. In certain cases the preferred stock has equal voting power with the common. No mortgage can be created except with the assent of a majority of the preferred shareholders.

	1908.	1907.
Assets:		
Real estate and buildings	$1,350,871	$1,225,794
Machinery, furniture, etc	697,699	489,063
Material	3,174,242	2,661,699
Cash and debts receivable	2,050,680	1,985,089
Total	7,273,491	6,361,648
Liabilities:		
Capital stock	4,830,000	3,500,000
Accounts payable	143,069	395,094
Floating debt	1,339,897	1,271,840
Surplus	960,543	1,194,714
Total	7,273,491	6,361,648

Officers: J. E. Mooney, president; August Fabel, vice-president and treasurer; H. H. Bechtel, vice-president and secretary; C. L. Harrison, third vice-president; J. F. Taylor, assistant treasurer and assistant secretary; Frank Monk, manager. Directors: The foregoing and H. B. Beard, J. A. Gardner, J. D. Neilson, and R. B. Smith. Annual meeting, first Wednesday after January 10. Office, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Comparative summary, with per cent of increase, 1880 to 1905.

	Census.				Per cent of increase.		
	1905.	1900.	1890.	1880.	1900-1905.	1890-1900.	1880-1890.
Number of establishments	1,316	1,599	2,082	1,959	[a]17.7	[a]23.2	6.3
Capital	$122,526,093	$99,819,233	$95,282,311	$42,994,028	22.7	4.8	121.6
Salaried officials, clerks, etc., number	8,811	7,779	[b]5,643	([c])	13.3	37.9	
Salaries	$8,706,682	$7,669,949	[b]$5,707,961	([c])	13.5	34.4	
Wage-earners, average number	149,924	141,830	133,690	111,152	5.7	6.1	20.3
Total wages	$69,059,680	$58,440,883	$60,667,145	$43,001,438	18.2	[a]3.7	41.1
Men 16 years and over	95,257	90,415	91,406	82,547	5.4	[a]1.1	10.7
Wages	$50,394,644	$42,811,430	$46,905,974	([c])	17.7	[a]8.7	
Women 16 years and over	49,535	46,894	39,849	25,122	5.6	17.7	58.6
Wages	$17,681,763	$14,823,726	$13,393,611	([c])	19.3	10.7	
Children under 16 years	5,132	4,521	2,435	3,483	13.5	85.7	[a]30.1
Wages	$983,273	$805,727	$367,560	([c])	22.0	119.2	
Miscellaneous expenses	$19,293,634	$10,669,402	$9,217,519	([d])	80.8	15.8	
Cost of materials used	$197,363,495	$168,632,654	$118,785,831	$102,442,442	17.0	42.0	16.0
Value of products	$320,107,458	$258,969,580	$220,649,358	$166,050,354	23.6	17.4	32.9

[a] Decrease.
[b] Includes proprietors and firm members, with their salaries; number only reported in 1900 and 1905, but not included in this table.
[c] Not reported separately.
[d] Not reported.

Products, by kind, quantity, and value, with number of establishments reporting each kind, and per cent of increase, 1905 and 1900.

Kind.	Number of establishments reporting.		Value.		
	1905.	1900.	1905.	1900.	Per cent of increase.
Products, total value			$320,107,458	$258,969,580	23.6
Boots, shoes, and slippers:					
Total number of pairs			242,110,035	217,965,419	11.1
Total value			$315,987,387	$255,720,266	23.6
Men's boots and shoes	483	560			
Number of pairs			83,434,322	67,742,839	23.2
Value			$142,038,632	$108,105,988	31.4
Boys' and youths' boots and shoes	299	388			
Number of pairs			21,717,236	21,030,479	3.3
Value			$24,301,298	$20,739,297	17.2
Women's boots and shoes	464	588			
Number of pairs			69,470,876	64,972,653	6.9
Value			$98,262,016	$81,804,303	20.1
Misses' and children's boots and shoes	377	551			
Number of pairs			41,416,967	41,843,202	[a]1.0
Value			$34,056,919	$30,094,611	13.2
Men's, boys', and youths' slippers	108	135			
Number of pairs			4,403,097	4,446,965	[a]1.0
Value			$3,464,561	$2,800,213	23.7
Women's, misses', and children's slippers	236	278			
Number of pairs			13,115,194	12,645,876	3.7
Value			$10,532,271	$10,134,393	3.9
All other kinds	157	126			
Number of pairs			8,552,343	5,283,405	61.9
Value			$3,331,690	$2,041,511	63.2
All other products	122	161	$3,327,955	$2,175,738	53.0
Amount received for work done for others	89	148	$792,116	$1,073,576	[a]26.2

[a] Decrease.

Boots and shoes and slippers.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Year.	Number of establishments.	Value of product.
1905	887	$173,612,660
1907	729	233,025,182

35 per cent increase in two years.

Imports of boots and shoes into the United States dutiable at 25 per cent during the years ending June 30:

Year.	Value.	Duty.
1902	$159,790.44	$39,947.66
1903	146,201.64	36,550.47
1904	162,066.50	40,516.63
1905	149,417.37	37,354.41
1906	155,842.40	38,960.71
1907	164,509.30	41,127.46
1908	129,075.47	32,268.92

Exports of boots and shoes and leather.

Year.	Pairs.	Dollars.	Percentage of increase (pairs).	Percentage of increase (value).
1896	1,036,235	1,436,686	100	100
1897	1,224,484	1,708,224	118	119
1898	1,307,031	1,816,538	126	126
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385	187	189
1900	3,016,720	4,276,656	291	298
1901	3,492,041	5,526,290	337	385
1902	3,966,766	6,182,098	383	430
1903	4,197,563	6,635,017	405	464
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940	448	504
1905	5,315,699	8,057,697	513	561
1906	5,672,249	9,142,748	547	636
1907	5,833,914	10,636,949	563	742
1908	6,552,412	11,469,559	532	798

1895.	
Boots and shoes	$1,010,228
Total leather manufactures	15,614,407
1905.	
Boots and shoes	8,057,697
Total leather manufactures	37,936,745
1907.	
Boots and shoes	10,666,949
Total leather manufactures	45,476,969

Mr. WARREN. I have something here about the tanning business and the number of hides. The census of 1905 shows that the cattle hides consumed by the tanners in the year before that, in 1904—and I should like the Senate to give careful attention to these tables—was 922,635,538 pounds. We will call that 100 per cent for the calculation. There were imported in that year 83,652,950 pounds—that is, the number of hides imported was 9.1 per cent of the consumption, while the number of domestic hides was 838,982,588, or 90.9 per cent. On the other hand, there were slaughtered at places where the Government provides inspection, such as the four great slaughtering houses in Chicago and slaughtering houses elsewhere, 447,530,167 pounds. That does not apply to the cattle trust, so called, any more than it does to the other places where the Government sends inspectors. The Government sends inspectors to every establishment that slaughters meat with the intention of selling it in interstate commerce or in the markets of the world. So, of the larger establishments, including all of them under inspection by the Government, there were over 447,000,000 pounds of hides, while at the so-called "retail" slaughtering establishments, not inspected by the Government, there were 391,452,421 pounds, almost as much as that produced where the concerns are large enough to be inspected by the Government.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. DIXON. Do those figures apply to all the hides imported or merely to the heavy hides that carry the 15 per cent duty?

Mr. WARREN. I will give it to you as the department states it—"Imports and domestic production for consumption, not including calfskins."

Mr. DIXON. All classes of hides?

Mr. WARREN. I should not take it that way. This is a report from the Agricultural Department.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think they are only the dutiable hides.

Mr. WARREN. There are further figures here that may throw some light upon it. Of course you will understand that there is a constant trading in this way. We are importing hides that are dutiable and we are importing largely of hides that are not dutiable; and we are exporting generously of both. Some of the calculations which I shall make will be where one has been deducted from the other. I will proceed further with the figures that are furnished me from the same source, which is official.

Mr. DIXON. Are those not hides that are dutiable?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; we will see as we go further.

We have here some unofficial statements, but they are made up at the Agricultural Department from the experts' figures before them. I say "unofficial," because there has been no authoritative census made. The imports for consumption of calfskins, raw and uncured, in 1904, were thirty-four million and some odd pounds; in 1905, fifty million; in 1906, fifty-six million; in 1907, forty-eight million.

The values are given, but that cuts no figure. We are talking now of pounds. The estimated number of calves slaughtered in the United States, based upon the number of calfskins tanned, according to the census of 1905, was 8,906,000. They make an estimate from that of the statistics of cows and calves on the farms, and so forth, and bring out a table here of approximately 9,400,000. The deductions are as follows: Calf kip skins, tanned and finished, in 1904 were 12,355,763. The estimate in pounds, at 10 pounds each, would be 123,557,630 pounds. Calfskins, raw or uncured, imported for consumption to June 30, 1904, were 34,501,000 pounds. Of slaughtered calves, slaughtered on farms and ranges, the estimated number under the census of 1900 was three and one-half million plus, and the estimated increase of 15 per cent for 1905 makes 3,550,000 for that year; the balance, slaughtered at retail establishments and by retail butchers, was 3,887,467.

That is the number of calfskins. The world's export of cattle hides in 1906—we may as well get at the world's total export—was 476,850,577 pounds. Those are the total exports of the world. The total imports into the United States were 134,671,020 pounds. Those are cattle hides, and do not include calves. The total exports of all kinds of hides and skins in the world in 1906 were 1,556,494,545 pounds. The total imports of all kinds of hides and skins into the United States in 1906 were 370,983,815 pounds.

Mr. McLAURIN. What year was that?

Mr. WARREN. Nineteen hundred and six.

It has been claimed here that as a result of the duty upon hides the imports have been rapidly falling off. I do not find that to be true, except in taking one particular year, and that is 1908. I do not have to consume the time of the Senate to explain why the boot and shoe business might have been dull in 1908, as well as any other business, and hence the imports ran down; but I will start to show what that claimed decrease has been in ten years.

The tariff was placed upon hides in 1897. I am referring now to the amount of revenue; and I want to say to my friends that if there was ever a revenue tariff directly for revenue that had greater qualities and better qualities to commend itself to a people than that of 15 per cent ad valorem upon cattle hides, I do not know what it is. I claim openly and aboveboard that I support it because it is a protective tariff; but if I had not supported it for that, I would have supported it because it is a revenue tariff. It is a protective tariff with positive revenue. It is a revenue tariff with some incidental protection if I am right, but no protection if the tanners are right. Nevertheless, it is a source of revenue to the United States which does not cost the wearer of shoes one "sou marquee," and never has.

In 1898, the first year after the duty was imposed, the amount paid was $1,824,000 plus, and the drawback was only $27,000. The latter figure represents the exports of leather. It shows the kind of business that was being done in the way of exporting leather just before and just following this free-hide period, as we were "crossing the line," so to speak. Coming along up ten years to 1907, we find that the $1,824,000 has increased to more than $3,000,000—nearly three million and a quarter. We find that the $27,000 of drawback has increased to $907,000. This shows that the business of exporting leather has doubled, trebled, and gone up in a sort of geometrical progression.

I am not going to read all of these figures unless my statements are challenged, but I have them here. The great cry made in support of free hides is made by a class of tanners who say that the increase in business they desire to carry on is to bring over hides for tanning as ballast in the tramp ships from the Argentine Republic and strip the hills of New England and other States clean of hemlock and oak and chestnut bark, and then send the hides back to the old countries as leather. They are doing that to-day. They come in here and say that we have such an abundance of hemlock and chestnut and oak; that these woods are going to waste over this country, and they want to use the bark and employ laborers to tan the skins so that they may export them. How does that tally with the statements of those who want to preserve the forests of this country and the lumber of this country?

The great cry is, "We must export." Of what value is it to the United States to employ a baker's dozen of men in a tannery somewhere along the Atlantic coast, foreigners at that, probably, so that tramp ships may bring over as ballast the hides from the Argentine Republic, and that we may send them back in the shape of exported leather at the expense of stripping our great forests of tanning material? Of what value is it?

They say that they have exported less leather. That is hardly true, because the leather we have exported as such, plus what is used in exported boots and shoes and leather goods, will probably balance our imports. But suppose it were true? They have used it and made it into shoes, and have exported the shoes. For, as was so well stated yesterday by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON], in the twelve years during which hides have been taxed they have increased the exports of shoes from between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000 worth to more than $11,000,000 worth—between 700 and 800 per cent. They have gone at a gait of more than 50 per cent advance every year over the year before in exporting boots and shoes. And even if they did export so much leather, which is the more valuable to this country—to ship the finished product of boots and shoes, in which labor is a large factor, and which takes only a small amount, proportionately, of tanning material, or to undertake to export the raw leather, which, as I said before, strips our forests and only gives labor to relatively a very few men?

This whole hue and cry has grown out of the efforts of that class of tanners who want to bring in hides free, and strip our forests of bark, and ship back to the other countries the leather. The shoe men—bless them, and I love them for their thrift—have been imposed upon in many ways by the tanners; never more so than when the shoe men fell in line behind this falsehood, in which, as has been stated, the tariff on hides was said to have been inserted in the Dingley bill in some crooked way, and that leather men were thus wronged by this Senate. The boot and shoe men are doing something for their country. They are exporting a product upon which there is a great amount of labor.

As a matter of revenue, we are receiving net duty on hides amounting to something over $2,000,000 a year. I claim that it

does not injure a single consumer; that it does not injure a single person, beyond taking some of what I believe is an illegitimate profit from certain parties between the producer of the raw skin and the wearer of the shoe.

I have further figures in this list—all official—which I shall ask leave to insert in my remarks at this point.

THE WORLD'S HIDES.

The total exports of cattle hides in the world in 1906 were 476,850,577 pounds.

The total imports of hides into the United States in 1906 were 134,671,020 pounds.

Total exports of all kinds of hides and skins in the world in 1906 were 1,556,494,545 pounds

Total imports of all kinds of hides and skins into the United States in 1906 were 370,983,815 pounds.

HIDES.

[See page 13, Free Hide Text-Book.]

	Pounds.
Imported, 1899:	
Dutiable hides	130, 396, 020
Free hides	66, 965, 785
	197,361,805
Imported, 1907:	
Dutiable	134, 671, 020
Free	135, 111, 199
	269, 782, 219

Statement that imports of kips and skins, free of duty, and exports of upper leather have increased (p. 3, Free Hides):

Imports of kips and skins.

	Pounds.	Value.
1898.		
Goat skins (free)	64,923,487	$15,776,601
Other skins (free)	54,607,534	7,667,342
Total	119,531,021	23,443,943
1907.		
Goat skins (free)	101,201,596	31,715,298
Other skins (free)	135,111,199	30,841,989
Total	236,312,795	62,557,287

Exports of upper leather.

Upper, value 1898	$10, 293, 430
Upper, value 1907	22, 306, 391

Imports of cattle hides.

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1898	126,243,595	$13,624,989
1906	136,155,300	21,867,060
1907	134,671,020	20,649,258

Exports of sole leather.

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1897	38,384,314	$6,510,401
1898	37,813,019	6,644,553
1906	40,548,767	8,186,279
1907	31,900,868	7,024,313
1908	31,189,897	6,593,950

Among the claims made here, one class of people represent that we are not growing cattle enough. Another class represent that we have a great surplus, and therefore ought to chip off what we can from the grower. It is said that that will not injure him; but if it does, let him charge a fifth of a cent a pound more for beef. That was stated here by resolution of an association of 700 boot and shoe makers after their mass meeting at Cincinnati.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. DIXON. What is the motto of these gentlemen who are asking protection on leather and shoes and at the same time asking for free hides and to put an additional charge of a fifth of a cent a pound on the consumers of beef? What is their motto? I should like to hear that read again.

Mr. WARREN. I had it here a moment ago. To tell the truth, they have mangled both truth and sentiment so much that my mind is not as clear as it was on the subject.

Mr. DIXON. But the Senator read the motto of these 700 men.

Mr. WARREN. If I remember it, it was "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." I think that is the motto of the alleged 700 men that appeared here, through an official association document, suggesting that while an additional charge of a fifth of a cent per pound on meat will hardly be necessary; yet if necessary, it may be made, and 90,000,000 people may contribute every day to it.

Now, as to the number of cattle: The Boot and Shoe Recorder gives us credit for having between seventy-three and seventy-four million cattle. They are generous in that. The Agricultural Department gives us something over 71,000,000 on January or February 1, 1909. On January 1, 1897, we had not quite forty-six and a half million head. The increase during that period of ten years has all been under taxed cattle hides. It is true that the duty is small. The farmer supposed when the bill left the Senate that he was to have a duty of 20 per cent upon all hides of cattle, skins of calves and kips. He supposed when it came back from the conference that he was to have a duty of 15 per cent, as the bill read. He got that amount of protection for a little more than a year. Then the importers, who are always rapping at the door of the custom-house and always present, while the farmer is hardly ever there, succeeded in getting a ruling that calf and kip skins as commercially known were skins, and therefore not cattle hides, and so they suspended further collection of the duty. Then the farmer, always humble and patient, did not appear, but, through newspapers and letters, inquired: "Please tell us how you are going to know which is a kipskin and which is a cattle hide?" So the appraisers got together and concluded—and I submit that it was an arbitrary ruling—that 25 pounds should be the outside measure of a calfskin or a kipskin, and the underside measurement of a cattle hide.

It must have surprised even the calves and the kips to know that the time when the change from childhood to puberty came was when their skins weighed 25 pounds.

Well, Mr. President, there may be somebody on this floor who can explain this; and if there is, I hope he will tell us just how and just why a calf has to remain a calf or a kip remain a kip until its skin weighs more than 25 pounds. And just when he may arise and bellow in his place and say at the proper time, "I am now in the cattle class and no longer a kip or a calf, because my skin weighs 25 pounds." Alas, alas! the poor bull which might have that privilege in his lifetime, and might enjoy it, must be killed and dead and gone before his skin can be weighed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether it is not true, also, that the improvement in the breed of cattle produces a lighter skin; that high-bred stock carries a lighter-weight skin than stock that is not finely bred?

Mr. WARREN. It is true.

Mr. President, I am now going to venture into that which I may not be able to prove so clearly as I did by the record yesterday, and may not have so important a witness to substantiate it. I refer to the way the language was changed from the old language in describing hide duties. I undertake to say that the subcommittee that framed that amendment, the committee that accepted it, the Senate that passed it, had no more idea that it was going to be construed as it has been than that the entire bill would be cast aside because of some error in construction. A member of that subcommittee was the late Senator Wolcott, of Colorado. He was from a cattle-growing country, and to a degree he represented on that committee that interest. Those with him were the Senator from Rhode Island, the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from Iowa.

The Senator from Iowa agreed with him that there should be a tax. But it was strongly represented by those who bring in sheepskins and goatskins in pickle, after the wooled skins have been taken out, that the children of the poor and the women of the poor largely wore shoes and gloves made from that class of leather, and that it did not conflict materially with any home industry, in that when we killed mutton we sold the hide with the wool on. So the old language of "all skins except furs" was dropped and they put in "hides of cattle," expecting to let in goatskins and sheepskins without wool free. Under another provision wool sheepskins were admitted at the duty on wool less 1 cent per pound. And, by the way, that was a concession. From time immemorial up to that time the tariff on sheepskins had been the same on wool skins as on wool itself. But 1 cent was taken off there to cover the expense of pulling and the possible injury that might come to the wool while preserving the hide.

That, Mr. President, is the way that discrimination occurred. I wish to remind the Members of the Senate that the farmers—long-suffering and enduring people under these circumstances—have not filled our archives with documents nor our corridors with representatives asking that that duty might be restored;

they have simply said they were sorry, and they did not think it was right; and they let it go at that.

I want to mark this proposition. I want at this point that the Senate should particularly note—as Senators will see if they will take up the testimony given over in the House—that the main complaint of the tanners and the heavy-weight shoe men is not that they are paying 15 per cent upon hides, but that calfskins and kips are let in free to compete with them and compete with sole leather, which bears a duty.

Now, I have finished on the hide question for the moment. I will next take up the tanning proposition, if I may have patient attention for a while. I will read not all of the figures, but a few of the more prominent, and will ask permission to include the others in my remarks. But I want to make this proposition—and I hope, if I am wrong, someone will correct me. I do not, however, want to be corrected only with assertions that are found in circulars. I want to be corrected with official figures to match mine that I produce from the files of the United States.

I want to say that the time when boots and shoes, when leather, when tanning, when all things connected with the hide and leather industry have been prosperous has been the time when there was a tariff on hides; and I am going to say that while there was a measure of prosperity when hides were free, that measure of prosperity was so much smaller that there is a glaring difference between the two, and it is always in favor of the time when we had a tariff on hides.

I do not say that all the rise in hides is because of the small tariff that we put upon hides. The hides of this country have been in greater demand. But it will not do, Mr. President, to say that in spite of the tariff, and with no credit to it, we have been prosperous, when you examine the figures and find that, without a single exception, taking a term of years, free-hide periods have been those of dullness and dutiable-hide periods have been those of prosperity.

The tanners are the ones who are making the greatest complaint. Now, let us see what the tanners have been doing.

We will take, in the first place, the period from 1900 to 1905, because that is the first period after the enactment of the Dingley law, for which we have official figures. We find that the capital invested in the tanning industry in 1900 was one hundred and seventy-three millions plus; that in 1905, five years later, it was two hundred and forty-two and one-half million dollars plus; that it had increased the first five years under a tariff 40 per cent in amount of capital invested. You may say that that may not show much. Well, let us proceed. During the same period the number of salaried officials increased 30 per cent. The salaries increased 50 per cent. It will be noticed that the salaries increased faster than the wage-earners. In this great industry that is so careful to provide for the wearers of shoes, it will not promise any relief except the back-handed proposition that they may pay a fifth of a cent a pound more for their beef in order to give a few tanners free hides. We find that while the salaries of a little over 3,000,000 people were raised 50 per cent, the salaries of the wage-earners, 57,000,000 of them and more, were only raised 10 per cent; but the total wages and salaries together amounted to 20 per cent more.

The only decrease that occurred was in the number of the tanneries. But I want to allude to the condition of affairs in 1880, and you will mark the date. It was right after they had had taxed hides. They had had taxed hides up to 1872, and in 1880 they had 5,628 tanneries. In 1890, after ten good years of business, ten long years of free hides, that number of tanneries had been reduced to 1,787, a reduction in ten years from over 5,600 to a little over 1,700.

Now, we will go back a little. Let us go to 1880, and see how much capital was invested. I will tell you. They had $73,000,000 and something invested, and they ought to have been prosperous in those times of free hides if their theory is correct. They ran it up to $98,000,000 only in 1890. That is an increase of $24,000,000 in ten years, or a little over—no; not quite—two and a half millions per year. That is pretty good under free hides. They did pretty well in those ten years. But, now, what happened? Why, we put a tariff on hides, and they increased in the next five years thirteen and a half million dollars per year, as against two and one-half under free hides. That is the gain made under the first period of five years of a tariff on hides. They gained over five times as fast under taxed as under free hides.

Again, the wage-earners increased under free hides 312 per year in number, and they increased 1,020 per year under taxed hides—three and one-half times as fast.

Now, let us go to the value of their product. The value of their product in 1880 was $200,264,944. These were the so-called "high and piping times of prosperity" under free hides! In ten years, in 1890, under free hides, their product decreased from two hundred and odd million dollars to $172,136,092—over $28,000,000 decrease in ten years under free hides, or 14 per cent decrease in ten years.

Following that decrease of $28,000,000 in ten years under free hides, we turn around, and in the first five years that follow, under taxed hides, there was an increase of over forty-eight and a half million dollars in the value of their product, or over 28 per cent.

Mr. PAGE. What year is that?

Mr. WARREN. These are the years, first from 1880 to 1890, then from 1900 to 1905. There was a decrease of more than 14 per cent under free hides and a gain of over 28 per cent under protected hides.

Mr. DIXON. Does the Senator mean 1905 or 1895?

Mr. WARREN. Nineteen hundred and five. I first gave the period from 1880 to 1890. That was the period of free hides. That is the full period between the censuses. I next gave you the period from 1900 to 1905, the first straightaway five years after we were under taxed hides. I will here submit the full tables from which I have quoted:

THE TANNING INDUSTRY.

That the tanning industry of the United States is in good condition and has not suffered because of the duty on hides, is shown by an examination of the reports made on the industry by the United States Census Bureau.

The capital invested in the tanning industry increased from $173,977,421 in 1900 to $242,584,254 in 1905.

The number of salaried officials, clerks, etc., increased from 2,442 in 1900 to 3,251 in 1905.

The salaries increased from $3,158,842 in 1900 to $4,451,906 in 1905.

The wage-earners increased from 52,109 in 1900 to 57,239 in 1905.

The total wages increased from $22,591,091 in 1900 to $27,049,152 in 1905.

The miscellaneous expenses increased from $7,023,416 in 1900 to $12,498,501 in 1905.

The cost of materials used increased from $155,000,004 in 1900 to $191,179,073 in 1905.

The value of products increased from $204,038,127 in 1900 to $252,620,983 in 1905.

The only decrease shown by the census statistics was in the number of establishments, from 1,306 in 1900 to 1,049 in 1905, this being due to consolidations and reorganizations.

These figures, covering five years of the history of the industry under the Dingley bill, show a commendable and uniform growth in the industry which does not accord well with the protestations in behalf of the tanners, not made by the tanners themselves, but mainly by the boot and shoe manufacturers.

In comparison with the business under 15 per cent tariff, let us take the figures under free trade in hides from the years 1880 to 1890:

The number of establishments decreased from 5,628 in 1880 to 1,787 in 1890.

The capital invested increased from $73,383,911 in 1880 to $98,088,698 in 1890, an increase of $24,704,787 in ten years of free hides as against the increase of $68,606,833 under dutiable hides in the five years 1900 to 1905. In other words, under free hides the increase was two and one-half millions per year and thirteen and one-half millions per year with dutiable hides.

The wage-earners increased in number from 40,282 in 1880 to 43,392 in 1890, an increase of 3,112 in ten years under free hides as against an increase in the five years under dutiable hides—1900 to 1905—of 5,130, being an increase under free hides of 312 per year as against an increase under dutiable hides of 1,020 per year.

The value of products decreased from $200,264,944 in 1880 to $172,136,092 in 1890, a decrease of $28,128,852 in ten years under free hides as against an increase of $48,582,859 in five years—1900 to 1905—under dutiable hides.

So much for the tanners. The next thing we turn to is boots and shoes. Let us see what the makers of boots and shoes in the United States did under free hides and under taxed hides.

The value of their product in 1880 was $166,000,000 plus. In 1890 it was $220,000,000 plus. In 1900 it was $259,000,000 minus. It will be observed that in that period of ten years when they had absolutely free hides they had increased only from $220,000,000 plus to $258,000,000 plus. From that time to 1905, five years instead of ten, they had increased to $320,000,000 plus.

Under free hides they increased 2½ per cent per year, and under dutiable hides they increased over 4½ per cent, about 100 per cent difference in favor of taxed hides to the boot and shoe makers in those comparative years.

AS TO MASSACHUSETTS.

In 1905 there were 887 boot and shoe establishments in Massachusetts. They decreased in number, and in 1907 there were 729 of them. But I want to say that in my research in the manufactures of woolens, the manufactures of leather, and the manufactures of shoes, and as far as I have gone in other manufactures, there has been, under free trade and under tariff, under the Wilson bill and under all, a like tendency toward reducing the number of establishments and increasing their size. So that when I make this statement about the number of boot and shoe establishments in Massachusetts decreasing, I want to state distinctly that the actual boot and shoe business there has greatly increased. Massachusetts is the great

capstone of this industry, and she has more boot and shoe manufacturers and does more of this business than any other State. In fact, she is the head and front and brains of this movement for free hides. If she gains it, Massachusetts should have all the credit.

Massachusetts has stood in her place all these years and demanded free raw materials with a consistency that I admire, although I do not sanction it. It has been "free wool" until most of our friends in Massachusetts have given that up. It has been, and is still, for "free iron ore;" I have letters not a month old from ex-governors and others asking that they may have free iron ore. Massachusetts wants free coal, of course. It is to its interest to have spotted protection. If it comes to that, that each man is for himself and the devil take the hindermost, then Massachusetts is right, and those who go with her can demand a tariff upon everything one sells and demand free trade for everything one buys. It is a glorious theory for the man who is rolling in wealth accumulated under the application of that doctrine. But, unfortunately, men do not always accumulate wealth under it. When you come down to facts, they really accumulate wealth more rapidly all around when they have a tariff, and have it on the raw material. And even with all respect to Massachusetts' judgment and to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, I am not going to permit Massachusetts, if I can help it, to come in here and commit hara-kiri and cut down her own profits and those of other States and people by having free raw material, when the record shows that they make more money when they do not have free raw material and when the producer of their so-called "raw material" has his part of the protective-tariff returns.

As to the amount of business, the value of the product of boots and shoes in Massachusetts alone shows an increase of 35 per cent in three years, or over 12 per cent per annum increase in the boot and shoe manufactures of Massachusetts alone.

Now we come to the imports of boots and shoes into the United States, and the exports of leather. Here are the imports of boots and shoes. I want to say—and I am glad to say it now while the Senator from Massachusetts is here—that Massachusetts and all the States that are making boots, shoes, and leather to-day are receiving the benefit of what we did in the Dingley Act of 1897, notwithstanding the damage claimed by reason of the imposition of a duty on hides, which it was also, but erroneously, claimed was only inserted in the conference at a late hour. Instead of the cattle raisers being humored by the Finance Committee in the Dingley bill of 1897 in a crooked transaction, as is sometimes claimed by the tanners and boot and shoe men, and being given a tariff in the dark, in the last hours of a conference Congress put a tariff on boots and shoes and leather higher as to some of them than ever before, with the distinct understanding that it was to be 20 per cent upon all hides and skins of cattle regardless of age and weight. When they took one-quarter of it off and reduced it to 15 per cent, Massachusetts and all the boot and shoe States interested with her had 25 per cent protection upon that which had received but 10 and 15 per cent at different times before, and on which she should have not more than a 10 per cent margin. So she has had in all these years since 1897 a tariff protection of 5 per cent extra, which may or may not account for the great prosperity which that great State has or which any State in the Union has obtained in this particular industry. All had the cream off of the transaction. Boots and shoes did not go down in the scale of protection in conference as the hide had to go down.

The boot and shoe industry we will take from 1900 to 1905: The capital invested in that industry increased from $99,000,000 plus to $122,500,000 plus, nearly 23 per cent. The increase of officials, and so forth, was from 7,700 plus to 8,800 plus, and the increase in salaries from $7,500,000 plus $8,500,000 plus. The increase in the wage-earners in number was from 141,000 plus to almost 150,000, and right here is where I want you to notice the disproportion between the increase of salaries of salaried officers and the pay of wage-earners. There is a sorrowful sequel to it, to which I will allude later, the disproportion in the expenditures, and all to the discredit and to the discomfort of the workingman, not to the salaried officer. Passing over the miscellaneous expenses and the cost of material, and so forth, all of which I have here and will insert, I come to the profit and I find that from 1900, when it fell as low as $168,000,000 plus, to 1905, it rose to $320,000,000 plus, almost double in five years under taxed hides. In all this great increase, in all this prosperity, I want to call attention to one fact, and it is a deplorable one. It is that every figure is on the increase until you come to the total of wages, and there we find the wages have decreased in boot and shoe manufacturing from $60,000,000 plus to $58,000,000 plus.

Mr. LODGE. The wage figure has not decreased. The wages are higher.

Mr. WARREN. I will state the facts nevertheless.

Mr. LODGE. That is, the number of factories has increased.

Mr. WARREN. I will be as fair as the Senator is. They have increased per capita; and I want to give credit to the Senator for improvements and machinery, which created a considerable expense in themselves but nevertheless cut down the proportion of man's labor and reduced the number of workmen. But here we are increasing along the whole line of expense. Higher salaries are being paid, but in the total pay to the wage-earner there is a visible decrease of $2,000,000. I am satisfied that is due partly to improved machinery that has gone into those factories, and until quite lately improved patented machinery has been one of the inestimable assets of the manufacturer. But to-day, as the Senator so well said, they are taking advantage of this machinery abroad; they are putting it up, and with skilled men taken from Massachusetts and other places who know how to run this machinery, foreigners are going to be formidable competitors. Therefore, as the distinguished Senator has said, there ought to be a tariff on boots and shoes, and there will be a tariff on boots and shoes so long as the farmers' products and the others along the line are protected. But when Massachusetts and other States here and there say it must be free trade upon everything they buy and tariff duty upon everything they have to sell, there will be a parting of the ways and a substantial change in the tariff situation of this country. The tariff map will look decidedly different when the matter is carried to a final issue.

I submit here some tables of figures about boots and shoes, from which I have quoted, and ask that they may be printed:

Boots and shoes manufactured in the United States.

	Value of product.
1880	$166, 050, 354
1890	220, 649, 358
1900	258, 969, 580
1905	320, 107, 458

Under free hides, 1880 to 1900, increase of 50 per cent, or 2½ per cent per year.

Under dutiable hides, 1900 to 1905, increase of 26 per cent, or 4½ per cent per year.

Imports into the United States of boots and shoes made of leather.

		Value.	Duty.
1904	duty, 25 per cent	$162,066.50	$40,516.66
1905	do	149,435.37	37,354.41
1906	do	155,842.40	38,960.71
1907	do	164,509.30	41,127.46
1908	do	129,075.47	32,268.92

Decrease in imports into United States of 25 per cent in five years, or 5 per cent per annum decrease.

Exports.

	Pairs.	Value.
1898	1,307,081	$1,816,538
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385
1900	3,016,720	4,276,656
1901	3,492,041	5,526,290
1902	3,966,766	6,182,098
1903	4,197,566	6,665,017
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940
1905	5,315,699	8,057,697
1906	5,672,249	9,142,748
1907	5,833,914	10,666,949
1908	6,552,412	11,469,559

Increase in exports in ten years under dutiable hides of $9,653,021, or 500 per cent, over 50 per cent per annum increase.

Exports of leather and all manufactures of leather, including boots and shoes, have grown steadily from $23,466,985 in 1899 to $40,688,619 in 1908, nearly double.

These figures and statistics, apparently dull and meaningless, are fraught with interest when interpreted in relation to the industry of boot and shoe manufacture.

Think of it; under this iniquitous burden of 15 per cent duty on hides, the boot and shoe manufacturers of the United States have grown from $258,969,580, in 1900, to $320,107,458, in 1905, a gain of 26 per cent.

The exports of manufactures of boots and shoes has grown while this pernicious duty on hides has been in force from $1,816,538, in 1898, to $11,469,559, in 1908, an increase of over 500 per cent in ten years.

Against this enormous export trade the imports into the United States are almost nil. In 1904 they were $162,066.50; in 1908, but $129,075.47, a falling off of 25 per cent.

No other industry in the United States can make such a favorable showing: An increase in five years of 25 per cent, an increase in foreign trade in ten years of 500 per cent, a decrease in competition from abroad in four years of 25 per cent, and in Massachusetts an increase of business in three years of 35 per cent, or 12 per cent per annum. And all this with a duty of 15 per cent on hides.

The census statistics of the boot and shoe industry in the United States show a healthy condition in that industry.

The capital invested in the boot and shoe industry increased from $99,819,233, in 1900, to $122,526,093, in 1905, or 22.7 per cent.

The number of salaried officials, clerks, etc., increased from 7,779 in 1900 to 8,811 in 1905.

The salaries increased from $7,669,949 in 1900 to $8,706,682 in 1905.

The wage-earners increased from 141,830 in 1900 to 149,924 in 1905.

The total wages increased from $58,440,883 in 1900 to $69,059,680 in 1905.

The miscellaneous expenses increased from $10,669,402 in 1900 to $19,293,634 in 1905.

The cost of materials used increased from $168,632,654 in 1900 to $197,363,495 in 1905.

The value of products used increased from $168,632,654 in 1900 to $320,107,458 in 1905.

The only decrease was in the number of establishments, being from 1,599 in 1900 to 1,316 in 1905.

In comparison with the substantial increase in business in the "dutiable-hide" period, 1900–1905, the showing from 1890 to 1900, part of which was under "free hides," is not so favorable.

In this period the number of establishments decreased from 2,082 in 1890 to 1,599 in 1900.

The capital increased from $95,282,311 in 1890 to only $99,819,233 in 1900, an increase of but 4.8 per cent, as against an increase of 22.7 per cent from 1900 to 1905.

The number of officials, clerks, etc., increased from 5,643 in 1890 to 7,779 in 1900.

The salaries increased from $5,707,931 in 1890 to $7,669,949 in 1900.

The wage-earners increased from 133,690 in 1890 to only 144,830 in 1900.

The total wages decreased from $60,667,145 in 1890 to $58,440,883 in 1900, a decrease of 3.7 per cent, as against an increase of 18.2 per cent from 1900 to 1905.

Miscellaneous expenses increased from $9,217,519 in 1890 to $10,669,402 in 1900, an increase of 15.8 per cent as against an increase of 80.8 per cent from 1900 to 1905.

Cost of materials used increased from $118,785,831 in 1890 to $168,632,654 in 1900.

Value of products increased from $220,649,358 in 1890 to $258,969,580 in 1900, an increase of 17.4 per cent as against 23.6 per cent from 1900 to 1905.

Despite great gains made in many other States, Massachusetts retains its leadership in the industry.

The increase in capital reported for Massachusetts in 1905 as compared with 1900 was $11,952,098, or 31.8 per cent, and in value of products, $27,176,183, or 23.2 per cent. These are by far the largest absolute increases shown for capital and value of products for any State.

Mr. President, I have waited in vain, I expect to wait in vain, for any proof that the farmer does not get the benefit of the protective tariff on hides. The only attempt to prove the assertion is based upon the statement that there is a monstrous trust in Chicago which takes all the benefits, and that all the other tanneries are subservient, and all of the wearers of boots and shoes will soon be subservient, to that great trust. I have asked the question not once, but twice, and I will again ask it now, for anyone to answer if he can: How are free-hide advocates going to prevent the packers—the trust, if they wish to call it such; I will not quarrel about that, I will join them in regulating that trust and holding it down in any legitimate way—from reaping benefits in excess of those enjoyed by the leather trust in any tariff changes? I ask any Senator or anybody to answer the question, What difference is it going to make with the packers, who are able to go to Argentina and buy hides or buy them in any country, and to put their manufactories and tanneries along the Atlantic coast, if necessary, just as well as in any other place, and who now have only 27, some say 30, tanneries out of over a thousand? Ten years ago we had exactly those same old stereotyped statements in the free-hide text-books about the languishing industry of tanning and boots and shoes that are now put forth.

We did not, however, hear anything then about either the leather trust that was then oppressing the country or the cattle or packers' trust that since then has been discovered by this text-book. All that has been given out since Upton Sinclair's book, The Jungle, was published. Even the Senate was nearly by the ears at one time as to certain inspection laws, but the Senate very properly rose to the occasion and put a law upon the statute books that not only furnishes excellent protection for our own people as to clean meat, but also furnishes sufficient protection so that foreign countries can not raise their hands and say this inspection is paid for by the packers and is entirely in their interests. On the contrary, the meat is inspected in such a way that foreign buyers can say that the great Agricultural Department of the Government, under pay from the Government, inspects the animals before they are killed; also the meat after animals are killed; and, therefore, if this country has meat to export, foreigners will buy it.

How do you expect the farmers will feel about a tariff bill which exempts from duty and makes free those things upon which they are absolutely dependent for a reasonable profit, like hides, when at the same time they are called upon to submit to 35 per cent ad valorem protection upon harness, saddles, and other leather articles with which they conduct their business?

Is it not a little pathetic that when a Wyoming farmer kills a beef creature he may be compelled to haul the hide away and bury it to prevent its becoming a nuisance, while at the same time the boots he wears when doing this duty and the harness worn by his horses which haul the hide away to the dumping place or the saddle on which he rides and around which is fastened a protected piece of cordage, its end being looped about the hide to be pulled away and buried, have all been assessed against him at good rates?

And yet this is just what his condition was during the years when there was no tariff on hides and when the leather trust had full sway and brought in as ship ballast its foreign hides. Small wonder that the packer was driven to tan the hides taken from his slaughtered animals.

Is it fair to ask the farmer to destroy, to put out of existence, valuable property, as hides certainly are, simply for the lack of a 15 per cent revenue tariff, if you will, in order that foreign countries may be enabled to sell their hides to this country, transported to the leather trust by tramp ships, that have no reason to ask our protection, simply that the leather trust may make a little larger profit and pay a little larger percentage upon the swollen volume of watered stock that the parent company and the constituent companies of the trust have inflicted upon a long-suffering public?

This condition prevailed in the Western and Rocky Mountain States.

Yes, Mr. President, thanks to Upton Sinclair and other causes, it becomes safe for the beef trust, so called, to be pursued by another trust, more obscure, perhaps, just at present, but nevertheless with just as wide a maw for sucking down the profits arising from all industries which it reaches—that is, the leather trust.

Ah, but there are independent tanners, it is said. Yes; and there are independent packers, too; and we can assert without any fear of contradiction that the leather trust more completely dominates the price of leather than the beef packers dominate the price of beef. My information is that the leather trust has many more associate concerns and a much stronger hold upon them than the beef trust has in the case of its associates—this by their own statements.

I ask leave to print in the RECORD a list of tanners, as shown by the Shoe and Leather Reporter, in the year 1907.

TANNERS.

[From Shoe and Leather Reporter, 1907.]

Acme Leather Company, Central Falls, R. I.
Adams Brothers, Lebanon, Ind.
Adams, A. M., & Son, Johnstown, N. Y.
Aeppli & Erickson, Chicago, Ill.
Aiken & White, Cumberland, Ohio.
Alabama Harness Company, Guntersville, Ala.
Albany Tanning Company, Albany, Oreg.
Alexander, James C., Freedom, N. H.
Allen, Bona, Buford, Ga.
Allen, E. R., & Co., Jeaoldstown, Tenn.
Allen, F. M., Lynn, Mass.
Allen, R. H., Buford, Ga.
Allen's, N. R., Sons' Tannery Company, Kenosha, Wis.
Alpena Hide and Leather Company, Alpena, Mich.
Altland, A. D., Dillsburg, Pa.
American Chrome Tanning Company, Newark, N. J.
American Hat Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
American Hide and Leather Company, New York City. (Tanneries in various parts of the country.)
American Lace Leather Company, Richmond, Va.
American Oak Tanning Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, and New Decatur, Ala.
American Oak Leather Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, Louisville, Ky., and Chicago, Ill.
American Oak Leather Tanning Company, Jacksonville, Fla.
American Patent Kid Company, Essington, Pa.
American Patent Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Ammond, P. T., Rural Valley, Pa.
Andrews, J. J., & Son, Wolf Glade, Va.
Anniston Oak Tannery, Anniston, Ala.
Anstedt, C., Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis.
Anti-Oak Leather Manufacturing Company, Los Angeles, Cal.
Argersinger, P. P., & Co., Johnstown, N. Y.
Argo Leather Company, Chester, Pa.
Argue & Wyles, Lockport, N. Y.
Armstrong Leather Company, Peabody, Mass.
Artzberger, L., Fairfield, Pa.
Ashland Leather Company, Chicago, Ill., and Ashland, Ky.
Ashtabula Hide and Leather Company, Ashtabula, Ohio.
Atlanta Tanning and Manufacturing Company, Atlanta and Duluth, Ga.
Atlantic Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Auman, F. H., Asbury, N. C.
Austin, J. L., Salem, Mass.
Ayer Tanning Company, Ayer, Mass.
Ayers, S. M., Leather Manufacturing Company, Carnesville, Ga.
Badger State Tanning Company, Sheboygan, Wis.
Baker, W. W., Tanning Company, Hallsboro, Va.
Bakersville Hide and Leather Company, Bakersville, N. C.
Ballard Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Ballard Stone Japanning Company, Woburn, Mass.
Balz Brothers & Finkeldey, San Francisco, Cal.

Barber Leather Company, North Adams, Mass., Readsboro, Vt., and Rensselaer, N. Y.
Bardes, Christian, Sons, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Barlow, E. D., Watertown, Conn.
Barlow, H. P., Manufacturing Company, Watertown, Conn.
Barnes, H. K., Salem, Mass.
Barnet, J. S., & Son, Lynn, Mass.
Barnet Leather Company, Little Falls, N. Y.
Barr, J. C. & S. E., West Lebanon, Pa.
Barry, James F., Danvers, Mass.
Barth, August Leather Company, New Albany, Ind.
Bartlett, Charles O., Gloversvills, N. Y.
Bates, William, Blandford, Mass.
Baugher, H. G., Aspers, Pa.
Bayer Tanning Company, Des Moines, Iowa.
Bay State Belting Company, Salem, Mass.
Bay View Hide and Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Beatty, J. W., & Co., Saco, Me.
Beck Tannery Company, Spring Creek, Pa.
Beckwith & Hiteman Brothers, West Winfield, N. Y.
Beckwith Leather Company, Chadwicks, N. Y.
Beegar Tanning Company, Redwood City, Cal.
Beggs & Cobb, Winchester and Woburn, Mass.; Watauga, Tenn.; and Confluence, Pa.
Bennett, C. G., & Co., Rohnerville and San Francisco, Cal.
Bernard, Albert, Newark, N. J.
Bernstein Brothers, Newark, N. J.
Bertram, A. D., & Co., Keezletown, Va.
Besee, Everett F., Albion, Me.
Besse, Frank L., Clinton, Me.
Birely, George K., & Sons, Frederick, Md.
Bissinger & Co., San Francisco, Cal.
Blanchard Brothers & Lane, Newark, N. J.
Blank Brothers, Winchester, Mass.
Blanton, A. B., Tannery, Ellenboro, N. C.
Blatz, F. J., & Bro., Elizabeth, N. J.
Bleyl, J. C., Gloversville, N. Y.
Blissfield Robe and Tanning Company, Blissfield and Hudson, Mich.
Blodgett, George, Bucksport, Me.
Bloom, Samuel, & Sons, San Francisco, Cal.
Bluefields Tanning Company, Bluefields, W. Va.
Blue Ridge Tannery, Buena Vista, Va.
Boeshaar, Charles, & Son, Lower Salem, Ohio.
Bolard & Ross, Cambridge Springs, Pa.
Bond, C. W., Nickelsville, Va.
Bowersville Tannery Company, Bowersville, Ga.
Boyle, T. F., & Co., Woburn, Mass., and Milford, N. H.
Boyne City Tanning Company, Boyne City, Mich.
Bradford & Sons, Statesville, N. C.
Bradford Brothers, Glasgow, Ky.
Bradt, Harry R., Gloversville, N. Y.
Brainerd, C. R., & Co., Peabody, Mass.
Brand, Jacob, Marietta, Ohio.
Brandon & Delaperriere, Hoschton, Ga.
Brann, C. J., Philadelphia, Pa.
Bretney, H. V., Company, Springfield, Ohio.
Bristol Patent Leather Company, Bristol, Pa.
Britton Leather Company, Brewer, Me.
Bradley Leather Company, Salem, Mass.
Broderick's, John, Sons, Dorchester, Mass.
Brodie, Benjamin, North Evans, N. Y.
Brown, George, Concord, N. C.
Buchsieb, Charles W., Columbus, Ohio.
Buckman & Kean, Woburn, Mass.
Buffalo Leather Company, Buffalo, N. Y.
Burke, R., Johnstown, N. Y.
Burke Tanning Company, Morgantown, N. C.
Burt Wool and Leather Company, Ogdensburg, N. Y.
Butler, E. C. & Co., Scottsville, Va.
Byron, W. D. & Sons, Williamsport, Md.; Chambersburg and Mercersburg, Pa.
Caffrey Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Cain, J. R., Kokomo, Ind.
Calais Tanning Company, Calais, Me.
Caldwell Tanning and Manufacturing Company, Auburn, Ky., and Nashville, Tenn.
California Oak Leather Company, Redwood City, Cal.
California Tanning Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Caller, George F., Chelsea, Mass.
Callery, James, & Co., Pittsburg, Pa.
Campbell, John, & Co., Monticello, N. Y.
Cannon Falls Tannery, Cannon Falls, Minn.
Cappon & Bertsch Leather Company, Holland, Mich.
Carlisle, F. W. & F., Saginaw, Mich.
Carr Leather Company, Salem, Mass.
Carroll Oak Tanning Company, Westminster, Md.
Cartwright-Mattson Company, Manitowoc, Wis.
Casco Tanning Company, Portland, Me.
Cavender, J. W., Tunnel Hill, Ga.
Century Enameling Company, Yardley, Pa.
Chalkley, B. D., & Co., Winchester, Va.
Chandler, Obed F., Strasburg, Va.
Cherry River Tanning Company, Richwood, W. Va.
Cherokee Tanning Extract Company, Andrews, N. C.
Chester Enameling Company, Chester, Pa.
Chicago Rawhide Manufacturing Company, Chicago, Ill.
Chicago Tanning Company, Chicago, Ill.
Chittenden, William, Racine, Ohio.
Chrome Tanning Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Cincinnati Chrome Leather Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Clark, A. B., Company, Bridgeton, Me., and Peabody, Mass.
Clark, H. W., Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Clerk, George, Peabody, Mass.
Cleveland Tanning Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
Coe & Brown, New Haven, Conn.
Cohn, Levin & Bro., Lancaster, Pa.
Colonial Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and St. Louis, Mo.
Concord Tannery, Concord, Pa.
Conduff, J. T., Willis, Va.
Cone Brothers, North Randolph, Vt.
Connelly, Mrs. J. E., Rome, Ga.
Conneaut Leather Company, Conneaut, Ohio.
Conrad Brothers, Milwaukee, Wis.
Conrad Tanning Company, Louisville, Ky.
Cook, J., Los Angeles, Cal.
Cool, Eli, Johnstown, N. Y.
Corder, T. W., Emeryville, Cal.
Cottle Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Corona Kid Manufacturing Company, Bristol, Pa.
Corwin Manufacturing Company, Peabody, Mass.
Counihan, John, & Sons, San Francisco, Cal.
Cover, F. P., & Son, Andrews, N. C.
Cover, J. R., & Sons, Elkton, Va.
Covington Tanning Company, Covington, Va.
Craft, Thomas, Vallonia, Ind.
Crawford, J. K., & Sons, Williamsport, Pa.
Creese & Crook Company, Danversport, Mass.
Crehore, J. S., & Co., Peabody, Mass.
Crescent Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Crisler, B. F., Canton, Ga.
Crissman, A. J., New Paris, Pa.
Crosby Frisian Fur Company, Rochester, N. Y.
Crow Blacking Company, Canton Junction, Mass.
Cummings, E., Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Cummings, M. M., Newark, N. J.
Curtis, J. G., Leather Company, Ludlow, Pa.
Cutler & Heller, Millville, Pa.
Dahm, H. C., & Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Davis, J. W., Ashland, Ohio, and Winchester, Va.
Davis, Medary & Platz Company, La Crosse, Wis.
Day Leather Company, New Albany, Ind.
Deal Tanning Company, Dealville, N. C.
Dean, J. W., Bellefontaine, Ohio.
Deeds, J. C., Baltimore, Md. Tanneries at Covington and Luray, Va.
Degelow, Ernest, & Son, Shelbyville, Ind.
Deichsel Brothers, Johnstown, N. Y.
Devanney, Daniel, St. Louis, Mo.
Devlin, Thomas, Tanning Company, Arcata, Cal.
Divie Tannery, Bristol, Tenn.
Dodge, A. E. & H. E., Lynn, Mass.
Donohue Brothers Leather Company, Lynn, Mass.
Dorey, Daniel, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dorsey, J. L., Albertville, Ala.
Dowden, Joseph, Coldspring Harbor, N. Y.
Downes, W. J., Port Republic, Va.
Drueding Brothers, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dudley, Geo., & Son Company, Winsted, Conn.
Duffy, J. N., Leather Manufacturing Company, Eldred, Pa.
Duncan, H. J., Lynn, Mass.
Dunn, Green Leather Company, Hudson, Mass.
Duttera, V. W. S., Gettysburg, Pa.
Dysart, J. S., Marion, N. C.
Eagle Tannery, San Francisco, Cal.
Eagle Tanning Company, Elizabethville, Pa.
Eagle Tanning Works, Chicago, Ill., Grand Haven and Whitehall, Mich.
Eastman, H. E., Limerick, Me.
Eberhard Tanning Company, Santa Clara, Cal.
Eberle, Dominick, Baltimore, Md.
Eberle Tanning Company, Westfield, Pa.
Eclipse Leather Company, Toccoa, Ga.
Eclipse Tanning Company, Newark, N. J.
Ede Robe and Tanning Company, Dubuque, Iowa.
Edgerton, J. M., Goldsborough, N. C.
Eisendrath, B. D., Tanning Company, Chicago, Ill., and Racine, Wis.
Eisendrath, J. N., & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Eisendrath, Schwab & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Elkert Brothers, Milwaukee, Wis.
Elkins Tanning Company, Elkins, W. Va.
Elk Tanning Company, Ridgeway, Pa. (Tanneries in various parts of Pennsylvania.)
Elliott, John H., Newark, N. J.
Elysburg Tannery (William Pensyl), Elysburg, Pa.
England, Walton & Co., Philadelphia, Pa. (Tanneries in various parts of the South.)
Erie Leather Company, Erie, Pa.
Espe, H. O., Mattawana, Pa.
Essex Tanning Company, Peabody, Mass.
Essington Enamel Company, Essington, Pa.
Eureka Tanning Company, East Oakland, Cal.
Evansville Leather and Belting Company, Evansville, Ind.
Excel Leather Company, Danversport, Mass.
Excelsior Tannery, San Francisco, Cal.
Excelsior Oak Tanning Company, Louisville, Ky.
Falls City Tannery, Louisville, Ky.
Faust's, A. D., Sons, Ambler, Pa.
Faulk, S. G., Ringgold, Pa.
Fear & White, Gloversville, N. Y.
Federal Oak Leather Company, Columbus, Ohio.
Felton, Alonzo, Philadelphia, Pa.
Fesler, U. H., Penns Creek, Pa.
Feuerhenn, E. G., & Co., Amesbury, Mass.
Field, W. N., Company, Bangor, Me.
Filmer Brothers, Gloversville, N. Y.
Filmer, D., Gloversville, N. Y.
Findeiss & Heckel Oak Leather Company, Zanesville, Ohio.
Fisher & Bros., South Ostelic, N. Y.
Fisher, E. C., & Co., Bethel, Vt.
Fitzgerald, M., East Weymouth, Mass.
Fitzpatrick, C. J., Peabody, Mass.
Flaccus, William, Oak Leather Company, Allegheny City, Pa., and Buckhannon, W. Va.
Fleissner, Charles, Newark, N. J.
Flesher & Martin, Pennsboro, W. Va.
Flohr's, Charles, Sons, Altmar and Canisteo, N. Y.
Flowers, J. F., Downsville, N. C.
Foan Brothers, Peabody, Mass.
Foot, S. B., & Co., Redwing, Minn.
Foote & Coddington, Traverse City, Mich.
Ford, J. W., Zebulon, Ga.
Fort Wayne Sheepskin and Wool Company, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Foster, A. J., & Co., Merrimac, N. H.
Foster, Beriah, & Co., Haverhill, Mass.
Foster, F. J., Haverhill, Mass.
Foster Robe and Tanning Company, Minneapolis, Minn.
Foucar, M. M., Woburn, Mass.

Fox, Warren P., & Son, Woburn, Mass.
Fowle, E. P., Salem, Mass.
Frank, S. H., & Co., Redwood City, Cal.
Franklin Haddock Leather Company, Lynn, Mass.
Franklin Tanning Company, Franklin, W. Va.
Friese, Charles, & Sons, Baltimore, Md.
Fry, John, Gallatin, Tenn.
Furbush, F. H., & Co., Stoneham, Mass.
Gallun, A. F., & Sons, Milwaukee, Wis.
Gautt Harness Company, Belwood, N. C.
Garrett Leather Company, Hutton, Md.
Gastonia Tanning Company, Gastonia, N. C.
Gebhardt, A. L., Milwaukee, Wis.
Geitner, C. H., Hickory, N. C.
Gensemer, G. & H., Pine Grove, Pa.
Gensemer & Salem, Pine Grove, Pa.
George & Barry Leather Company, Peabody, Mass.
Gerber's, D., Sons, Fremont, Mich.
Gill, Peter R., Peabody, Mass.
Gildersleeve, J. H., Brookston, Pa.
Gillenwaters, O. R., & Co., Rogersville, Tenn.
Gillette Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis.
Given, R., & Son Company, Sidney, Ohio.
Gleason, L. R., & Sons, Driftwood, Gleasonton, Medix Run, and North Bend, Pa.
Globe Tanning Company, Des Moines, Iowa, and Louisville, Ky.
Gochenour, H. D., Alonzaville, Va.
Goetz, Ferd., Sons Company, Reading, Pa.
Good, John F., Concord, Tenn.
Goodlet, M. W., Greenville, S. C.
Good, R. C. & H. B., Newark, N. J.
Goodman, J. C., & Sons, Polkton, N. C.
Gormley, James, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
Gottschalk, Charles G., Jersey City, N. J.
Graichen, F. A., Winchester, Va.
Graichen, W. C., Glove Company, Winchester, Va.
Graton & Knight Manufacturing Company, Worcester, Mass.
Gray, F., & Sons, Indianapolis, Ind.
Green, Austin, Cassville, Pa.
Green & Hickey Leather Company, Shrewsbury and Winchendon, Mass.
Greene, Calvin, & Son, Lewistown and Saltillo, Pa., and Gassaway, W. Va.
Greenebaum, J., Chicago, Ill.
Greul Tanning Company, Zanesville, Ohio.
Groezinger's, G., Sons, Lancaster, Pa.
Groover, W. J., Cumming, Ga.
Grossman Leather Company, St. Augustine, Fla.
Guigues, Albert, Newark, N. J.
Gunnison, Charles, & Co., Erie, Pa.
Gusdorf, S. M., & Co., Indianapolis, Ind.
Gutmann & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Guttschall, S. W., Blain, Pa.
Haffner Brothers Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Haffner, F. & C., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Hahn, H., & Stumpf, Harrison, N. J.
Haines, W. W., Tanning Company, Everett, Wash.
Hall & Johns, Gloversville, N. Y.
Halsey, J. H., & Smith, Newark, N. J.
Hambleton Leather Company, Hambleton, W. Va.
Hamburg Cordovan Leather Works, Newark, N. J.
Hammond & Co., Sparrowbush, N. Y.
Hancock Leather Company, Bangor and Riceville, Me.
Harden, W. B., Harper's Cross Roads, N. C.
Harmon, W. P. & E. F., Salem, Mass.
Harriman Leather Company, Harriman, Tenn.
Harrington, O. E., Imlay City, Mich.
Harrington & Knights, San Francisco, Cal.
Hart, W. I. & Co., Johnson City, Tenn.
Harrison & Co., North Leominster, Mass.
Harris-Rees Tanning Company, Sylvia, N. C.
Hartmann, E., Hide and Leather Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Haskin-Reid Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.
Haub, William, St. Louis, Mo.
Haubold, H., San Antonio, Tex.
Hayes, George N., & Son, Peabody, Mass.
Hayes, J. Frank, Belvidere, N. J.
Hays, Daniel, Company, Gloversville, N. Y.
Hawkins, William, & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Healey, Francis C., Woburn, Mass.
Heimerl Hide and Leather Company, Jefferson, Mo.
Helb, Fred, Railroad, Pa.
Helvetia Leather Company, Lancaster, Pa.
Hendrie, J. B., Luzerne, N. Y.
Hermann Oak Leather Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Hertz, Max, Newark, N. J.
Hess's, Adolph, Sons, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hess & Harburger, Newark, N. J.
Hess & Hopkins Leather Company, Rockford, Ill.
Hickory Tannery, Hickory, N. C.
Hirschberg, H., St. Louis, Mo.
Hoffmann & Son Tanning Company, Malta, Ohio.
Hoffmann, J. Edward, Rochester, N. Y.
Hoffmann, John G., & Sons Company, Wheeling and Gormania, W. Va.
Holden, Henry E., Peabody, Mass.
Hollinger, Amos, & Son, Lancaster, Pa.
Hollinger, Henry, Columbia, Pa.
Holmes, Henry, Philadelphia, Pa.
Holstein, L. C., Sharpsburg, Pa.
Hopkinson Leather Company, North Leominster and North Woburn, Mass.
Hopkins, William, Louisville, Ky.
Horn & Bevier Company, Chicago, Ill.
Horween, I., & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Hosick, H. M., Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.
Houck, J. P., Tanning Company, Harrisonburg, Va.
Howard, Franklin & Son, Witten Mills, Va.
Howard, J. W. & A. P., & Co., Corry, Pa.
Howard, W. H., Noise, N. C.
Howell, D. W., Brainards, N. J.
Howell, T. P., & Co., Newark, N. J.
Howell-Hinchman Company, Middletown, N. Y.
Hoyle, W. B., & Co., Rockdale, N. C.
Hubschman, E., Philadelphia, Pa.
Huch Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.
Hunnicutt, John, Ellijay, Ga.
Hunt, F. W. & Co., Bridgewater Center and Island Falls, Me.
Hunt, Walker & Co., Liberty, Me.
Hurkamp, John G., Company, Fredericksburg, Va.
Indiana Leather Company, New Albany, Ind.
Ingraham, J. F., Peabody, Mass.
Iowa Rendering and Hide Company, Des Moines, Iowa.
Ironton Tannery (R. S. Dupuy), Ironton, N. Y.
Irvin, William, Company, Big Run, Pa.
Janney, E. K., & Son, Philadelphia, Pa.
Jasper Tanning Company, Jasper, Ala.
Jenkins, H. M., Flat Ridge, Va.
Johnson, J. Peter, Waupaca, Wis.
Johnstown Mocha Mills Company, Johnstown, N. Y.
Jones, W. N. & Co., Petersburg, Va.
Jorns Oak Calfskin and Leather Company, Cleveland, Ohio.
Judd, N. J., Cookeville, Tenn.
Junaluska Leather Company, Waynesville, N. C.
Kabbes, J. H., tannery, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Katz & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Kaufherr & Co., Newark, N. J.
Kayser Raw Hide Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Keith Tanning Company, Denver, Colo.
Kelly, John F., Company, Newark, N. J.
Kelly, Michael, Salem, Mass.
Kelly & McLaughlin, Newark, N. J.
Kelton, Bruce, Manufacturing Company, Salem, Mass.
Kendall, James R., Woburn, Mass.
Kengott, Fred, Milwaukee, Wis.
Kessler, Anthony, & Sons, Leather Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Kimball & Brown, Manchester, N. H.
Kimball, B. F., & Co., Woburn, Mass.
Kings Mountain Tanning Company, Kings Mountain, N. C.
King & Walter, East Freedom, Pa.
Kingsbury Manufacturing Company, Newport, Me.
Kingsley, C. S., Mansfield, Pa.
Kinley, Adam, & Sons, Breesport and Olean, N. Y.
Kistler, Lesh & Co., Boston; tanneries at Morganton, N. C., Johnsonburg, Lock Haven, Mount Jewett, Pa.
Kitchen, E. B., Bolton, Va.
Klein, J. Ross & Co., Ridgway, Pa.
Klumpp, J. C., & Son, Marietta, Pa.
Knapp, J., Tapleyville, Mass.
Knapp, S. Everett, Danvers, Mass.
Knoff, H., Johnstown, N. Y.
Korn Leather Company, Salem, Mass.
Kornman, Louis, & Co., Baltimore, Md.
Kost, Jacob, Carlisle, Pa.
Kraft, F. W., Bronxville, N. Y.
Kreig Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Kroegel, Adolph, Crestline, Ohio.
Kroehle's, Adam, Sons Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
Kron Tanning Company, Santa Cruz and San Francisco, Cal.
Kullman-Salz & Co., Benicia, Cal.
Lackawanna Leather Company, Hackettstown, N. J.
Ladew, J. H., Company, Newark, N. J., and Chattanooga, Tenn.
Landers, W. J., & Co., Fayetteville, Tenn.
Lane, R. M., Mouth of Wilson, Va.
Lang, Henry, Company, Newark, N. J.
Lappe, J. C., Tanning Company, Allegheny City, Pa.
Laub's, George, Sons, Buffalo, N. Y.
Lawrence & Co., Malden, Mass.
Lawrence & Parkhurst, San Francisco, Cal.
Lawrence, A. C., Leather Company, Peabody, Mass.
Lawrence & Sullivan, Woburn, Mass.
Leas & McVitty, Philadelphia; tanneries at Buena Vista and Salem, Va.
Leavette, George, Chicago, Ill.
Lebenheim, J., & Sons Company, Gloversville, N. Y.
Lefler, John D., Johnstown, N. Y.
Legallet-Hellwig Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Leist, Val, Barboursville, W. Va.
Leidy, Andrew N., Souderton, Pa.
Le Maire Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Lentz, J. W., & Bro., New Martinsville, W. Va.
Levin Tanning Company, Santa Rosa, Cal.
Leviseur & Conway, Peabody, Mass.
Levor & New, Gloversville, N. Y.
Levy, Isaac, San Francisco, Cal.
Lewis, G. B., Sioux City, Iowa.
Lewisburg Tannery, Lewisburg, Va.
Lichtman, J., & Son, Newark, N. J.
Lincoln, H. W., Lynn, Mass.
Lincoln Tannery, Lincoln, Nebr.
Linden Tanning Company, Linden, N. J.
Littauer Bros., Johnstown, N. Y.
Little, George D., Deering, Me.
Littlefield Leather Company, Berwick, Me.
Lloyd, James M., Peabody, Mass.
Lloyd & Richards, Camden, N. J.
Locke, E. S., Richford, Vt.
Loehnberg, A., & Co., Newark, N. J.
Loehnberg, Leopold, Newark, N. J.
Loehnberg, Louis, Newark, N. J.
Loescher, H., & Co., Chicago, Ill.
Loescher, J., Tannery Company, Muskegon, Mich.
Loffman, Jacob, East Tawas, Mich.
Logan Glove and Tanning Company, Logan, Utah.
Lohr, William H., Forest Hill, Pa.
Looney, Salem, Mass. (M. Looney).
Lorentz, W. J., & Co., Glenville, Va.
Louisiana Leather Manufacturing Company, New Orleans, La.
Louisville Leather Company, Louisville, Ky.
Luray Manufacturing Company, Snowhill, Md.
Lynch Brothers' Leather Company, Salem, Mass.
Machetanz, F., Kenton, Ohio.
Mackey, A. J., Logansport, Ind.
Maddux, N. G., Mechanicsville, Tenn.
Mahon, Mark W., Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Manaho Leather Company, Newark, N. J., and Schenevus, N. Y.
Manchester Wool and Leather Company, Manchester, N. H.
Mannasse Block Tanning Company, Oakland and West Berkeley, Cal.

Mansur, C. W., Mount Vernon, Me.
Marion Leather Company, Marion, Ind.
Marsh & Parks, Nashville, Tenn.
Martin, George, Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis.
Martin, W. J., Haverhill, Mass.
Mason, J. L., Newark, N. J.
Massachusetts Glove Company, Peabody, Mass.
Massachusetts Hide Corporation, Norwich, Conn.
Mathias, J., Bally, Pa.
Maylander Brothers, Johnstown, N. Y.
McBain, Thomas, Tannery, Napa, Cal.
McCabe Duprey Tanning Company, Eureka, Cal.
McCarthy, Edward, & Co., Peabody, Mass.
McCarthy, John, & Sons, Salem, Mass.
McCarty, Ellis, Academy, W. Va.
McClanahan Harness and Collar Company, Columbia, Tenn.
McConkey, H. D., Johnstown, N. Y.
McComb, Thomas, Wilmington, Del.
McConnell, J. C., Belting Company, Athens, Ga.
McCormick, E. H., & Sons, Newark, N. J.
McKay Leather Company, Benicia, Cal.
McLain, J. J., Kenton, W. Va.
McLeach, David, Johnstown, N. Y.
McLeod & Wolgamot, Brownsville, Oreg.
McMillan, John, New Lexington, Pa.
McMurran, W. F., Salem, Ind.
McNeill, Benjamin, Hoop, Tenn.
Meinke, George, Gloversville, N. Y.
Melby & Hanson, Momence, Ill.
Mendota Tanning Company, Mendota, Va.
Merrill Glove, Mitten and Tanning Company, Merrill, Wis.
Metten & Gebhardt, San Francisco, Cal.
Meyer, Richard, New Durham, N. J.
Michigan Leather Company, Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich.
Middleburg Leather Manufacturing Company, Middleburg, Pa.
Milford Robe and Tanning Company, Milford, Ind.
Miller, Argersinger & Co., Johnstown, N. Y.
Miller & Eckstrom, Crookston, Minn.
Miller, M. D., Upper Strasburg, Pa.
Mills Brothers, Gloversville, N. Y.
Minneapolis Sheepskin Tannery, Minneapolis, Minn.
Minszer, Meyer, Ticonderoga, N. Y.
Missouri Belting Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Moak, F. P., Sherburne, N. Y.
Moench, C., Sons Company, Gowanda and Salamanca, N. Y., and Alpena, Mich.
Moffat, David, Company, Elizabeth, N. J., Irongate, Va., Davis, W. Va., and St. Louis, Mo.
Moffat, Henry C., Buffalo, N. Y., and Alden, N. Y.
Monarch Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.
Monson Leather Company, Chicago, Ill.
Monson, Andrew, Fargo, N. Dak.
Mooney, W. W., & Sons, Columbus, Ind.
Moore, Benjamin N., & Sons, Peabody, Mass.
Moore, J. M., Newark, N. J.
Moorison, McIntosh & Co., Grinnell, Iowa.
Mosser, J. K., & Co., Allentown, Mahaffey, Newberry, and Noxen, Pa., and Parsons, W. Va.
Mosser, W. F., & Co., Westover, Pa.
Mount Jewett Tanning Company (Kistler, Lesh & Co.), Mount Jewett, Pa.
Mount Union Tannery, Mount Union, Pa.
Moyer, S. C., Freeburg, Pa.
Moyers, G. J., Summerville, Ga.
Muehlhausen, A., & Son, Cleveland, Ohio.
Mullikin, W. L., & Co., Baltimore, Md.
Muller, Edw. A., Cambridge, Mass.
Munising Leather Company, Munising, Mich.
Murray Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Musgrave Leather Company, Baltimore, Md.
Musgrove, N. C., Frisco, W. Va.
Myers, Israel, Duhring, W. Va.
National Calfskin Company, Peabody, Mass.
National Oak Leather Company, Louisville, Ky.
National Tanning and Fur Company, Three Rivers, Mich., and Milwaukee, Wis.
National Wool and Leather Company, Peabody and Salem, Mass.
Nelson, Gustav, San Jose, Cal.
Neumann, R., & Co., Hoboken, N. J.
Newark Fancy Leather Manufacturing Company, Newark, N. J.
New Process Rawhide Company, Syracuse, N. Y.
Nieder, Charles, Newark, N. J.
Nieder, John, Newark, N. J.
North American Tannery, Lewistown, Pa.
North Star Tannage Company, Philadelphia, Pa.
Northwestern Leather Company, Manistique and Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.
Norton Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Occidental Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Ocmulgee Tannery Company, Macon, Ga.
Ohio and Kentucky Kid Leather Manufacturing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Ohio Leather Company, Girard, Ohio.
Ohio Tanning Company, Cincinnati, Ohio.
O'Keefe, P., Peabody, Mass.
O'Keefe, William, Salem, Mass.
Olmer, George F., Baltimore, Md.
O'Malley, John, & Co., Baltimore, Md.
Oppenheimer, O. H., Newark, N. J.
Orndorf, W. B., Springfield, Tenn.
Osborne, C. P., Peabody, Mass.
Osborne, J. E., & Co., Peabody, Mass.
O'Shea, T. H., Peabody, Mass.
Page, W. D., Canton, Ga.
Parker, F. C., & Son, Arlington and Woburn, Mass.
Parker, J. W., Romney, W. Va.
Parker, R. B., Newark, N. J.
Park Run Tanning Company, Lancaster, Pa.
Parvin, M. S., East Berkeley, Pa.
Paskusz, J., & Son, Newark, N. J.
Passero & Getman, Johnstown, N. Y.
Patent Leather Company of America, Newark, N. J.
Patrick, A. B., & Co., San Francisco, Cal.
Patterson, W. C., Mooresville, N. C.
Peiffer Brothers Leather Company, Portland, Oreg.
Peirce, C. A., Leather Company, Woburn, Mass.
Pennsylvania Hide and Leather Company, Curwensville and Allegheny, Pa.
Pennsylvania Tanning Company, Great Bend, Pa.
Petaluma Tanning Company, Petaluma, Cal.
Petersburg Leather Company, Petersburg, Tenn., and Petersburg, Va.
Pfahler, C. P., Catawissa, Pa.
Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis., and Cheboygan, Mich.
Phelps, E. J., East Highgate, Vt.
Philadelphia Leather Company, Frankford, Philadelphia.
Phoenix Leather Company, Gloversville, N. Y.
Pierce, James, Leather Company, Olean, N. Y.
Pile, C. W., & Sons, Campbellsville, Ky.
Pitts, B. F., Grant, Pa.
Pittsburg Leather Company, Ebensburg and Pittsburg, Pa.
Place, W. B., & Co., Hartford, Wis.
Plummer, George, Leather Company, Girard, Pa.
Pocahontas Tanning Company, Durbin, W. Va.
Poehlmann, Frank, Tannery, Petaluma, Cal.
Poetsch & Peterson, San Francisco, Cal.
Poor, N. H., Leather Company, Peabody, Mass.
Popp, Charles V., Charleston, W. Va.
Porter, J. F., Red Wing, Minn.
Preston, Thomas F., Newark, N. J.
Printz, E., & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Proctor, Ellison & Co., Elkland, Pa.
Pruden, W. H., Dalton, Ga.
Pum, John, Watertown, S. Dak.
Pyle, C. & J., Company, Wilmington, Del.
Pyle, C. & W., Company, Wilmington, Del.
Quaker City Morocco Company, Camden, N. J.
Queen City Tannery, Titusville, Pa.
Quigley & Gay, Newark, N. J.
Quirin, W. C. A., Olean, N. Y.
Radel & Mentz Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Ramsour, P. W., & Co., Lincolnton, N. C.
Rasche Brothers, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Raser Tanning Company, Ashtabula, Ohio.
Rate, E. F., & Sons, Iowa City, Iowa.
Rathbun, C. E., Canton Junction, Mass.
Reading Robe and Tanning Company, Reading, Mich.
Rees, Hans, Sons, Asheville, N. C.
Reid, W. W., Chicago, Ill.
Reilly, John, Newark, N. J.
Reliance Leather Company, Cape May Court House, N. J.
Remper, C. H., jr., Westport, Conn.
Renfro & Waldrum, Pulaski, Tenn.
Renz, S., & Co., Covington, Ky.
Renz, Samuel, & Co., Covington, Ky.
Reutersham, M., Santa Rosa, Cal.
Rex-Imperial Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Reynolds, Frank, Ayer, N. C.
Reynolds & Blair, Tellico Junction, Tenn.
Reynolds, T. A., Los Angeles, Cal.
Rice, W. W., Leather Company, Petoskey, Mich.
Richmond Leather Manufacturing Company, Richmond, Va.
Richter, J. L., & Sons, Accident, Md.
Riddell, R. J., Oakland, Va.
Riddle & Saher, Johnson City, Tenn.
Rielly, P., & Son, Newark, N. J.
Rink, J. F., & Son, Light Street, Pa.
Rio Grande Woolen Mills Company, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Rippman's, C. A., Sons, Millerstown, Pa.
Ritt, Thomas & Co., Newark, N. J.
Ritter, Richard, Louisville, Ky.
Riverside Japannery, Mansfield, Mass.
Robertson, James, Woburn, Mass.
Robinson, J. G., & Thomas, Gloversville, N. Y.
Rockwell, Theron, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Rogers & Smith, Gloversville, N. Y.
Rogers, Thomas, Rowlesburg, W. Va.
Rogersville Tannery, Rogersville, Tenn.
Rolfe Tanning Company, Johnsonburg, Pa.
Rome Tannery, Rome, Ga.
Rosenburg, Happ, & Siegel, Baltimore, Md.
Rosenthal Brothers, Columbus, Ohio.
Roser, Hermann, Glastonbury, Conn.
Ross, A. H. & Son, Chicago, Ill.
Roulette Leather Company, Olean, N. Y.
Ruddle, Isaac C., Franklin, W. Va.
Rueping, Fred, Leather Company, Fond du Lac, Wis.
Ruf Leather Company, Jackson, Ohio.
Rugg, Adelbert, Smyrna, N. Y.
San Mateo Tanning Company, San Mateo, Cal.
St. Mary's Tanning Company, St. Marys, Pa.
Santa Rosa-Vallejo Tanning Company, Santa Rosa and Vallejo, Cal.
Sawyer Tanning Company, Napa and San Francisco, Cal.
Schaeffer, F. A., Newark, N. J.
Scherer, H., & Co., Detroit, Mich.
Scherer, Oscar, & Bro., Newark, N. J.
Schieren, Charles A., & Co., Bristol, Tenn.
Schlegel, Henry, Leather and Bait Company, Lapeer, Mich.
Schlosser Leather Company, Walland, Tenn.
Schmidt, Carl E., & Co., Detroit, Mich.
Schmidt, Traugott & Sons, Detroit, Mich.
Schoellkopf & Co., Buffalo, N. Y.
Scholz Tanning Company, Chicago, Ill.
Scholze, Robert, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Schoepel Brothers, Menasha, Wis.
Schroeder, W. M., Anniston, Ala.
Schuff, William, & Co., Louisville, Ky.
Schulthels Brothers, Lima, Ohio.
Sears-Hitchcock Tannery Company, Berlin, Wis.
Seege Fur Tanning Company, Buffalo, N. Y.
Semmel, F. P., Neffs P. O., Pa.
Seaton Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Sharadin, J. D., Kutztown, Pa.
Shaw Harness Company, Charlotte, N. C.
Shaw, W. F., & Co., Benicia, Cal.
Sheldon, Charles, St. Clair, Mich.

Shephard, George A., Sons Company, Bethel, Conn.
Shingledecker, S. P., Ringgold, Pa.
Shirk, C., Churchtown, Pa.
Shive, Daniel, & Bro., York, Pa.
Shotwell, A. D., & Co., Manchester, Va.
Shotwell, S. H., & Son, Gloversville, N. Y.
Shultz Belting Company, St. Louis, Mo.
Sim, Peter, & Sons, Salem, Mass.
Sinon, Arnold & Co., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Sladek, Joseph, Tacoma, Wash.
Slater, B., Attica, N. Y.
Small & Houston, Belfast, Me.
Smith, A. J., Edray, W. Va.
Smith, C. H., Corryton, Tenn.
Smith, Hugh, Company, Newark, N. J.
Smith, J. O., McAlisterville, Pa.
Smith, J. J., & Sons, Catawaba, N. C.
Smith, L. M., & Sons, Newark, N. J.
Smith, L. W., Company, Canton, Me.
Smith, W. J., Jackson Center, Ohio.
Smoot, C. C., & Sons Company, Alexandria and Sperryville, Va., and North Wilkesboro, N. C.
Smyth, Charles, Newark, N. J.
Smyth Leather Manufacturing Company, Newark, N. J.
Sommer, H. F., & Co., Newark, N. J.
Sonoma Tanning Company, Petaluma, Cal.
Southern Oak Leather Company, Norcross, Ga.
Southwick, L. B., Company, Peabody, Mass.
Spangler, C. P., & Bro., Peterstown, W. Va.
Spohr, E., St. Louis, Mo.
Spring City Leather Company, Spring City, Tenn.
Spring Run Tannery Company, Abbottstown, Pa.
St. Paul Tannery, St. Paul, Minn.
Stafford, J. W., & Sons, Barnesville, Ga.
Standard Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Standard Leather Company, Allegheny, Pa.
Stanton Tanning Company, Stanton, N. C., Richmond, Va., and Manchester, Va.
Starr, E. W., Gloversville, N. Y.
Stead Tanning and Supply Company, Lowell, Mass.
Steeber, Charles, St. Louis, Mo.
Steele Brothers, Gloversville, N. Y.
Stein, A. J., Vanceburg, Ky.
Stengel, George, Newark, N. J.
Stengel & Rothschild, Newark, N. J.
Sterling Leather Works, Newark, N. J.
Stern Brothers & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Sternitzky Brothers, San Francisco, Cal.
Stewart, Clarence, Gloversville, N. Y.
Stewart, D., & Sons, Johnstown, N. Y.
Stewart, George A., & Co., Johnstown, N. Y.
Stifel, Charles F., Company, Allegheny City, Pa.
Stockamore, J. H., Gloversville, N. Y.
Stoecker, Charles, & Son, Louisville, Ky.
Stone, C. Moulton, Providence, R. I.
Straus, M., & Sons, Newark, N. J.
Streuber, Emil, Erie, Pa.
Strong Leather Company, Bainbridge, N. Y.
Stuart, J. N., & Son, Chelsea, Mass.
Suhre's, Rudolph, Sons, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Sumner Tanning Company, Benicia, Cal
Sunset Tanning Company, San Francisco, Cal.
Swavely, H. L., & Co., Clifton Heights, Pa.
Swisher, W. O., Berlin P. O., W. Va.
Swoboda, H., & Son, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sylvania Tanning Company, Sylvania, Ohio.
Taubert, M., Minneapolis, Minn.
Taylor, John, Petersburg, W. Va.
Taylor, William, Lyons, N. Y.
Thayer, Foss & Co., Peabody and Woburn, Mass.
Thomas Hide and Leather Company, Middleville, N. Y.
Thompson, L. C., Enigma, Tenn.
Thorne & McMann, San Francisco, Cal.
Thrailkill, R. J., Thrailkill, Miss.
Three Rivers Robe Tannery, Three Rivers, Mich.
Tigh, L. M., Peabody, Mass.
Tobin, M. J., Los Angeles, Cal.
Tolle, Gus., New Braunfels, Tex.
Topp & Vosburg, Johnstown, N. Y.
Topp, William, Company, Johnstown, N. Y.
Towle Leather Company, Salem, Mass.
Town Hill Tannery, Town Hill, Pa.
Toxaway Tanning Company, Brevard and Rosman, N. C.
Trier, Reuben, Newark, N. J.
Troeger, George, Jefferson, Wis.
Trostel, Albert, & Sons, Milwaukee, Wis.
Troutwine, George F., Gloversville, N. Y.
Tully, P., Salem, Mass.
Tuny, H., Rocheport, Mo.
Uber, Adolph, Owatonna, Minn.
Uber Brothers, Hartford, Wis.
Ukiah Tanning Company, Ukiah, Cal.
Ulmer Leather Company, Norwich, Conn.
Unaka Tanning Company, Newport, Tenn.
United States Leather Company, head office, New York City. (Tanneries located through the country.)
United States Tanned Pigskin Company, Peabody, Mass.
Universal Leather Company, Newark, N. J.
Van Dyne's, E., Sons, Troy, Pa.
Van Tassel, A. R., Du Bois, Pa.
Vaughn Calfskin Company, Peabody, Mass.
Veil, George J., Carlisle Springs, Pa.
Wagner, E. R., Shartlesville, Pa.
Wagner Leather Company, Stockton, Cal.
Wallace, E. G. & E., Rochester, N. H.
Wallace, L. M., Maynardsville, Tenn.
Wallin Leather Company, Chicago, Ill., and Grand Rapids, Mich.
Walsh, J. V., & H. M., Malone, N. Y.
Walters, J. E., Paducah, Ky.
Walters, Lewis, Philippi, W. Va.
Wampler, L. P., Crockett Depot, Va.
Ward, E. S., & Co., Newark, N. J.
Warren's, J., Sons, Auburn, Mass.
Warren Leather Company, Morrisville, Vt.
Warren's, W. G., Sons, Holden, Mass.
Waterhouse, R. D., Boston, Mass.
Watzke, Alex., New Orleans, La.
Wautauga Tannery, Wautauga, Tenn.
Way, Arthur T., Salem, Mass.
Wayland Tanning Company, Salem, Mass.
Weber, Frank L., & Sons, Walla Walla, Wash.
Weber Brothers, Portland, Oreg.
Webster & Co., Malden, Mass.
Wedekind-Hallenberg Tanning Company, Louisville, Ky.
Weigand & Doerzbacher, Newark, N. J.
Weil & Eisendrath, Chicago, Ill.
Weil, J. M., & V., Chicago, Ill.
Weil, S. & J., Newark, N. J.
Weisheit, Andrew, Ravenswood, W. Va.
Weisse, Charles S., & Co., Sheboygan Falls, Wis.
Werner, George F., & Sons, Jersey City, N. J.
Wertz, Abram, Falling Springs, Pa.
West Branch Tanning Company, Lock Haven, Pa.
West Coast Tanning Company, Ballard, Wash.
Western Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis.
Western Robe Company, Detroit, Mich.
Western Tanning and Japanning Company, Flint, Mich.
Western Tanning Company, Louisville, Ky.
Wettach & Co., Allegheny, Pa.
Weyrauch, George, Newark, N. J.
Whitewater Robe Tanning Company, Whitewater, Wis.
Wilder-Manning Tanning Company, Waukegan, Ill.
Wiley, T. J., & Co., Piqua, Ohio.
Wilkinson, J. J., Morristown, Tenn.
Williams, Isaac B., & Sons, Dover, N. H.
Williams, G. S., & Sons, Chippewa Falls, Wis.
Willit's Tanning Company, Willitts, Cal.
Winchester Tannery Company, Nashua and Winchester, N. H.
Windt, Morris, San Francisco, Cal.
Winslow Brothers & Smith Company, Norwood, Mass.
Wintzer, Charles, Tanning Company, Wapakoneta, Ohio.
Wittman, Joseph F., Philadelphia, Pa.
Woelfel Leather Company, Morris, Ill.
Wolfstein, Simon & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
Wood & Hyde, Gloversville, N. Y.
Worthing & Alger Company, Hillsdale, Mich.
Wright, J. M., Zone, Ga.
Wylie, J. C., Hicksbury, S. C.
Yocum Company, The, Newark, N. J.
Young, Richard, Company, Gloversville, N. Y.
Zeller, G. F., & Sons, Buffalo, N. Y.
Ziegel, Eisman & Co., Newark, N. J.
Zirkel, J. A., Rinkerton, Va.
Zimmerman, W., New Orleans, La.
Zohrlaut, Herman, Leather Company, Milwaukee, Wis.

Leather tanning, currying, and finishing establishments, 1850 to 1905.

	1905.	1900.	1890.	1880.	1870.	1860.	1850.	Percentage of increase.					
								1900 to 1905.	1890 to 1900.	1880 to 1890.	1870 to 1880.	1860 to 1870.	1850 to 1860.
Number of establishments	1,049	1,306	1,787	5,628	7,569	5,188	6,686	[a]19.7	[a]26.9	[a]68.2	[a]25.6	45.9	[a]22.4
Capital	$242,584,254	$173,977,421	$98,088,698	$73,383,911	$61,124,812	$39,025,620	$22,774,795	39.4	77.4	33.7	20.1	56.6	71.4

[a] Decrease.

In speaking of the Agricultural Department I want to say another thing. Among the complaints the free-hide men have entered here is a complaint that we are spending too much money on the Department of Agriculture.

The Free Hide Text-Book says:

The Federal Government now expends about $12,000,000 a year under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture. This does not include an outlay of $1,500,000 for the Weather Bureau, by which the agricultural interests of the country are benefited more directly than any other. In addition to these expenses the agricultural colleges of the country get $1,200,000 a year, which is expended through the Interior Department. Likewise the consular service, in the Department of State, is constantly showing where products of agriculture may find advantageous markets.

Mr. President, that may be $1 apiece for all the farmers in the country. But I will have all interested parties understand that when people in this country propose to blue pencil the farmer, either in politics or in tariff matters or in business or in the general welfare of the nation, they are attacking the very foundation stone of our national structure. The farmer,

as I have always insisted, is a long-suffering and patient man. He is at his plow or other implement attending to his business. He is not going into an association where the hat is passed and money is raised to send men down here to lobby for free this or free that. He is willing to pay for everything he buys the legitimate price that is necessary to protect the one part of the country engaged in manufacturing. All he asks is the poor privilege that when he sends a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives down here who stands in his place and supports the Committee on Finance on a thousand articles for the protection of the manufacturers of the East as against every one article on which the farmer asks protection, that when his representative humbly rises in his place and asks to have the two or three items in his State's interest protected mildly—for example, 15 per cent ad valorem upon 23 per cent of the imports of hides and skins—he shall not be turned back on the plea that he is not worthy of consideration, and that the Government is already expending $12,000,000 in the Agricultural Department for his benefit.

I stand for the farmer, Mr. President, and I shall continue to stand for the farmer. Let me say to those Senators who think that because of their heeding requests from local tanners who may live in their town or State, they are bettering their political fortunes by following these solicitations or desires, they may have in their States another class of people to meet when the time next comes, and that class is the farmers.

I can say to you that no tariff bill was ever made, and no tariff bill will ever be made, that will stand long which does not have the reasonable support of the farmer, and no representative can long have that support who maintains that the manufacturers of this country shall have protection, but that their raw material, which is the finished product of the farmer, shall be free. No man will be elected President of the United States, and no man will occupy office very long, in my judgment, who follows that policy.

The producer of beef, mutton, and the hides which grow upon them and are a part of them, should have his part of a protective tariff as a matter of right if he demands it. He demands but little, nothing compared with the others, but this he demands, just as the woolmen have demanded for years a tariff on wool.

During the debate upon this bill I have listened in vain for a statement from anybody, on this side of the Chamber at least, that there should not be a tariff on wool, yet I remember the time when the manufacturer of wool demanded free wool, exactly as the leather men now demand free hides. But the people interested in wool were, in early times, better distributed and better organized than the cattlemen. That is because, in 1864 the woolgrowers formed an association and put vigorous men at the head of it, and it has been vigorously supported all the way through. It was finally recognized that the producer must have protection, provided the manufacturer had it.

So it will be with hides the same as with wool. You may say that wool may be less in some one year. I grant that it is in some cases, formerly in many cases, but to-day over 88 per cent of the mutton product in this country is killed before any fleece is taken from the back of the sheep or lamb. Therefore to-day nearly 90 per cent of the mutton is exactly the same as the beef which goes to the shambles. Its hide is sold on the market for what the hide is worth and then the mutton is sold on the market for what the mutton is worth. The hides may be high to-day and the meat may be low, and there is the best reason why hides should be low when beef is high. I will tell you why.

When meat is high every man who has an animal and can get it to market shoves it along to market, and consequently the men who buy and slaughter cattle handle a large number in a short time and have a great lot of hides. These are piled up in warehouses and in cellars, and prices go down because there is an unusually large supply taken off in short time and the tanner gets the benefit of this condition.

At the same time meat may have been high for a period. But in any business like that of slaughtering cattle there is a line of average. The man who buys the animal to-day and slaughters it has to wait perhaps six months before the hides go on to the market. They have to be salted and laid away.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me a moment on the question of wages, to which the Senator alluded. The average number of wage-earners in 1880 was 111,000; in 1890, 133,000; in 1900, 141,000; and in 1905, 149,000.

The total wages in 1880 were $43,000,000—I gave only round numbers; in 1890, $60,000,000; in 1900, $58,000,000; and in 1905, which, I think, the Senator did not give, $69,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. I gave 1890 as $60,000,000 plus, and 1900 as $58,000,000 plus.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and in 1905, $69,000,000. They have gone up again.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator will not complain when I admit that that may be accounted for to quite a little extent in the adoption of machinery, which did, in a large way, the manual labor.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will examine those figures—I have been examining them rapidly—it is perfectly apparent that the wages rose in fact from 1890 to 1895. The period between 1895 and 1900, as the Senator knows, included a long period of depression. They rose from 1900 to 1905. But the total number of shoes manufactured has decreased.

Mr. WARREN. But enlarged in capacity.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; enlarged in capacity. My own belief is—in fact, I know—that the wages in that, as in all other industries, have advanced during the last ten years.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will admit that I quoted correctly the figures, and also that I made allowances which were reasonable.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. But the Senator did not quote 1905, which showed an advance in wages and 10,000 more men.

Mr. WARREN. Taking up the latest Free Hide Text-Book, published by the National Association of Tanners, November, 1908, we find that it has every appearance of being official. The association took time by the forelock and met in Chicago in August and September, almost immediately after the presidential nominating conventions were held.

We find that the association has a president, a general secretary, a treasurer, 12 members in its executive committee, 18 vice-presidents, and 67 directors, making an even 100 officers.

On the first reading page, after the usual declaration that the Senate put a tariff on hides as a compromise in the closing hours of Congress, and that the farmer derives no benefit from the tariff on hides, but really is injured by it, it states that the "imports of cattle hides and the exports of sole leather have decreased as a result of the tariff on hides."

The answer to this is that it is not so. The official figures show:

Exports of sole leather.

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1890	39,595,219	$6,420,134
1900	34,060,296	6,433,303
1905	44,107,054	9,434,873

This Text-Book further says:

As a producer of revenue the hide tax is of small consequence.

While to this we answer that the duty runs as high in some years as over three and one-quarter millions of dollars; that the drawbacks sometimes run as high as exceeding $900,000, and that the yearly average for the ten years—1898 to 1908—of the duty collected less drawbacks paid is nearly $2,000,000, still leaving about twice the amount of the revenue that the Free Hide Text-Book allows.

Next the Text-Book states:

Cattle in the United States are decreasing, while the population is increasing.

The book itself gives the present number of cattle as 73,246,573 head. The same book gives the number of cattle for 1899, ten years ago, as 43,984,340 head; increase in ten years of 29,262,233 head, or nearly 70 per cent. This is a larger increase, and not a smaller, than our increase in population, as the official figures will show.

Next the book states that in all former tariff bills, excepting that of 1897, it—

was always made to apply to all descriptions of hides and skins. The present law, therefore, was a new departure in hide tariffs, which has proved burdensome and oppressive in its operation.

I am glad to find some truth in the first statement, for it is true that in prior tariff acts the duty was imposed upon hides and skins of all descriptions, which included goatskins, sheepskins—without wool—hogskins, horsehides, and so forth. It will be observed that here is a valid complaint that the present duty is burdensome and oppressive, because it does not apply to the thin hides and skins; that it is not enough instead of too much.

It must be remembered that we all supposed the law of 1897 included kipskins and calfskins, and that the change from the wording in former laws only permitted goat and sheep skins to come in free. But after our custom-houses had collected the duties in this way for more than a year a new ruling was made, and kip and calf skins were excepted arbitrarily, and, I may say without fear of contradiction, unjustly; and this ruling made the weight of skins decide their character, and a dividing

line was drawn by which a green hide had to weigh 25 pounds and a dry hide had to weigh at least 12 pounds in order to bear the tax as dutiable hides.

This was an unexpected, and, I believe, an unjust, ruling.

The Free Hide Text-Book further avers that—

It is evident to those who investigate the matter that there is an attempt to make the farmer a cat's paw to drag other tariff chestnuts out of the fire.

It then further avers that the farmers lead all other classes of citizens in the consumption of leather, and yet, Mr. President, they would have the farmer pay a 45 per cent duty on harness and 25 per cent on boots and shoes, and at the same time put hides, which he raises, and which are a part of the material and the finished product of his efforts, on the free list.

The book further states that to produce hides it is necessary to raise an animal worth $100. This falls short, just about 100 per cent, of being the truth, for a $50 steer will carry a hide worth nearly or quite the amount stated.

We note another statement in the text-book as follows:

In any case it is inevitable that the United States will have to face the problem of foreign meat, as well as hide and skin, supply sooner or later.

And yet these petitioners would hasten the time by lowering the price of the farmer's product, or, failing in that, would increase the price of beef in order to make up the loss in hide value.

Then the books indulges in the following:

Cattle are raised in vast herds by large corporations, and it would seem that sufficient protection to the live-stock industry is furnished by the Government in the form of free grazing lands.

In this statement the free-hide people are very much behind the times. With probably less than half a dozen exceptions, there are now no vast herds owned by large corporations and no free grazing lands of consequence left, except in small areas that lie adjoining the lands of the farmers who are proving up upon homesteads, and improving their lands, and who keep a few head of live stock to graze upon the adjacent unoccupied land.

In some of the protests filed here against a duty on hides, it is stated that the domestic supply is growing less every year. This is untrue, notoriously so, for the official figures in the Census Office show a very large increase. The number of cattle slaughtered in 1905 was over 50 per cent greater than the number slaughtered in 1895, ten years earlier. The number slaughtered in 1907 was, in round numbers, three-quarters of a million greater than the number slaughtered two years before.

But the statements made by these petitioners for free hides are startlingly untrue in almost every particular. The stock argument in nearly all of their publications, letters, and addresses is as follows: In 1897, when the Dingley bill was in conference, the duty of 15 per cent on cattle hides was imposed. Since skins of all kinds and all hides except those of full-grown cattle were not taxed, it is evident that the new duty was not intended to produce revenue. If so, why is it that for every million dollars' worth of cattle hides imported, upon which 15 per cent duty is paid, nearly $5,000,000 worth of skins and hides come in duty free?

This statement has been made over the signatures of various presidents of manufacturing concerns, of societies, of mass meetings, and so forth; and, in fact, is the same statement as appears in a book issued by the leather interest, entitled "Free Hide Text-Book," of which I have spoken.

But the facts remain as clear as the noonday sun—that we must have revenue; that hides are going to be brought into this country; that we might as well collect, if we are to have any revenue from tariff, a duty on hides as well as on any other commodity that can be mentioned; and the present tariff of only 15 per cent ad valorem is surely not more than a revenue tariff, for it has been admitted upon this floor a number of times by those opposing a protective tariff—notably during the consideration of the Dingley bill and the present bill—that in support of the Government a revenue tariff of from 25 per cent to 45 per cent ad valorem should be required upon all imports, as nearly as could be approximated. If these figures are nearly correct, surely the 15 per cent duty on hides is less than it should be rather than more.

And be it remembered also, while on this point, that this Senate twelve years ago voted 20 per cent duty on hides and expected that that would apply to the hides of all cattle, regardless of age or weight of skin; but afterwards the Treasury Department ruled that since the tariff-act specified "hides of cattle," and since certain hides were known commercially as "hides of cattle," while calfskins, notwithstanding the fact that calves are cattle, were known commercially as "calfskins" and not as "hides of cattle," calfskins must therefore come in under that clause in the free list which provides that certain furs and skins, naming a few, and "all others" (a sort of basket proposition) shall be free. The same proposition covered what is known as "kip skins," which may be the hides of yearlings or even 2-year-old cattle—yes, and some small cows.

The farmer being almost never present with the appraisers and customs officials, the importers and those purchasing from importers being always present in person or by representation, this point was easily gained by the importers—that calves were not cattle, and calfskins and kip skins were not cattle hides.

Then they were confronted by the interrogatory, When does a calfskin or kip skin become a cattle hide? Or when do calves become cattle? And after solemn conclave, with no questions or advice asked of the farmers, it was decided by the august officials of our Government that when a skin or hide reached a weight in excess of 25 pounds, green, it should be called a "cattle hide," while all hides weighing less than 25 pounds should be called "calf" or "kip" skins. And so calfskins, skins of small yearlings, hides of 2-year olds, and so forth, have come in free, with the result that a far greater tonnage of hides and skins of cattle have come in free than have been taxed; and as the calfskins and small hides are worth very much more per pound, the real duty that has been collected on all skins and hides of cattle would average probably less than 5 per cent ad valorem, instead of the 20 per cent ad valorem voted upon this commodity by this Senate, or the 15 per cent finally agreed upon by both Houses of Congress in conference upon the Dingley bill.

And now, having suceeded in reducing very materially this small protection intended for the farmer's finished product, cattle, and this revenue needed for the support of the Government, from 20 per cent ad valorem to about one-fifth of that percentage, these importers, the leather trusts, have become like wild animals, which, after devouring their weaker brethren and becoming intoxicated by the taste of blood, seek to destroy all who stand in their way.

They want absolutely free hides and skins and 35 or 45 per cent tariff upon harness and saddles, and a high tariff upon leather and everything made from leather, including boots and shoes. This is not a wild statement.

The figures show that in 1898 the value of dutiable hides imported was a trifle over thirteen and a half million dollars, which had increased in 1907—ten years, mind—only to a trifle over twenty and a half millions—about 50 per cent—while in free hides the figures show an increase in importations from a little over seven and one-half millions in 1898 to $30,840,000 and odd—between four and five hundred per cent increase in free hides, against but 50 per cent increase in dutiable hides imported.

The weight of dutiable hides imported increased only from 126,000,000 plus, in 1898, to a trifle less than a hundred and thirty-eight millions in 1908. The imports in free hides increased from a little over fifty-four and a half millions in 1898 to over 158,000,000 in 1906—about 300 per cent in weight in a period of nine years.

Now, suppose for a moment, for the sake of argument, that we allow the contention that the farmer gets no benefit from the duty—which I do not admit, for it is untrue: If the packer dominates absolutely the price of cattle to the extent that he can say the farmer shall receive nothing for the hide of his animal, as that is a by-product, then he can also say that the farmer shall receive nothing for the tallow; nothing for the various other parts that might be called by-products; and, in the same manner, it could be said that the farmer should get nothing for the forequarters of the beef, because the desirable parts and those which bring the great value in the market are the hind quarters, the roasts, the steaks, and so forth, while the soup bones and lean and tough parts, the tallow, hoofs, horns, and so forth, go for but a fraction of the price per pound that is brought by the choicest cuts.

If all this were true, and if it were true that the packer dominates and fixes the price that the farmer should get, then he surely would have the power to still further impose upon the farmer; and if you remove this small duty now assessed against hides, you will certainly place in the packer's hands additional weapons with which to oppress the farmer.

If the packer can now say to the farmer, "You shall have $25 for your animal and no more," and you reduce the value of a hide one or two dollars, then the packer surely must have the power to say to the farmer, "Congress has now removed the tariff on hides; therefore we will pay you three, five, or ten dollars less hereafter than we have paid you heretofore for your cattle," and the farmer would have to submit.

And so, if the packer absolutely makes the price now, he will certainly make it hereafter, and make it at a lower figure, having the power, because of our action, if we should remove the duty on hides.

Now, what will be the net final result of this? Cattle raising is not a very remunerative business at the present time. Aside from milch cows, there is little of profit to the farmer in the business. Many former raisers of cattle have already changed to the raising of sugar beets, wheat, and other products.

Just as fast as you reduce the price or value of cattle you lessen the number of cattle raised, and when you lessen the number of cattle, with our growing population, you make the meat product—beef—for the table that much higher.

And the ordinary consumer to-day of leather in boots, shoes, harness, and so forth, conceding that he would obtain a benefit from this proposed reduction on hides, which he will not, would dearly pay for it in the price of beef; and this applies to everybody.

The farmer, in the final analysis, always has to stand for reductions that may be made all along the line of agricultural productions. It is idle to contend that the beef packers compose the one class in all our country that can absolutely make prices at both ends of the line as to what they pay for their live stock and what their product must bring, regardless of circumstances.

It is claimed that the packer now makes leather from his hides, and therefore competes with the tanner. I regret this. I would have it otherwise. But the packer makes soap, too, from the tallow of animals, brushes from the bristles, extracts, and innumerable other articles. Will the removal of the little revenue tariff of 15 per cent ad valorem from cattle hides which weigh more than 25 pounds each stop the packers from making all of these various articles? Why, Mr. President, the removal of the tariff on hides would no more stop or interfere with the tanning of hides into leather by the Chicago packers than the removal of tariff on fertilizers would prevent the manufacture of that product. In fact, it is like "The flowers that bloom in the spring;" it has "nothing to do with the case."

The removal of the tariff on hides will lessen the value of every head of neat cattle in the United States, whether it be the poor widow's cow, the farmer's little bunch of beef stock, the cattle of the great feeders, who buy from the ranges and fatten the stock on grain in the Middle West, or the stock of the man on the plains who raises cattle for such feeding.

But stopping for a moment to dwell on the assertion made in nearly every document sent here at the behest of the leather trust demanding free hides, that the hides cut no figure with the price of cattle, let me state one or two propositions—and there are thousands of others that could be stated, but I do not wish to be tedious.

As the cattle come into any of the great markets from the plains country, the purchaser or his agent first looks them over to see what is the condition of their brands. If an animal is one which was branded as a calf with a large iron, perhaps on both sides, the brand growing as the animal grows, so that it plainly disfigures and harms the hide on both sides, a deduction is promptly made on that animal, varying from $2 to $5, according to the estimated damage to the hide. If an animal is branded on one side only with a large brand, a less deduction is made; if branded on one side with a smaller iron, still less reduction; if branded only on the jaw, scarcely any reduction; and if not branded at all, the cattle run in price from $2 to $5 a head, right through, higher than the branded ones.

Now, this statement can not be gainsaid. If the hide does not figure in the value of the animal, as do the steaks and roasts from the animal, there would not be this clean-cut transaction and understanding. In other words, every animal that goes into the market for beef, and every one that is killed at home for beef, varies in value—as it can not help doing—according to the condition of the hide.

To say to the farmers and cattlemen in my country that the packer takes all of the benefit of the value of hides and that the farmer gets nothing at once insults and outrages the farmer's intelligence.

This seems to be a case, as I have said, of the "pot calling the kettle black." The great leather trust of this country, which essays to control the price of leather, which dominates the boot and shoe and harness makers, and actually causes them to send in all these demands for free hides, is undertaking to get more firmly into the saddle by trading upon and capitalizing the bad reputation of the "beef trust," so called.

The cattle raisers and farmers have no commission or warrant to protect in any manner the beef packers, and if the removal of the tariff on hides would affect the packers alone, I do not know of a single cattle grower or farmer who would consider himself called upon to defend the duty on hides.

The Free Hide Text Book of April 14, 1897, made no complaint about the packer, although all kinds of disaster was prophesied for farmers and dealers of leather and makers of boots and shoes if a duty on hides was enacted. Upton Sinclair had not then written The Jungle, and it was not then as fashionable or effective as now to denounce the packers.

Mr. President, I do not suppose there has ever been a more perfectly organized literary bureau even in the heat of a political campaign of this country than our free hide friends have inaugurated, have sustained, and have pushed into every part of the United States. They have been exceedingly careful not to promise any lower prices for shoes, but they have used threats that there might be higher prices.

For instance, here is a little article which I found. I know the man well who is responsible for it, and I asked him where he got it and why he published it. He said it was sent to him with other like material, with compensation. He was asked to put it in his paper, and so he inserted it. I reads as follows:

The next time you buy a pair of shoes you will pay 15 cents a pair more than you have ever paid for a similar pair of the same make before. This is the order of the trust that manipulates the price of leather goods.

Shoe dealers received a notice yesterday that the advanced price would become effective at once, and that they must charge accordingly. The reason given is that the price of leather has increased considerably lately and that the manufacturers must have the extra 15 cents a pair. Of course nobody out this way, where we have hides to sell, has ever before heard—

These last are the editor's words—

has ever before heard a suggestion of higher prices, but the trust says it is higher, and perhaps you will agree with them when you purchase that next pair of oxfords which you will be wanting soon for summer.

Just how it was done, as they say, nobody can find out. They have sent out all kinds of literature. This, for instance, was sent all over the southern country:

DEMAND FREE HIDES—THIS AFFECTS YOU—WIRE OR WRITE YOUR SENATORS TO-DAY.

Tariff affairs at Washington are at a critical stage. The Payne tariff bill, as it passed the House, provided for free hides, and at the same time reduced the duty on shoes from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. This was satisfactory to most shoe and leather interests, but it is now believed to be the purpose of the Senate to restore the duty on hides for the sole benefit of the beef trust.

The domestic supply of hides is far short of the demand. This market is controlled by the beef trust, which is now tanning many of its own hides. The independent tanner must buy his hides from his competitor, the trust, thanks to the present tariff, which bars him out from the other markets of the world. With hides on the free list, South American hides would be imported in quantities and would be tanned here, prices would be governed by the law of supply and demand—the trust could not "fix" prices in the face of world competition.

It is only the beef trust that gains by a tariff on hides. During the past fifteen years the value of the hides has increased ten times more than the value of cattle (on the hoof). See United States Census, 1894 and 1908.) It isn't the farmer that is hollering for protection. It's the trust demanding profits to which they are not entitled.

Don't allow this duty to be placed on hides; don't jeopardize your interests by allowing the beef trust to dominate the shoe business as well as the packing and tanning industry. The next logical step is for the trust to establish its own shoe factories. Where would you come in then? You would be absolutely at their mercy. They could and would dictate the terms.

Your Senators are at Washington to represent you; they are there to protect your interests. Insist that they do it. Write or wire your Senators to-day (irrespective of whether you know them or not) to stand pat on that section of the new tariff bill which calls for free hides, to vote against any amendment which shall put a duty on them. The danger is real; it is right now. Act.

Yours, for a square deal,

CRADDOCK-TERRY COMPANY,
Lynchburg, Va.

One of the Members of this Senate received the following from a constituent—I refrain from using names:

———, ———,
April 26, 1909.

———, ———,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you on some business I do not exactly understand, as the friend of mine who explained to me and begged a promise of me to write you did not understand himself, but it is something concerning the "sole leather" being formed into a "trust," which, as I understand it with the explanation given me, will cause all shoes to be of a higher price, and if prevented will give a better shoe for the same money or the same shoe for less money. And I, together with my friend, wish to ask your honor please to overrule the bill when presented and give "free" hides, as my friend termed it, which I think means "free from tariff" (or trust). Perhaps you will know better what we want than he could explain to me.

Hoping our names will count toward the interest and benefit toward the people generally, I am,

Respectfully, yours, ——— ———.

Then here is a card marked "important," which says:

IMPORTANT!

Senator H. D. MONEY, of Mississippi, and Congressmen OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, and JAMES M. GRIGGS, of Georgia, will be members of the conference committee which will finally shape the tariff bill. It is of the utmost importance that you write one or all of these gentlemen, urging them to vote in favor of free hides, in the interest of the consumer as against the beef trust. Do so at once.

Here is another style of communication:

Agents: Boston Rubber Shoe Company, Bay State Rubber Company.

GEDDES-BROWN SHOE COMPANY,
WHOLESALERS, 215–217 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET
(BOTH PHONES 2076),
Indianapolis, Ind., April 6, 1909.

Mr. ——— ———,
———, *Indiana.*

DEAR SIR: At the request of the Indiana Free Hide League, we are sending you herewith three forms of blank petitions, two of which you will note are addressed to the Senators from Indiana, one to Hon. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE and one to Hon. BENJAMIN F. SHIVELY, and the third to be addressed to the Congressman of your district.

We desire your hearty cooperation in urging the United States Senators and the Congressmen from Indiana to use their influence to remove the duty on hides. Will you please sign these three petitions and also circulate them in your city for as large a number of petitioners as possible to obtain among all classes of your citizens, especially among those of prominence, who are in favor of free hides? Have each signer sign all three petitions.

"We take it for granted that you are in favor of free hides as tending to prevent further advances in shoes, harness, and other leather goods, and in the interest of all consumers.

"Please write the name of your Congressman and the number of your district, and also the city and county, in large, prominent letters upon the space provided for same, and mail the petitions direct to Washington to the respective legislators, inclosing with each a short letter stating what the petition is and the number of signatures it bears. When you have done this, kindly fill out and mail the inclosed postal card to the league. It is necessary that immediate action be had if these petitions are to be of any avail, as they must reach Washington at once."

Very truly, yours,

GEDDES-BROWN SHOE CO.,
Per BROWN.

I do not claim that they have not a perfect right to do this, but I want to say it explains a great many of the petitions that have come here. I have given personal inspection to all the petitions that have come to the Senate in the days and weeks that we have been assembled in this extraordinary session, and they form a remarkable exhibit.

Mr. President, they are on two or three printed forms, usually with the names of the Senator or the Member of the House of the district printed in—everything ready for a starter. Somebody is hired to stand on the corner or to go through a railroad train and present it to every man who comes along and ask him if he wants to do something to break down the great wicked meat trust, and if he wants lower prices on boots and shoes. Of course he says, "Yes." "Well, then, sign this."

I will not take the time of the Senate to read them, but I have here a few of the blank forms—the Wisconsin, the Indiana, the Missouri, the South Dakota and Middle West forms, and others.

Their wonderful similarity throughout would awaken a suspicion in the mind of the least suspecting of persons that these petitions had originally emanated from one and the same source.

It is not hard to trace that source and to determine the originator. There is no doubt in my mind that the great leather trust, working through the various "free-hide leagues" organized throughout the country for the purpose of carrying on this warfare of petitioning, has sent these blanks to the wholesale leather houses, thence to the retailers, and thence into the hands of the petitioners in every community where there was thought to be any possibility of a favorable response.

The tactics can be best shown by the printed circular letters and their inclosures which I have here. A blank space is left for a superscription of the retailer's or merchant's name and address, in each case cleverly filled in by typewriter in ink to match, so that the letter might have the appearance of a personal appeal.

In some instances I found all the signatures in one person's handwriting, one of the many circumstances I might mention to impress upon you the valuelessness of all that mass of lists of proper names that has been handed to the desk during the past few weeks.

One petition showed that the signatures had been collected on board a train, the signers purporting to be citizens of one certain State. Indeed, the league's methods were devious and far-reaching. I have heard stories to the effect that many years ago the census, in some of the out-of-the-way portions of new Western States, was taken by enumerating all the tourists who passed through on the overland trains. Doubtless they were just as much a part of that locality's population as the signers of the free-hide petition, prepared on the train, were citizens of the State whence that petition came. Who knows that the list of names—alleged "signatures" prepared by one person's hand—was not made from an enumeration of the names of unfortunate individuals laid away in some remote cemetery?

Everyone knows what a simple matter it is to get signatures to a petition if it is being presented by an energetic canvasser. If a man is approached by such canvasser with the inquiry, "You are in favor of cheaper shoes and other leather goods, are you not?" and the demand, "Well, if you are, then sign your name here. Smith, Jones, and a lot of others have already signed," and that man is not sufficiently interested to inquire into the matter, in nine cases out of ten he will carelessly and good-naturedly affix his name to the list. It is often said that a petition could be successfully circulated praying for the hanging of a reputable citizen, if the right person had charge of it—one who could present the matter convincingly on the ground of moral reform.

In communities where factories are located it is very easy for the circulator of a petition to obtain signatures to his heart's content, if he has an argument to offer which will convince those whom he approaches that they are petitioning for benefits to themselves; but the farmer in an isolated spot, at work with his crops or his stock, is not going to leave them to take up the work of circulating petitions or training upon Congress countless letters, telegrams, and skilled lobbyists, with a view to furthering his interests at the expense of some one else's. He has confidence in the party which has heretofore protected his interests, and believes that they will continuously be protected.

This is a form of one of the petitions used:

To the Hon. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE,
United States Senator from Indiana, Washington, D. C.:

Knowing that the duty of 15 per cent on hides, levied twelve years ago, has been unfair to the entire leather industry and a burden upon every consumer of leather in this country, and that it has not helped the farmer, as its advocates claimed it would, and has helped the large packers only, who are also tanning leather, we most earnestly urge you to use your influence to have the duty on raw hides removed.

——— ———.
——— ———.
——— ———.

I have received an immense mail of late from farmers and associati[illegible] representing the other side of the proposition. I have not [illegible] their communications in the Senate, and will now insert only a few samples:

WYOMING STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
Cheyenne, Wyo., April 12, 1909.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed you will please find copy of resolutions adopted by our association at the annual meeting, held recently.

Very truly, yours,

WM. C. IRVINE, *President.*

Whereas the bill H. R. 1438, known as the "Payne tariff bill," has taken the present duty of 15 per cent off of hides and placed them on the free list; and

Whereas, on the other hand, the same bill has placed a protection tariff of 5 per cent to 75 per cent on all manufactured articles of leather; and

Whereas we believe this to be an unjust discrimination against cattle producers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, That we do protest against any reduction of the present duty on hides, except on the basis of a maximum and minimum tariff, as we believe a reduction of tariff would mean a reduction in price of cattle on the hoof, with no corresponding reduction in the price of leather goods.

Resolved. That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

LARAMIE COUNTY CATTLE AND HORSE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Underwood, Wyo., April 19, 1909.

Senator F. E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: After a careful reading of the testimony offered pro and con in regard to the tariff on hides, the strength of the entire argument for free hides seems to be centered on two points:

First. To enable the manufacturers of leather and shoes to enter the foreign markets and compete or undersell the foreign manufacturers; and,

Second. To secure a club that will enable the same people to dictate to the so-called "packers' trust;" or, in other words, it is a case of trust fight trust.

The cattle grower has been eliminated from the discussion with the mere statement "that he does not secure a benefit of any kind from the present duty on hides, for the reason that he does not grow an animal for hides, but for beef."

The shoe manufacturers state that they are compelled to a great extent to ship their uppers to foreign countries and sell to foreign manufacturers, who place the soles and then put the finished article on the market. I fail to understand why this is necessary when they import the leather that constitutes the upper to export. It costs no more to import the leather for the sole than for the upper, if we accept their statement as to the kind of leather they use. The ruling of the Treasury Department practically allows them to now import a large portion of their hides free of duty, and the Dingley Act allows them a drawback on what they again export.

Because they see fit to buy the various parts of a shoe upper from different jobbers, and are therefore not able to claim the drawback does not seem a good argument why the cattle grower should stand a loss that they may secure a profit on goods to be sold in foreign markets. Again, they have not supplied any direct testimony to prove that they will ever reduce the price of shoes. To the average man the talk that they will improve the quality of the shoe, even if they do not lower the price, is not a very convincing argument. In their testimony they further state that the retailer always makes his advances in 25 and 50 cent jumps. If, on the other hand, the manufacturers only think they are going to be able to make a reduction of 10 cents a pair on shoes

to the wholesaler then it is again very apparent that the reduction by the wholesaler to the retailer will only be a mater of 4 or 5 cents a pair. If the retailer has recently made an advance of 25 cents on his lines of shoes, it is not very evident that he will reduce these lines 25 cents to meet the 5-cent reduction in cost to him.

Another of their sympathy-producing arguments is that which relates to the cheap shoe for the laboring man. The laboring man at present is receiving higher wages than ever before. The skilled men and all office help are about all protected with certain hours of labor. If his labor has become more valuable on shorter hours, then it is very evident that the necessities that he requires will also advance on about the same ratio. On the other hand, the cattle grower during the winter months is compelled to work every day, including Sundays, and from daylight to dark, and yet they say we receive no benefit from a tariff.

In the entire testimony I did not see one statement that would tend to show there would be a reduction on harness or saddles by the manufacturers of these articles if they received free hides, and yet the Payne bill has protected their industry with a 35 per cent duty. In fact, every article manufactured of leather has a protective duty of 5 per cent to 75 per cent, and they ask the producer of the hides to go on the free list and compete with the world. I note the shoe and leather people at first were willing to compete with the world with their goods and go on the free list, but later they returned and advised the Ways and Means Committee that they had misunderstood them—"that it would be very necessary that their manufactured articles should be retained on the duty list."

In their arguments against the packers it seems to me they have offered the best possible argument why hides should be retained on the duty list at 15 per cent. If, as they say, the packers maintain a trust and hold up the price of hides to the tanners, then, on the other hand, with a reduction of the duty the packers would certainly reduce the price of cattle on the hoof to the cattle grower. In fact, I do not see where the duty affects the packer one way or another. The reduction of the tariff would only reduce the value of his product 15 per cent, but it would certainly not compel him to run after the tanners and beg them to buy their hides. If they see fit to tan their own hides now, they will continue with a free-duty hide. If they hold their hides for better prices they are only acting human. If I think cattle prices will be better in October than September I certainly try to hold my cattle until then. Again, when the packer buys an animal he does not do so primarily for his meat. He uses the hides, hoofs, and offal. He pays as much per pound for these as he does for the meat. When I offer my stock for sale I consider the hide as much a finished product as the meat of the animals.

The cleaner and neater their hides are the more appealing the animals are to the eyes of the buyers. The argument that the hide is raw material is an absurdity. It may be a fact that we do not put any work on the hide alone, but it is impossible for us to produce a good beef animal and at the same time have a poor hide. The feed given the animal helps as much to make a good hide as good beef. Another point that I disagree with is the matter of the hide on a good animal and a poor one. They state the hide of a 1,200 pound steer that sells at 6 cents is no better than the hide of a 1,200 pound animal that sells for 3 cents. If the former goes for beef and the latter for a canner, it is very apparent that there is a great physical difference in their make-up or condition, and that condition will naturally affect the quality of the hide. Hides are always sold in different classes. It is very certain the hide of the poorer animal is somewhat diseased, like the animal, or it would bring a different price. Its hide would probably get a glue or third rating, while the hide of the good animal would no doubt get a No. 1 rating. In the testimony I also notice the statement that the reduction of the hide tariff would no doubt reduce the price of cattle at least 96 cents. It is not probable that the packer would figure that close without making it $1 if, as is stated, he now controls the price of hides to the tanners. If this is the case, then the loss to the cattle growers of the United States from this one cause will run $17,000,000 or better each year, yet the shoe and leather men are not willing to say there will be a reduction of one cent for a certainty in the price of leather goods. In fact, their own testimony goes to show that to-day there is an open bidding market for every hide that is taken off, and that a shortage is becoming more apparent every day. With this situation in view, it is not apparent that there will be any reduction in the price of leather goods.

The growing of hides is probably one of the most important industries in the United States to-day. Every man, woman, and child must have shoes, farmers must have harness, and manufacturers belting. Yet the producers of cattle are the least protected of all industries. We are not even allowed to put our business on a legal and solid basis. The Government says if we fence the public domain and try to control our herds that we are criminals in the sight of the law, yet it has absolutely refused to consider a proposition to sell or lease us these public lands that are only fit for grazing that we may legalize our business and run it as each individual sees best. I will venture to say that with the present policy of the Government in reducing fences without providing some legal way of protecting our herds that the production throughout the Northwestern States will fall off 50 per cent in the next five years. Already great numbers of cattle growers are expecting to reduce their she-cattle holdings to a great extent this year and expect to replace them with southern steers. Sections that have spent years in building up fine herds will in a short time be operating on a speculative basis with steers. Free hides and free grass will cause a shortage that not even the so-called "packers' trust" can be blamed for.

If the men who have endeavored to build up the West, who have paid the taxes to maintain the state governments, are to be kept in business, then it is to the interest of all Members of Congress to see to it that they are protected from foreign invasion in the matter of free hides and home protection in the matter of legalized ranges.

Very truly,

J. C. UNDERWOOD.

At a meeting of the board of directors of the South Omaha Live Stock Exchange held May 24, the following resolutions were adopted and I was instructed to transmit same to you.

The exchange, representing the largest single industry of the State you represent in Congress, hopes you can see your way clear to vote for the retention of the duty of 15 per cent on cattle hides, thus helping rather than injuring this industry.

Whereas Congress is now considering a change in the present tariff laws of the country; and

Whereas we understand there is an effort being made by the manufacturers of boots and shoes, harness, and other industries using leather in large quantities, to have removed the duty of 15 per cent on cattle hides, while at the same time they are also seeking to have the present tariff retained on the goods they manufacture; and

Whereas the removal of this duty will cause an immense loss to the cattlemen of the country, amounting to from $1.50 to $3 per head on all cattle raised and sold by the cattlemen; and

Whereas if this duty is removed the ones to gain thereby will not be the people at large, but the manufacturers above mentioned; and

Whereas the ones to lose thereby will not be the manufacturers of leather goods or the purchasers of the cattle, but the people who raise the cattle and those who have to purchase the meat of these cattle to eat: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the South Omaha Live Stock Exchange in the interests of all of the stockmen of this and other States, That we request our Representatives and Senators in Congress to vote and work for the retention of the duty of 15 per cent on hides, and further request that they use their influence with Congressmen from other States who may not have had an opportunity to learn of the great injury the removal of this duty would be to one of the greatest industries of the country: And be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of our Representatives and Senators in Congress, and that copies be given our market paper and the daily papers of Omaha.

(Resolutions similar to the above were adopted by the Denver Live Stock Exchange, of Denver, Colo.; the Western South Dakota Stock Growers' Association; and the East Buffalo Live Stock Association, of East Buffalo, N. Y.)

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION
AND CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1909.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The membership of the American National Association comprises state and local organizations of stock raisers and farmers, as well as individual members from the States and Territories west of the Mississippi River, with headquarters in Denver, Colo. The Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas is composed of those engaged in raising cattle in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, many of whom are also engaged in the same business in the Northwestern States.

Speaking for the live-stock industry, these associations, asking no special favors, seek only fair and equal treatment in tariff schedules on live stock and its products and the adoption of that policy which will give the widest market for our surplus in foreign countries.

It is the aim of these associations, through this office, to collect and disseminate such information relating to the live-stock industry as will aid in a correct understanding of the facts to secure these ends.

We urge that a reasonable tariff, consistent with the general policy of the law which shall be enacted, be retained on cattle and other live animals, and on hides and wool. We strenuously oppose placing hides on the free list, as is urged by tanners and manufacturers of leather and shoes, while retaining those articles on the dutiable list, and declare that it would be the worst sort of discrimination against the stock raiser and the farmer, with no resultant benefit to them or to the public.

We shall be glad to furnish information in support of these views, and invite you to call on us for the same.

We call your special attention to Judge Cowan's testimony and briefs in published hearings of Ways and Means Committee. (See pp. 3711–3774, 5559–5572, 6341–6343.)

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
H. A. JASTRO, *President, Bakersfield, Cal.*
T. W. TOMLINSON, *Secretary, Denver, Colo.*
THE CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
IKE T. PRYOR, *President.*
H. E. CROWLEY, *Secretary, Fort Worth, Tex.*
S. H. COWAN,
Attorney for the Associations, Fort Worth, Tex.

Address: J. L. KENNEDY,
In charge of Washington Office.

Whereas there has been passed in the lower branch of the United States Congress the Payne tariff bill (H. R. 1438), wherein the hides of cattle have been placed on the free list, while on the other hand all manufactured articles of leather have been placed on the dutiable list at from 5 per cent to 75 per cent ad valorem; also all wools and woolen goods and all agricultural products of the farms are reasonably protected; and

Whereas the present Dingley Act provides by sufficient drawback-duty clauses and the interpretation of the law by the Treasury Department to protect the tanners and manufacturers of leather in the course of their foreign trade by virtually reducing the duties to the free list; and

Whereas the hides of cattle being a finished product to the producer any change in the present duty of 15 per cent would work a great injury to our industry; and

Whereas the present campaign for free hides is only a move to put the now-derived revenue to the credit of the tanner and manufacturer of leather and to give them an opportunity to dictate to the large killers of cattle and would never reduce the price of shoes or leather goods: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Laramie County Cattle and Horse Growers' Association on this 25th day of May, That we do protest against any change in the present Dingley duties.

The fact is, hides of cattle are no more a by-product of cattle than wool is of sheep.

While the duty on wool is not just now being generally protested against by eastern manufacturers, yet there are a few at the present moment who say the same thing regarding wool and mutton as the free-hide people say about hides and beef.

There have been long years of struggle between woolgrowers and manufacturers, until at last it seems to be recognized that it is the wool raiser's right to have a tariff. The same is true exactly in the case of the farmer and cattle grower. The only reason why we are now pursued by those desiring free hides is that only a few years have elapsed since they had free hides

for a time, and they are now hungry again for the little difference, even though it be a cent or a little more per pair of shoes, which the leather and shoe men make and which they have no intention of dividing with the consumer.

It is the same old time-worn and specious appeal of the free trader to the selfish side of the manufacturer's nature.

The dogmatic statement that the farmer gets no benefit from the 15 per cent duty on hides has been so often and aggressively made that possibly some of its advocates believe it. But I deny the truth of the assertion just as vigorously as they make it. The only proofs that are offered—and I find the statement running through all kinds of memorials, pamphlets, and letters sent to Members of Congress—consist in tables showing prices of beef at the packing houses in Chicago on different days in different months and the prices of hides at corresponding times, showing that sometimes beef is lower and hides are higher, and sometimes hides are lower and beef is higher. That forms the only argument and the sum total of proof offered in support of the oft-repeated dogma.

To those who know anything of the business, the proof is as convincing as that of the boy who undertook to prove the truth of the Mother Goose rhyme about the cow jumping over the moon. It happened to be a moonlight night. A cow stood under a neighboring tree calmly chewing her cud. The boy said: "Yes; I believe the cow jumped over the moon, and I can prove it. Just look over there—there's the moon; and just look under that tree—there's the cow. That proves that the cow jumped over the moon."

Of course the prices of hides and beef vary. One goes up and the other goes down, exactly as do the prices of mutton and wool. The market of one has nothing whatever to do with the market of the other. The price of beef may be, and generally is, high in late winter and early summer, and lower in late summer and fall, because in the one case there has been a large amount of grain or stall feeding necessary, and no beef has come directly from the grass, while in the other case the stock has been taken directly from the pastures and has not had a long season of expensive stall feeding.

Mutton may be high at a time when wool is low, or may be low when wool is high; but that does not prove that the wool on the sheep's back is a by-product and that the farmer gets no benefit from it. The cases are exactly parallel. It may be claimed by some that there is a difference in that sheep, or some of them, live after they are shorn; but against that lies the fact that some ten or twelve million sheep are slaughtered every year, a large proportion of which are lambs, a little less or more than a year old, that have never been shorn, and all the wool they have ever grown goes with their hides.

The Boot and Shoe Recorder, addressed especially to "Senators and Representatives at Washington," contains the usual declarations, first, that farmers and cattle growers derive no benefit from the duty on hides, and, second, that the beef packers are the sole beneficiaries from said duty.

It says:

The Dingley bill placing a duty of 15 per cent on hides became a law, I think, in July, 1897, and its effects on the price of hides were almost immediate. For illustration, please note that according to this table the price of native steers in Chicago, April 3, 1897, was $5.40 per hundred pounds, and the price of hides taken from the same animals on that date was 9 cents per pound.

On October 2, 1897, native beef steers had advanced to $5.50 per hundred pounds, or 2 per cent, while the hides taken from them had advanced 16 per cent above the price of April 3, 1897.

Of course it was expected that the imposition of the duty would raise the price of hides enough so that western stock growers could send their hides to market and have something to show for them over the freight paid. Before, the freight had amounted to more than they could obtain for their hides; consequently the hides were not marketed, but were buried or otherwise disposed of.

The claim is made by Mr. Goodbar, whose words I have just quoted, that the packer buys an animal at $5.40 per hundred pounds and gets 9 cents a pound for its hide, and consequently makes $3.60 per hundred profit. Evidently he never saw an animal butchered or he would know that an animal bought in gross weight shrinks nearly half after the wastes are thrown away, and therefore the hide, meat, and so forth must bring twice or more the price paid per pound on the gross weight, in order that the killer may get out even. And yet the editor of this yellow (in color) paper says that Mr. Goodbar's arguments in his letter are practically unanswerable, and that the gentleman has done some excellent campaign work in placing this large amount of valuable information before Senators and Representatives.

There are many correspondents to this paper whose letters are copied.

One says:

I believe we should have free hides and a high tariff on shoes.

Another says:

We are all aware of the fact that there does not exist any combination amongst the shoe manufacturers, but that there is a very strong one amongst the tanners.

And he therefore asks that Senators shall rescue the poor makers of foot wear from the clutches of the tanners. And, by the way, it is the tanners who are demanding free hides.

Another correspondent says:

Were the duty taken off, beef would be more in demand and could be retailed to the consumer at a price per pound within the means of the most humble laborer and his family, at the same time making a greater demand for beef as well as the hides.

And he adds:

Why not help the farmers?

Perhaps other Senators may catch the point of this lucid argument. I have been unable to do so.

Another correspondent says:

We have used all our powers of persuasion with our customers to induce them to take active steps in influencing public opinion in their own localities in favor of free hides.

And this correspondent adds:

Much talk has been made that if hides are put on the free list shoes would get somewhat cheaper. On the contrary we are firmly of the opinion that they are not going to be cheaper.

Then we find a number of other correspondents who take the same view. For instance, one says:

While advocating the removal of this duty, it is necessary to convert some of the absurd ideas now prevailing in the public mind and even finding lodgment in the ideas of many retail dealers, namely, that if the hide duty be removed shoes will be shaded the 15 per cent. In other words, a shoe now costing $3 can be then sold for $2.55, and so on down the line. We hope the Recorder will take hold of this erroneous idea, so that proper appreciation of correct conditions may be obtained.

We find reports from many other correspondents, such as the following:

Prior to the Dingley bill the price of packers' cowhide was 4 cents; to-day it is 13¾ cents.

The 4-cent market to which this man refers prevailed at the time I have described, when the western cattle growers were burying or otherwise disposing of their beef hides, as they were worth nothing for shipment, the freight being more than the hides would bring in market.

On the other hand, 15 per cent on a hide could not possibly account for any such difference as he records. It might raise the price 1 or 2 cents.

The same man says further:

Should the duty remain on hides, the shoe trade will suffer a setback from which it will take years to recover, as it will interfere with our small export business, which we are at present securing.

And so it is for the exporter, and not for the consumer, that he wants the tariff removed And he thinks a 500 per cent increase in exports, about 50 per cent a year, in a straight-away run of ten years is not rapid enough. In would seem to an ordinary business man, outside of the shoe business, that it would be "going some" to have the assurance that his business would increase 500 per cent in ten years.

Still another correspondent says:

The fine Italian hand of the packers, as was expected, put in an appearance at the last moment, and we are now facing an amendment proposed in the Senate retaining the duty on hides and a reduction of 40 per cent in the duty on shoes. The situation is alarming. * * * Will the packers again win out? If our people will only stand together, shoulder to shoulder, as they have been doing since this tariff agitation began, I believe the people will win out.

And finally, after searching throughout this remarkable document, which is officially directed especially to the Senators and Representatives in Congress by the boot and shoe trade, I find two things of remarkable prominence:

First. That not a single correspondent is willing to drop his protection on leather and shoes to obtain free hides; and, second, that with a single exception, not one promise or hint of a promise is contained as to lower prices on shoes.

Now, here is another yellow authority upon the subject of hides. This is styled "A common-sense appeal," and is addressed to the Congress. After stating that "it (meaning the duty on hides) crept into the act during the conference hours," and after the usual dogmatic declaration that the duty benefits only the packers, it says:

There are many substitutes for beef for food, but sole, harness, belting, furniture, and other leather can not be made from anything but cattle hides.

Then the document further states:

But since the imposition of the duty of 15 per cent, exports of leather made from dutiable leather have not increased and the exportation of heavy leathers made from the domestic hides has practically stopped. All other leathers made from nondutiable hides and skins have enjoyed

a steadily increasing export business. * * * They not only are turning back the tide of leather exports, but actually are invading our shores.

Both of these last assertions are as untrue as the first one. I have here [exhibiting] samples of different kinds of substitutes for furniture, carriage, automobile, and other leather, which are in very common use. Some of it can be found on the furniture in my committee room, and doubtless in most of the committee rooms, and in hotels, cars, carriages, and automobiles.

Why should we not increase our exports of sole leather when the exporter gets a drawback on exported leather of all the duty he paid on imported hides?

This sheet also says:

Testimony shows that on the high-priced shoes the value is affected 2 or 3 cents per pair by the duty.

And with generosity remarks that—

We are perfectly willing that we be given free hides, and ask that the duty on leather be cut in half—that is, reduced from 20 to 10 per cent.

It will be noted what a magnanimous offer that is—that the grower may give up all of his protection for the benefit of the leather man, while Mr. Leatherman is willing to forego a half of his protection in return. This seems to be a new way of doing things by halves.

Concerning letters, petitions, printed matter, and so forth, when I went home in April I took occasion to visit shoe stores in my town and the banks and asked them the authority under which they wrote and why they wrote suggesting free hides. Well, in two of the cases they knew nothing about it, but finally upon investigation a clerk said, "Yes; they came in with a petition and I signed it. I did not know what else to do with it." I went to a banker. He said, "I do not know anything about it, but I sent it down to you for what it is worth. I care nothing about what you do with it."

Similar explanations would account for many thousands of names that have been sent here in these petitions. I have presented the petitions; almost every Senator has presented them. It is the duty of a Senator to present petitions. It is the right of the American citizen to address the Congress by petition. We have had tons and tons, and I might say almost millions of tons, of them in the last hundred of years, and they have very much likeness one to the other.

I have here a great flaming placard covering the whole side of a newspaper that appeared in certain western publications as a paid advertisement. I have here papers showing the organization of the great Central leather trust.

They take in the New York Sun more than one-half of one of the pages, and put their advertisement in a reading-matter column. It is hard to discover as an advertisement, but almost a fortune is paid for its insertion, which shows the extravagance of the great Central leather trust, which swallowed up the United States trust and others; which represents hundreds of tanners—a trust that is at the bottom of these disturbances; a trust that does not care much what statements it makes and does not expect to be called upon to prove its statements; a trust that has shown an accretion of wealth and properties heretofore that ought to credit its officials with intelligence and integrity and prevent them from stating to the country and to the Senators such foolish falsehoods as the one about the hide duty being slipped into the Dingley bill while it was in conference twelve years ago.

I have here, but I will not take the time to read it, the exact property that this so-called "meat trust" or "packers' trust" own and use as tanneries. One of the largest packing concerns in Chicago—one of the "Big Four," the National Packing Company—has not a dollar of interest in any tannery, but sells all of its hides. All the packing concerns sell largely of their hides. No one of them tans all its hides, or expects to.

I will ask to insert in the RECORD the figures.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 28, 1909.*

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WARREN: In lieu of some data which was recently furnished you relative to the United States Leather Company, we are now furnishing you our latest information.

When the United States Leather Company was organized, it bought outright and has since operated about 100 tanneries scattered throughout the country. When, later on, the Central Leather Company was organized to take over the United States Leather Company, that concern (the Central Leather Company) absorbed about one dozen more tanneries. All these tanneries, with one or two exceptions, are now operated in the name of the United States Leather Company or the Central Leather Company. The American Hide and Leather Company owns and operates over 100 tanneries.

Armour & Co. only operate and own one tannery, and that is located in Sheboygan, Wis. That plant tans for Armour & Co. about 150,000 hides per annum. Armour & Co. produce about 1,250,000 hides per annum. All these hides produced by Armour & Co., including those tanned by its Sheboygan plant, are sold on the open competitive market; their Sheboygan plant buys the hides from Armour & Co. the same as any other tanning concern. Armour & Co. has no other tanning plant, or any contracts. Armour & Co., however, are interested in the concern of Winslow Brothers & Smith, of Massachusetts, by a small stock interest in that company. Winslow Brothers & Smith simply handle sheepskins.

Swift & Co. own the control of A. C. Lawrence & Co., of Peabody, Mass. This concern does a general tanning business, but most of its product is upper leather. Swift & Co., we understand, have tanned under contract a small percentage of their hides. On the whole, the tanning of Swift & Co., either under contract or through A. C. Lawrence & Co., is only a small percentage of their total hide production.

It is safe to estimate that the big packers have tanned themselves, or under contract, less than 25 per cent of their total output of hides.

Very truly, yours.

———.

Mr. WARREN. But, Mr. President, I am very glad to say that we have men in New England, we have men in the Middle States, we have men in Massachusetts, who do not believe in free hides. With a timidity that prevents me from entering deeply into the subject in the absence from the Chamber just at this moment of both Senators from Massachusetts, I will not say what I think is the proportion of the Massachusetts people who favor free hides as against a tariff on hides, but I will admit that free hides is a great fad there. It is something like the hysteria, if I may term it such, that swept over the western country regarding silver some years ago.

There are men there who seem to rise in the morning with nothing in view but a calfskin or a steer skin. One of her governors, and a charming man he is, wrote to the President of the United States, after he had first seen him about the subject, asking that a message be sent to Congress advocating free hides.

To be more explicit, Governor Douglas, of Massachusetts—a great governor, representing the Democratic party and representing the shoe industry—and Curtis Guild, also a great governor, representing to a great extent the shoe people and sundry others, came to Washington to interview President Roosevelt, and to make sure that everything was right they put their prayers in writing. President Roosevelt answered them, and those documents have been printed and are here with us now.

I remember one expression of the President. Its meaning was burned in on my memory then and it has remained there; and, in my judgment, it was one of the bright jewels in the diadem of the man who had probably a greater vote and could have again had a still greater vote for President than any other American citizen. He said to these men: "I am glad to hear your complaints. I will look into this matter. If a wrong is being done, I will try to correct it." I am not giving his exact words.

"But," he said, "there are many localities to be considered in this great country. There are many subjects to be considered, interdependent subjects, and I can only promise you to give this matter my earnest attention." Those were the words of a statesman and a fair and generous man—Theodore Roosevelt.

Now, Mr. President, in that letter that I am speaking of the case was so urgent that our friend Governor Guild said to the President: "Free hides are an anathema in Massachusetts." Mr. President, has it come to a pass in Massachusetts that the difference between a curse and a blessing is only 15 per cent ad valorem upon 23 per cent of a product so base in fabric as the bad-smelling hide of a dead steer?

Shall it be bliss if they can wipe out a small benefit where it is announced by the governor of a great State to the President of the United States that a certain policy is a curse? Is this Senate ready to accept the statement that Massachusetts is under a curse, and that the trouble is so urgent that the President of the United States had to be sought? Why was he sought? He was sought and it was almost demanded of him that he send a message to Congress requiring them to undo the wrong that had been surreptitiously done—as was falsely represented—by the Senate of the United States in the expiring hours of a special session called to legislate on the tariff in 1897.

But they are not all that way, I may say; and I say it with pleasure. Here is one of the great builders and greatest manufacturers of Massachusetts, Mr. William Whitman, who says:

THE TARIFF REVISIONIST: AN EXAMPLE OF THE NATURE OF HIS DEMAND.

History repeats itself. As in 1871 and 1890, there is to-day a group of men in this Commonwealth who sound a note of discontent and clamor loudly for immediate tariff revision. The most persistent members of this group, the boot and shoe manufacturers, we may study as examples. They insist on the removal of the 15 per cent duty on hides imposed by the act of 1897, and they have joined in a petition to the Congress of the United States for a reduction or abolition of that duty among others. The petition is based upon the allegation that the manufacturing interests of the Commonwealth are not prospering; that they can only be restored to a condition of prosperity by abandoning the present broad scope of the protective policy and by granting free raw materials to certain manufacturers.

At the outset the allegation in the petition, that the industries of the Commonwealth are not prosperous, may be denied. The industries of Massachusetts are in a far more prosperous condition now than they have ever been. The census statistics of ten leading industries in the Commonwealth can only be interpreted as showing a marked advance in our industrial progress since 1900.

It is without any spirit of envy or malice that these statements are made with reference to the claims of the boot and shoe manufacturers. I wish success for the boot and shoe industry, as for all Massachusetts industries. I am in hearty sympathy with any legislation that will promote the prosperity of Massachusetts or of any industry in Massachusetts, for I believe that the true prosperity of any one industry adds ultimately to the prosperity of other industries and to the general welfare. (Industrial Interdependence, by William Whitman, Boston, 1906. An address.) I am opposed, however, and shall always be opposed, to any legislation which will favor Massachusetts at the expense of the country at large, or will favor any one industry in Massachusetts or elsewhere to the detriment of other kindred industries.

The 15 per cent duty on hides should not be removed, because its removal is sought on erroneous grounds and for selfish reasons. Its removal will be of no real advantage to the boot and shoe manufacturer, and will prove inimical to our other industries and to the true interests of Massachusetts.

* * * * * * *

The present agitation is dangerous. An effort to relegate to the free list the products of the farms and ranches of the Middle and far West *will tend to alienate* sections which have stood steadfastly for our present system. If such effort succeeds in spite of the opposition of the West, which is increasing rapidly in political power, retaliation will supplant cooperation, and when the next tariff law is to be framed the manifold interests of Massachusetts and New England may be less favorably treated than under the present act. This is my personal opinion, but it is shared also by Members of the House of Representatives, past and present, who know the temper of that body.

The mayor of Boston, though not a protectionist, recognizes the difficulty, if not the inconsistency, of the position taken by those participating in this agitation. In a recent speech to the New England Shoe and Leather Association, he acknowledged that "the men from the South and the West laugh when we appeal now for free hides, free coal, free lumber, and free wool, and say that Massachusetts has too long been feeding at the Treasury, and that it is now time that their sections get a chance. There is no question about this belief, and we must not only combat this opinion, but we must inform these men of the true state of affairs."

This is significant from an ex-Congressman, who is in hearty sympathy with the demands of the boot and shoe manufacturers. The Members of Congress from the Middle and far West, the sections of the country which will be affected by the changes urged, are at present strongly opposed to the extension of the free list to cover the productions of their States. Is it wise, therefore, to arouse their opposition?

* * * * * * *

THE DUTY HAS NOT HINDERED IMPORTATION OF HIDES.

Prior to 1873 there was a duty on hides. In 1873 that duty was removed, and yet from 1874 to 1876 the value of the imports of hides entered for consumption decreased from $13,524,733 to $10,242,874.

In 1882 the imports were valued at $23,026,402. Then began a decline, until in 1894 the imports were only $7,665,792 in value, less than one-half that of twenty years earlier. This enormous decline in importations took place under the law admitting hides free of duty. It is strange that such should be the case if the duty injures our import business, as alleged. But let us consider the more recent periods.

The imports of hides (now dutiable) for the five years—1893 to 1897, inclusive—were valued at $70,392,256, while those for the five-year period—1899 to 1903, inclusive—were valued at $79,853,805, or $9,461,549 more than in the earlier period when hides were free. It is interesting to note that during the past fiscal year our imports have increased about 46 per cent in value and 38 per cent in quantity over those of the previous year. These facts demonstrate that the duty has not caused diminished importation or rendered it more difficult to get supplies for the home industry.

EXPORT OF SOLE LEATHER UNABATED.

Nor has the duty prevented the export of sole leather and other leather by the tanners of the United States. An examination of the exports of sole leather for a dozen years or more discloses the fact that they have been practically the same since 1897 as before.

* * * * * * *

Our exports of sole leather alone in the year 1904 were 44 per cent in pounds of the hides imported. Had the sole leather that was exported been needed in this country, or could it have been marketed at as high a price in this country as in other countries, such exports would not have been made.

This was written, I may say in justice to this man, before we had suffered the dullness and panic, if you wish to call it such, of 1908.

There is your free-hide history for you. Commencing right at the initial point where hides were free, after the old tariff, which was 10 per cent upon all hides and skins, you find there commenced immediately a reduction; finally they rallied and had a small increase; but again they go along, and in a term of twelve years they tumble back from $23,000,000 to $7,665,000. This is the evidence of one of the manufacturers of Massachusetts. His are the official figures taken from United States authoritative publications.

The newspapers of Massachusetts are not all supporting free hides. I send an extract to the Secretary's desk, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURTON in the chair). If there be no objection, the extract referred to by the Senator from Wyoming will be read from the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

No tariff law has ever been made solely in the interests of one State, and never will be. We can not have both free raw materials and protected finished products. If we are for protection, we must be willing to have protection granted to raw materials as well as to manufactured products. If we are for free trade, then we must have both free raw materials and free manufactured products. Massachusetts can not play both ends of the game.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is from the Springfield Union, of Springfield, Mass., a leading Republican newspaper of that State.

Here is an item taken from the Boston Advertiser, a very short one, of date November 6, 1905. It shows what the feeling was then. It opens another line, which I wish to approach for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the extract will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE MASSACHUSETTS POSITION.

[From the Boston Advertiser.]

The threat that free hides may mean the loss of duties on leather goods will never frighten the Massachusetts men who are in the reciprocity movement. If our Washington contemporary means it as a threat, such a warning would be useless, for every Massachusetts man who is talking free hides also intends to submit gracefully to lose the duty on boots and shoes. That is felt to be only fair. So while the Washington comment may have been intended to frighten the manufacturers into silence as to the duty on hides, there is little doubt that some noted Boston people will say to the President that Massachusetts stands ready to see the duty taken off from protected boots and shoes, especially if the duty is taken from hides. That is one reason why the reciprocity campaign has come so near to success in this State. The manufacturers are the first to admit that this is the only logical course in the very nature of things.

Mr. STONE. What is that extract from?

Mr. WARREN. That is from the Boston Advertiser of five or six years ago. I want to explain that that was the position taken by the shoe men of Massachusetts, and I think by others at that time. That was at a time when they felt absolutely secure in their peculiarly invented machinery and felt that they were unassailable from every quarter. They were demanding free hides then as now, without any promise of a lowering of the price of shoes. Since that time, as I have explained, this new machinery has become the property of the world, to those who have the money to buy it, and while they commenced in the testimony before the other House that same style of independence and free shoes, of bravado, if I may be permitted to call it so—and I say it respectfully, for if there is any class of people in the world for whom I have respect, it is the thrifty manufacturer of Massachusetts, though I may differ from him in his judgment—one after the other they were forced into a different position. If we should take the duty off, they wanted to have free eyelets and the duty taken off of trimmings, linings, and so forth.

Yes; they would favor free shoes, provided they could have free eyelets, free linings, and several other things. Finally, we find as we go along that every last mother's son of them has, as near as I can find, with two exceptions, either come back by long letters or they have asked their friends to state that they wish to withdraw what might have been considered their consent to free boots and shoes, and they made then the sensible appeal for protection that they ought to have made in the first place, and dropped their bravado. They said they believed they ought to have a tariff on leather and on boots and shoes, because foreign countries had secured the Yankee machinery which had been invented in New England, and upon which the patents had expired, and were now able to compete successfully; so that in order to protect their operatives, they needed a tariff on boots and shoes.

I regret that it is necessary to offer criticism against any citizen or class of citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. But, disliking as I do to criticise, I think adverse comment is justifiable when we see a class of manufacturers protected by adequate duty levied upon importations of manufactured articles competing with their own, reaching out for still further benefits by demanding free material from abroad which competes with the productions of the farmer and stockman of the West and South.

I am glad to point out that there are other notable exceptions in Massachusetts to this spirit of self-benefaction. A notable instance is afforded in the publication the Protectionist, published in Boston by the Home Market Club and edited by a faithful and consistent Republican protectionist, Col. Albert Clarke, who, in a recent newspaper interview on the principle of mutuality of interests, said:

If we are to have a tariff on hides, we must have a tariff on leather and leather manufactures. * * * Since the Senate placed a duty on hides I have heard from the leather manufacturers. When the House took the duty off hides and leather they were satisfied, but now that the Senate has put back the duty on hides they insist that the Dingley rates on leather manufactures be restored. The leather men are willing to take their chances so long as they have free hides, but if they can possibly help themselves they will not stand for a duty on hides and no duty on manufactured articles.

Although published in the camp of the leather manufacturers and the tanners, who have been conducting the campaign for free hides, the Protectionist has had the courage of its convictions and has stood for tariff uniformity. In its issue of September, 1908, the following appears editorially:

HIDES OF CATTLE.

The agitation of this subject two or three years ago quieted down after the Democratic leaders in Congress gave notice to the shoe manufacturers that they would not consent to a repeal of the 15 per cent duty without a guaranty of reduction in the prices of shoes. As the shoe and harness industries have greatly prospered, the duty is not considered a serious burden, and the agitation for its repeal was largely political. One of the worst effects of the duty grows out of the drawback on exported leather. The foreign buyer demands and usually gets a concession of the whole or a part of this drawback, and thus has an advantage over the domestic buyer. A large manufacturer of shoes suggests that if the duty can not be repealed the drawback had better be.

In consistence with these views on hides, the same article refers to wool and woolens as follows:

WOOL AND WOOLENS.

This is the most difficult schedule in the entire tariff, because wool-growing must be protected and manufacturers must be allowed an extra duty to compensate for it. The present schedule is the result of years of conferences—"battles" some have called them—between the growers and the manufacturers and of long study by experts and by committees of Congress. While some of the manufacturers would like lower duties, particularly on carpet wool, and while dealers as well as manufacturers would like to substitute an ad valorem duty for a specific duty on heavy-shrinkage wools, so that they would not have to pay for grease and dirt, yet the difficulties of agreeing are so great that most of them say they prefer a continuance of existing arrangements to the evils that they know not of. In products which have to compete with cotton goods, like hosiery, the wool duty is said to force a large use of poor shoddy, but just how to remedy it and still protect wool is an unsolved problem.

Notwithstanding other branches of agriculture have been increasingly profitable and tempting, sheep husbandry has held its own and gained moderately as a result of protection. The gain would have been much larger, especially in New England, New York, and Ohio but for the dog nuisance. An increase of sheep for both wool and mutton is most desirable; hence, in the interest of consumers, tariff changes of a discouraging character should not be made.

The woolen and worsted manufacture has made gratifying progress. In 1905 the capital employed in it was $370,861,691, the wages paid $70,797,524, and the value of the product $380,934,003, the last item showing a gain of 28.3 per cent in five years. Improvement in the quality of the product was equally marked, some of the mills now turning out cloths that compare favorably with the best made abroad and at lower prices.

It remains true, as demonstrated by Senator ALDRICH in 1894, that if the whole duty on wool were added to the cost of a 5-pound suit that ordinarily retails for $20, it would increase the cost only about 65 cents, and most of it would be shared by the manufacturer and dealer.

In the issue of February, 1909, the Protectionist editorially emphasized the importance of consistency and uniformity in tariff legislation, as follows:

With adequate protection we have prosperity, unless some other cause than the tariff brings adversity. With inadequate protection we always have adversity, unless some other and paramount condition prevails. All the people desire prosperity. They expect Congress to give them the necessary tariff conditions. In case of doubt, it will be far better to fix duties too high than too low, for in the former case the law of supply and demand will keep the price reasonable, while in the latter case the supply will be diminished by closing industries. Employment, the general employment of the people, is the one great thing to be looked out for.

All this inevitably leads to the conclusion that there should be substantial uniformity of protection in all the schedules. Mr. Carnegie, who does not reason as a protectionist, but as one who thinks ultimate free trade is desirable, says the steel duties can be and should be heavily reduced or repealed, although he admits it would have little or no effect on prices. Why, then, run the hazard? When nothing is to be gained by repeal, the duties should stand as a safeguard against contingencies, the same as we keep a navy in time of peace. The Wilson law had a fairly good cotton schedule, and some of the cotton manufacturers thought they could prosper—perhaps all the better because the woolen mills had to shut down. They learned better. They learned the great lesson that all must prosper or none can in the long run. Hence scrapping between industries is a very narrow and dangerous policy. Hence piecemeal revision is unscientific and disturbing. Hence taking one industry at a time, as Cobden advised Louis Napoleon to do, and as Carnegie advises now, is to divide and be conquered.

Showing whether the New England shoe manufacturers and tanners would consent to have boots and shoes and leather-manufactured goods admitted free if hides were made free, the Protectionist published the result of a canvass on the question, as follows:

FREE SHOES FOR FREE HIDES—AN INTERESTING CANVASS BY THE BOSTON COMMERCIAL BULLETIN—NEW ENGLAND SHOE MANUFACTURERS, 311 FOR, 64 AGAINST—TANNERS, 29 FOR, 11 AGAINST.

The Boston Commercial Bulletin, always enterprising, trustworthy, and interesting, in the number for February 21, published the results of a canvass conducted by itself of all the shoe and leather manufacturers in New England on the inquiry: "If hides are made free, will you consent to have your products free?" The names of the persons, firms, or companies answering were published under "yes" or "no," the result being as stated in the heading.

Commenting upon this, the Protectionist said:

Protection is and must be national. Owing to differences in industries and in world competition, its direct benefit is less to some than to others and may be less needed at one time than at another; but it benefits all alike indirectly, and no class should permit itself to be turned from it by prosperity, by temporary conditions, by any conceit of superiority, by any mistaken conception of it as a "local question," or by the persistent efforts of the Cobdenites to "divide and conquer." Shoes and cottons and woolens and silks, the finished products of the farm and mine and the finished products of the factory, must stand together or they will fall together. Duties may be, and in due time should be, readjusted to conform to new conditions, but at no time and in no industry should the great and beneficent principle be abandoned or be considered no longer necessary, for, like an efficient navy, it defends us in war and secures us in peace.

The Massachusetts legislature is sometimes heard from as follows:

Resolutions relative to the removal of the duty on hides.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts favors the removal of the duty upon hides.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted, March 21, 1905.

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 24, 1905.

Resolutions relative to the removal of the duty on hides.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts favors such action by the Congress of the United States as will cause the removal of the duty upon hides.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

Resolutions relative to the temporary removal of the tariff upon coal.

Resolved, That the general court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Congress of the United States to take measures forthwith for the removal of the tariff upon the importation of coal so long as the present strike among coal miners continues.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth.

I want to say that I stand here ready to give every manufacturer of leather and boots and shoes a proper tariff upon his product provided these manufacturers are willing to give every other manufacturer his meed of protection, including that which he may call his "raw material," though he may be the ignoble farmer.

Mr. President, next to Massachusetts, I think Wisconsin is probably in the forefront of this industry. I will send to the desk and ask to have read a little statement made by a Wisconsin man. It seems they are not all of one mind there. I ask the Secretary to read from where I have made the blue mark to the end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The country is flooded with literature attempting to show that the price of shoes would be immensely reduced if the 15 per cent duty on hides were removed, and request all to impress this illusion upon their Congressmen. How ridiculous!

I am a protectionist, and opposed to free hides, which would be at the loss of one and to the benefit of another class. Why protect the tanner and shoemaker and not the hide maker?

I believe in protecting one and all.

Hides are not raw material to the farmer, herder, or cattleman. They put more labor into it than the tanner or shoemaker. It is a manufactured product with them. What is raw material?

In the forest the trees,
The fishes in the seas,
The ores in the ground
Wherever they are found.

This is the limit of raw material. After you have located it, then commences labor, mentally and physically, to catch the fish, dig out the ore, chop down the trees.

I do not believe in the assertion that the packers derive the only benefit of the 15 per cent duty on hides.

If they are so independently powerful, they will surely make the cattle raiser stand the resulting loss by the removing of the 15 per cent duty on hides.

I see it is claimed that the value of the leather contained in a pair of common shoes is 40 cents. I assume the hide value of this is 20 cents; 15 per cent duty on this is 3 cents; and this is all free hides could possibly cheapen a pair of shoes. And as the laboring class will use about one pair a year, I think, and so does everybody else, that they will gladly contribute 3 cents a year merely to be just and give all a square deal.

JOHN SCHUETTE.

Mr. WARREN. Now, Mr. President, to contribute to the gayety of nations, I send to the desk and ask to have read just a few lines from a paper published in Philadelphia, that great manufacturing center. I want to say beforehand that, in my opinion, it does not represent the opinion of the majority of the people of Pennsylvania. I will not ask to have it read, but I will read it myself, as it is but a few lines. This paper says:

A WIDESPREAD OBJECTION.

[From the Philadelphia Press, May 6, 1909.]

If Senator DOLLIVER expressed the opinion of only a Western State or two in his protest against the cotton and wool schedules of the Senate tariff, he would represent a Republican opposition calling for serious consideration.

But Senator DOLLIVER voices a widespread objection. It is not only in the West that many Republicans have no desire to see rates horizontally advanced by new classifications, whose effect is not clear and whose result can not be known, but which are certain to advance rates. A revision upward is not wanted or desired by public opinion. The

rates which were high enough twelve years ago in the Dingley tariff are certainly high enough now after twelve years' growth in our manufactures.

Changes made should be chiefly downward, and a broad change is wise if conservative in character and sufficient protection is retained to meet the difference between labor here and abroad and furnish American maufacturers a fair profit.

When the Senate tariff wiped out the reduction in the duty on carpet wools in the Payne tariff, the restoration of the old and heavy duty on this raw material worked directly against the carpet industry of Philadelphia. This city needs lower duties on wool, free iron ore, free hides, and free lumber. Philadelphia is protection to the core, but it is for the protection that widens markets and increases the demand for labor and not for an advance in duties, which narrows both.

There is philosophy and benevolence for you.

Mr. DIXON. From what paper is that?

Mr. WARREN. This is from the Press, of Philadelphia. On the other hand, we sometimes get something from the New England States. I will send to the desk and have read something from a Connecticut paper, starting with the lines which are marked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Seriously, Senator BULKELEY, in a few timely and trenchant words, exposes the thorough selfishness, narrow-mindedness, and shallow 30-cent policy of that class of politicians and would-be political economists who practically cry "Everything for me and nothing for anybody else."

The Senators of Connecticut are representing steadfastly and honestly nine-tenths of the citizens and nineteen-twentieths of the business of Connecticut. More than that, they are representing the broad interests of all the people of all sections of the United States. For when you benefit one part of the Nation you benefit all. They are standing by the magnificent record of the Republican party, which not only preserved the Nation, but has given it the grandest government, based on the wisest policies and supported by the highest order of statesmanship of any government in the world.

Our honored Senators may well feel merry over the ridiculous figure cut by a certain free-trade sheet, whose old paint won't wash off or fade when posing as an advocate of the great material interests of Connecticut.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. BULKELEY. I should like to ask the Senator to give me permission to have that entire editorial article printed in connection with his remarks, as well as the portion of it which has been read.

Mr. WARREN. I ask that the whole editorial may go into the RECORD.

Mr. BULKELEY. It reflects, I think, the sentiment of nine-tenths of the people of my State, though it is not exactly in accord with the sentiment of some petitioners in the retail shoe business who have asked us to vote for free hides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked that the entire editorial, a part of which has been read, be published in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

"MR. SAMUELS."

Connecticut's grave and reverend seniors of the United States Senate must have felt inordinately moved to merriment when they chanced to glance over (if they ever do) the columns of our inordinately funny State street contemporary of yesterday morning in which appeared a leading editorial entitled "Connecticut's Senators."

It seems that a certain "Mr. Samuels," of somewhere, who avers himself to be fervently in love with the shoe business, also somewhere, and who is said to be "intelligently converted to the prosperity which is believed to lurk in the policy of free hides," has written to Senator BULKELEY imploring him to use his influence to compel western and southwestern cattle raisers to submit to the loss of several million dollars annually upon hides (an important part of the cattle industry) in order that a few small shoe factories, somewhere, might save a few thousand dollars from free leather out of which to make shoes amply protected.

"Mr. Samuels" modestly shrinks from suggesting "free boots and shoes" as a complementing factor with free hides. So it is poor "Mr. Samuels" who is, after all, at "the old game of 'heads I win, tails you lose,' played without a blush." It is "Mr. Samuels" (whoever he may be) who is shrieking "deals! deals! deals!" in favor of protected shoes, and against protected hides.

Senator BULKELEY very courteously reminds "Mr. Samuels" that there is, after all, some fairness and propriety in giving "the other fellow" some show in the game; and that the stripping of the cattlemen of their coats and taking cloaks also may be a subject for some serious consideration.

"Mr. Samuels," in his appeal for the earth, reminds us of the "Good Samaritan" story, where a certain good man, going down to "Mr. Samuels's" Jericho, encountered that gentleman ready for business. The good man's hide and tallow were abstracted, and he was left on the free-trade side of the road, in a bad fix. Good Senator BULKELEY happens along shortly afterwards, picks up the good man, pours oil into his wounds, wraps him in a protective-tariff mantle, and carries him tenderly to a quick lunch near by; so the poor fellow's life was spared, and all after that went well.

Seriously, Senator BULKELEY, in a few timely and trenchant words, exposes the thorough selfishness, narrow-mindedness, and shallow, 30-cent policy of that class of politicians and would-be political economists who practically cry: "Everything for me and nothing for anybody else."

The Senators of Connecticut are representing steadfastly and honestly nine-tenths of the citizens and nineteen-twentieths of the business of Connecticut. More than that, they are representing the broad interests of all the people of all sections of the United States. For when you benefit one part of the Nation you benefit all. They are standing by the magnificent record of the Republican party, which not only preserved the Nation, but has given it the grandest government, based on the wisest policies, and supported by the highest order of statesmanship of any government in the world.

Our honored Senators may well feel merry over the ridiculous figure cut by a certain free-trade sheet, whose old paint won't wash off nor fade, when posing as an advocate of the great material interests of Connecticut.

Mr. WARREN. Some of our newspapers have not been so kind to the Senators. I submit items from Chicago Tribune and Washington Post:

LEATHER MEN ACT—DENOUNCE TARIFF—BIG MASS MEETING OF MANUFACTURERS INSISTS ON REMOVAL OF THE PRESENT DUTY ON HIDES—MAKES APPEAL TO TAFT—LETTER OF PROTEST IS ORDERED SENT TO VARIOUS MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

[From the Chicago Tribune, April 25, 1909.]

A deluge of protests against the maintenance of the duty on hides of cattle, destined to reach President Taft and every Member of the United States Senate, was launched yesterday afternoon at a mass meeting of 200 representatives of the leather industries at the Grand Pacific Hotel.

In ringing resolutions and speeches, in which they declared that they are fighting for their business lives against the meat packers, who are declared to be gaining control of the leather business of the country, the shoe, harness, trunk, and leather manufacturers called upon the Finance Committee of the Senate to follow the example set by the House by eliminating the duty of 15 per cent on hides of cattle, which they fear will stand in the Payne tariff bill, as it stood in the Dingley bill.

DIRECT APPEAL TO TAFT.

The meeting, which was presided over by Fred Vogel, jr., president of the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, of Milwaukee, did these things:

Adopted a resolution urging the free import of cowhides and voted to send it to President Taft, every Member of the United States Senate, and to "Uncle Joe" CANNON, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Appointed a committee to go to Washington to interview President Taft and Senators ALDRICH, CULLOM, WARNER, and LA FOLLETTE, considered by the leather men to be the most important targets for attack.

Appointed a committee to visit Mayor Busse and ask him to send a telegram to Senator CULLOM telling him that the sentiment of his supporters in Illinois is for free hides.

Voted to send individual telegrams to every Senator.

In dorsed letter to Senator DOLLIVER written by A. D. Browne, of St. Louis, setting forth the situation from the view point of the leather men of the Middle West and explaining that, inasmuch as the hides sold by farmers are the hides of calves and small cattle, the free import of cowhides will not cause them hardships. Copies of the letter, with the indorsement of the meeting, will be sent to leaders of the "doubtful" element in the Senate.

Incidentally, in the transaction of the aforementioned business, certain individuals had difficulty in restraining their indignation sufficiently to speak of Senator CULLOM'S stand on the hide question with the temperateness which they desired to cultivate, so far as verbal references to him were concerned. They made no secret of the fact that they wanted to make a noise in Washington that would be remembered.

HAMILTON-BROWNE SHOE COMPANY,
By A. D. BROWNE, *President*.

The letter is indorsed by Roberts, Johnson & Rand Shoe Company, Brown Shoe Company, Peters Shoe Company, Glesecke, D'Oench, Hayes Shoe Company, Friedman-Shelby Shoe Company, and Wertheimer-Swarts Shoe Company.

One of the telegrams to a Senator read at the meeting was as follows:

"You must stand firm for free hides. The country outside the trusts demands it."

WANTS PRESSURE PUT ON CULLOM.

Mr. McFarland, whose firm is the M. D. Wells Company, in addressing the meeting, said:

"In 1897 a number of us put in a good deal of hard work in Washington. We got through the House all right, and were patted on the back, and were told we had a good thing. A representative of one of the largest packers said our efforts would be of no use. They were there lobbying to keep on the duty.

"Why is it they can control that Senate? We have a Senator, and why he says he is for tariff on cowhides I do not understand. We ought to bring something to bear on Senator CULLOM, and in strong language, too. He ought to stand with us. We are unanimous. We ought to do something to make him understand we mean business."

JUMP ON SENATOR SCOTT—FREE HIDE LEAGUE SORE BECAUSE OF HIS ATTITUDE.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1909.]

A delegation of tanners from West Virginia, representing what they call the "Free Hide League" of that State, to-day presented to Senator SCOTT the resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the league deprecating his advocacy of the duty on hides. A statement given out by the league declares that the duty on hides is detrimental to the tanning industry and is helpful only to the meat packers, also fostering a monopoly to extort unreasonable prices on leather and leather goods. The resolution adopted by the league urged Senator SCOTT to reverse his position.

The statement given out to-day signed by the president and secretary of the league says:

"The delegation called upon Senator SCOTT. The interview was unsatisfactory. He said his first duty was to secure protection for coal, lumber, iron ore, and brass. He charged that the tanners were actuated by selfish motives in asking for free hides. He would not say what motives prompted his fight for a duty on coal. The delegation will report back the outcome of the interview to the league which will soon meet at Keyser."

OPPOSE DUTY ON HIDES.

[From the Washington Post.]

KEYSER, W. VA., *May 4.*

A meeting of tanning and leather interests of West Virginia was held here to-day, nearly all the tanneries of the State being represented. A permanent hide league was organized, with H. K. Grubb, of Parsons, president, and L. C. Dyer, of Hambleton, secretary. It is claimed that the duty on hides is a serious handicap to the score or more of independent concerns in West Virginia, and the purpose of the league is to carry on an active campaign for free hides.

There we have the official statement as to what the consumer may get. Let me inquire, on the other hand, what is asked? I will tell you what is asked. It is asked of the farmers in the West and the great Northwest, sections which are populated in part by men formerly from the manufacturing States, who at least are on a level in patriotism and intelligence with those who remain—it is asked by those manufacturing States that we shall take off the duty on hides on the assumed proposition that it will accrue to the benefit of labor on the Atlantic coast. They are asking us to reduce our products, which must reduce our wages to labor in a portion of the country where it costs more for labor, where it costs more to support labor.

They are asking us to humiliate and humble our laboring men in the interest of the foreigners who come to the Atlantic coast and who are engaged in tanning, shoemaking, and so forth. Where will that land us? It just as surely lands us in the employment of Chinese and Japanese labor and bringing in help from the oriental countries as it is possible for the reduction of pay to be compatible with having sufficient help. We are now paying the very lowest price that we can in conscience pay, and raising hides and beef in a section of the country where it means more for a day's work than going in an automobile to the office and from the office to the factory and back in a day. It means men stripped to the skin and working in manual labor day after day, exposed to the elements, and sleeping under the blue heaven, with nothing to cover them a great part of the time. You are asking those who are getting simply enough to provide homes at their homesteads for their wives and children to still further mortgage those homes and raise cattle at a loss, or else you are asking them to dispense with that intelligent class of American labor that they now employ and take to the Chinese and the Japanese.

Mr. President, it would seem that elementary discussion of the principle of tariff for protection should be unnecessary in this debate, for there is no phase of it on which the American public needs enlightening at our hands. Tariff for protection has been discussed on every platform, in every county crossroads grocery store, in every school and college lyceum, in the columns of the newspapers, and it is entirely safe to say that in these discussions the question is debated with as much sincerity and perhaps as much knowledge of the subject as can be found on this floor.

But, from current criticisms in the press of the manner in which this present tariff bill is being framed, we are forced to conclude that some discussion of the elementary ideas of the principle of protection is necessary.

Fault is found that there is an interchange of support between different portions of the country, and that the representatives of States which have certain products for which protection is desired vote for protective duties on the products, not of their own, but of other States, whose representatives in turn vote for protective duties on the products of the States whose representatives have aided them. Put in plainer language, criticism is severe on what is designated "trading" in framing a tariff bill.

Despite this criticism and despite the criticism that doubtless will be made on this argument, I venture the assertion that the method of framing a tariff bill by compromises and by considering the needs and desires of every part of the country is proper.

The method means that no single section can have the benefits of the principle of protection without giving due heed to the wishes of other sections.

If the industries of New England and the Middle States, for instance, are to have the benefit of protection on thousands of articles manufactured in that part of the country, consideration should be given the welfare of other parts of the country dependent upon the protection of articles classed, perhaps, as raw material, but which are, in reality, finished product.

We of the West, with less than a half dozen items of production, have been making sacrifices through which the East, which supplies us with thousands of manufactured articles, has prospered. We are asking nothing unreasonable when we look to the East to make concessions and sacrifices, if you will, on the material we produce. In fact, the principle of surrendering what may be the natural rights of one part of the country for the benefit of all is as applicable to tariff legislation as it is to common law and practically all legislation. That each individual must surrender some of his inherent natural rights for the benefit of the whole is the basis and foundation of all law. And individuals and communities must make concessions and sacrifices in tariff legislation if a perfect law, beneficial to all, is to be framed.

Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that States other than the one so ably represented by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. CRANE] will join in the demand for free hides, but it is nevertheless true that the brains and push of the leather trust and of all this free-hide movement lies in Massachusetts. I can not express the regret I feel that Massachusetts, the old Bay State, the State that is the beneficiary under the proposed bill, perhaps to a greater extent than any other State in the Union, should take the lead, through her brilliant representatives here, in the matter of opposing the States of the Northwest, which derive but little direct benefit from the protective tariff.

Mr. President, the manufacturers of the New England and near New England States are a thrifty, intelligent, enterprising, and deserving people; but they pursue their business with a vigor and close attention which leads, I fear, toward too acute concentration. They grow rich and fat and lusty with confidence in themselves and their business, and they become forgetful of their cooperative forces.

They forget the tremendous motive power of the growing West and the Middle West, that power which in reality has carried the Eastern States into the placid waters of success. These eastern manufacturers give their whole strength of body and mind to their business, and I honor them for it; and when, as it seldom happens, they take a few hours or a few days or a few months off for recreation they scud across the briny ocean to some foreign country, to enjoy vacations there instead of turning to the West, that broad, unfolding, teeming country of industry, that is contributing so continuously and so largely to the profits of the Atlantic States.

I wish they might turn their eyes westward instead of crossing over to Europe, and go where, within their own country, they can view at close range the wide and growing domain that lies over the mountains to the west; that they might view the broad and fruitful fields which a few years ago, when we were children, our geographies designated as the "Great American Desert," but which is now a panorama of cultivated fields and hives of industry.

Let these manufacturers who are now demanding their pound of flesh and even more—although it was never written in the bond—learn that, instead of the interior of North America being the "Great American Desert," there now exists a great and growing country, overflowing with enterprise and industry, which is contributing daily, hourly, constantly, in fact, with her great efforts, achievement, and accumulations, to the older manufacturing States.

For, be it known, the great West has sent back to the parent States on the Atlantic coast for years about all of her earnings; and these earnings finally rest in the capacious pockets of the eastern capitalists.

I would that these men, some of whom have become provincial and selfish in the contemplation and enjoyment of their own success, would not forget those who have most contributed to that success; that they might see and appreciate their own country and its development instead of scudding across the waters to spend their vacations in viewing the wretched conditions of foreign labor and its mode of living, as they must do in the old countries. Let them go into the heart of their own hemisphere and among its people; let them view labor conditions among a people who are properly compensated; let the manufacturers of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other industrial centers visit the great Mississippi Valley, the Missouri Valley, the intermountain and the Rocky Mountain country itself, instead of visiting the Old World and its 2 by 7 wonders when compared with the marvelous wonders of our own country. Let them go to the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, to the Yosemite Valley, and to the Yellowstone National Park.

Indeed, let them visit the country lying near the foot of the Rocky Mountains, formerly termed "The Great American Desert," and see the wonderful result of irrigation; see what intensive irrigation has done in Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, on the Pacific coast, and in all of the great Western States lying between the mighty rivers and the Pacific coast. Let them go into Nebraska, Wyoming, Kansas, Colorado, and other Western States, where dry farming—the new method of farming—is being successfully practiced. Let them see how

enterprise, intelligence, and industry are being exerted in that great prairie country, which is being transformed from a sandy waste into a garden of productiveness.

Then these eastern manufacturers will better realize that they themselves are supplying all of this great and growing country with manufactured articles of necessity and luxury.

Let them remember, then, the fact that, with the thousands of articles upon which they have tariff protection, this protection can only be sustained and justified with the support of the great West and Middle West. Let them remember, Mr. President, that while they enjoy protection on thousands of articles in this tariff bill, there is only here and there an article upon which the West and Middle West can get the slightest direct benefit.

The very few articles which the West produces, and which are its finished products, and upon which it asks any protection at all, should be cheerfully granted protection, even without the asking, and in the fullest measure.

Do not try to teach us of the West that narrow proposition of selfishness—that very quintessence of selfishness—that goes to make up the policy of asking protection for everything one has to sell and free trade for everything one has to buy. Do not teach us of the West a theory of "spotted protection" (to borrow the phrase of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ELKINS), a protection granted to some States and denied to others. Do not teach us to forget the golden rule.

Of course, Mr. President, that Utopian condition that some of our manufacturing friends would like to enter upon—that everything they have to sell shall be protected, and everything they have to buy shall be free—is, like everything of an Utopian nature, unsafe to build upon.

Men and States that have pulled upon the rope long and faithfully to steer the eastern manufacturers' ship of fortune into a safe and comfortable harbor may sometime weary of their hold and refuse to longer bear so uneven a burden.

In former times, for many years and until quite recently, it has been necessary to bring to Washington at short intervals delegations from the different tribes of Indians to visit the "Great Father." The casual observer from the outside has seen little reason for doing this and has often caviled about the expense entailed thereby. But, Mr. President, the philosophy of it becomes apparent to those who dwell near the Indians and know more of their thoughts and nature.

The young bucks and fighting men of the Indian tribes, born on the reservation, growing up there and seeing only the few white men that are near by, become imbued with the idea, as they become strong, robust, and of fighting age, that the Indians are very numerous and able, and that they can whip all the white men of the Nation, who, from the Indian's contracted view point, are weak and few in numbers, and could be easily routed if vigorous warfare were made.

So there grows up sometimes among an Indian tribe the idea that they can whip the whole United States, and this feeling, if not interfered with, would become so strong among them that an Indian war would follow, with all its horrors and bloodshed. Therefore, educational trips across the country are prescribed for the purpose of showing the Indians what they might have to contend with.

Mr. President, I sometimes think that the manufacturers, living, as they do, in these beautiful manufacturing villages and, for that matter, in the cities, become so intent and so engrossed in their thrifty and profitable business that they overmeasure their own importance and strength and underestimate the importance and strength of others. They are apt to look out upon those rural people, those many millions of farmers, most numerous in the West, who are contributing to their success, as being of an inferior intelligence, inferior industry, and as inferior in staying qualities, and so they sometimes feel safe in ignoring those who have done most to build them up. In other words, after ascending to the topmost rung of the ladder, and having made a safe landing, they are apt to indulge in the delightful diversion of kicking over the ladder and preventing the other fellow from coming up—the one over whose shoulder they have reached the top of the ladder and who has held it steadily in place for them while they have mounted to safe and impregnable heights.

Mr. President, I do not claim to be a prophet, or the son of a prophet, or to be related to a prophet in the remotest degree, but I indulged in a sort of quasi prophecy in this Chamber in 1901, about 6 o'clock one morning, during a toilsome and tiresome all-day and all-night session, in discussing irrigation matters, a discussion which only ended on March 4 at noon, when the gavel fell upon the old Congress and the new one commenced. I stated then, as firmly and sincerely as I was able to utter it, the sentiment and warning that, in my judgment, there would never be another rivers and harbors bill passed by the Senate making provisions for vast expenditures by this Government until the Government had made provisions for conserving the waters of the West in reservoirs for irrigation, through appropriations in the rivers and harbors bill or in an independent measure.

Mr. President, I happened to guess right, and before the next rivers and harbors bill was passed we enacted the great irrigation act, which marked the very highest notch in the high tide of Theodore Roosevelt's popular administration. Since that time the most tremendous development has taken place in the West, and there is probably no one in this Senate or in the House of Representatives who, if he voted against the reclamation act, is proud of his vote, or anyone who voted for the measure who would now change his "yea" to "nay" if he were again offered the opportunity to vote upon it.

While it is not a case of "You tickle me and I will tickle you," at the same time, if protection is desired and required upon one industry, there is no possible reason why it should not apply to another. And just so soon as you ever depart from that, with the Nation's strength distributed as it now is, just that soon will you tear down the whole fabric of a protective tariff.

I am going to be pretentious enough and rash enough, perhaps, to venture a prophecy that if this bill or any following bill shall undertake to predicate its action upon the assumption that manufacturers shall be protected, and that so-called "raw materials," which are really the finished product of other labor, shall be free, and this rule shall be applied at the behest of the manufacturer, that moment the death knell will have been sounded for protective tariff as an economic principle, either of the Republican party or of the Nation. There is the great South, growing rapidly in every way, adopting new industries and enlarging old. There is the great Middle West, rivaling even now in wealth and size her sister States on the Atlantic coast. Then come the intermountain country, the mountain country, and the Pacific coast region, and the entire area of the United States outside of the New England and the old so-called "Middle States."

My eloquent friend from Massachusetts gave us a beautiful and deserved eulogium regarding Massachusetts and New England; and I am going to claim that I enjoyed it as much as any one of his hearers. He told us of the strength in voting power, and the strength in finance of that region. I am not going to contend against a single figure or a single statement he made regarding the great success and importance of those States, for I gloried in everything that he said in commendation of them and of their great industries. But I want to remind him that the total area of the eastern New England and Middle Eastern States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—is only 296,568 square miles, while the area of the West, Middle West, and South is 2,677,591 square miles. The population of the New England States, and so forth (census of 1900), is 32,730,987, while the population of the West, South, and so forth, is 43,263,588.

I want to remind him that the States in the Union whose percentage of increase in population was greatest, as shown in the two or three latest census returns, are the States of Idaho, North Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and other States in that region. And I want to remind the Senate—and I do it with pride—that if there is any growth or any development in this Nation they have to look for it to a larger extent in the South, the Middle West, and the West, for development in those sections must naturally be greater than it is possible for them to expect in the overcrowded portions of the eastern part of the United States. It is well enough to look a little way into the future.

These Western, Middle Western, and Southern States have very few industries in any one section; in fact, taking them altogether and considering their vast area, you can almost count on the fingers of your two hands the industries which are directly and beneficially affected in any one State by a protective tariff. Does anyone suppose for a moment that these people are going to continue to send Senators and Representatives to Congress to stand in their places and sit in their seats during these long and laborious sessions, from early morn until late at night, day after day, and ask nothing but to vote "yea" while these schedules, containing from 3,000 to 4,000 items of benefit to each of a few manufacturing States, are being considered, and then be denied some one or two or all of the two, three, or half dozen items of the sum total of protection asked for their own States?

Will the State of Wyoming, which to-day can only be directly benefited by the protective tariff on three articles—hides, coal,

and wool—be satisfied to send men here who will vote favorably on every proposition proposed by the Committee on Finance to give direct protection to thousands of items, and then have the two or three items in which she is interested put upon the free list?

Coal, wool, and hides are all products of capital and labor. All are the results of the expenditure of money and human endeavor. Each is the manufactured product, respectively, of the coal miner, the farmer, or the stock grower of the prairies and plains just as much as cloth is, or leather, or any of the other items of the manufacturer. Cloth is raw material to the tailor; leather is raw material to the shoe or harness maker.

Nay, if you strike down even one of these few things in which a Western State is interested, you inflict an injury to that State proportionate to striking out, say, one-third of the numerous benefits granted in this bill to the manufacturers of some of the other States, amounting to thousands of articles. Are you willing to have this particular niche of territory—Massachusetts—although admittedly one of the richest States in the Union, draw a line between the thousands of articles in which it is the beneficiary and the very few items in which the great West, Middle West, and South are interested?

If so, I venture to say that you will find those whom you have placed on the other side, and who have only the position of adversary left open to them, not only ready but even willing to be adversaries after the first shock of their grief is over at being cut off from the affection and friendship—aye, the love and relationship—which they have previously borne to this cherished, old, rock-ribbed, and, I am afraid, hide bound, or "free hide bound," dear old New England.

Mr. President, the old Bay State and the States near by—the manufacturing States—are the depositories or financial repositories that absorb about all the money we have in the West, especially the new West, for which we, of course, get value in consumption; they make profit.

It sometimes occurs to me to inquire of the manufacturing States where their market would be and what their support, except for the great West and South. We buy our boots and shoes and clothing of them. We buy largely of articles of food and drink, the tools we work with, the books we read, our life insurance to provide for those who come after us, and insurance to protect us against loss by fire or accident. The profit from all these lines finds its last resting place in Yankee land and the localities mentioned.

About all of the money we accumulate in the West goes to that group of States. They are the beneficiaries of thousands of articles under a protective tariff, while the great group of Northwestern States is directly benefited by only a baker's dozen or so. Therefore it seems to me the most spotted kind of protection for the State of Massachusetts to break out from the fold of protected industries, or, rather, I should put it, to draw the fold of protected industry around the commodities she makes or wishes to sell, leaving outside in the cold the Western States which have so lately stood by the principles of protection, although they meant thousands of dollars to the extreme East as compared with dimes to the Northwest.

Mr. President, there is a picture of a well-known man, whose face greets us in every city or town of any size in this country and extends to us an earnest appeal to read the legend under it. The legend under this picture of a bald-headed, pleasant-faced gentleman entreats us to "Buy Douglas $3.50 shoes; buy Douglas $4 shoes."

These prices never change. Hides may go up, or they may go down; hides may be free, or they may be taxed; but it is always the "$3.50 Douglas shoe." This man, although not the only one who advocates free hides, is universally acknowledged as the prime factor and leader of the movement. This face I speak of haunts me sometimes; and I almost believe that some of my friends may see it, as I sometimes think I see it, arising in the political horizon beyond the old Bay State. It seems to me that his free-hide banner must look more formidable and dangerous to those in the East and near by than it does to those at a distance and outside the borders of this man's native State.

If the correct way to vanquish a political opponent is to adopt his doctrines, then I can understand how certain persons, not on this floor, and certain newspapers adopt the free-hide banner, assuming, it is supposed, that by some legerdemain one may undertake to sit in two political chairs at one time without inviting a fall.

The great Douglas of Scottish warfare, we are told, was wont to cast the heart of Bruce far to the front of the line of battle and into the enemies' ranks, so that his men would push forward fighting to recover it. This modern Douglas's talisman is a free hide, and not only does he call upon political friends, but political enemies to assist him in his warfare, and sorry I am to see them aid him.

It may be possible for a State with every one of her own products carrying abundant protection to rule that everything she is compelled to buy shall be free, but I beg that Commonwealth to consider from whence will come the support of that doctrine or plan after it is fairly entered upon.

In the Massachusetts legislative assembly resolutions have heretofore been presented, and most or all of them have been passed at different times, demanding free hides, free coal, and free wool, free iron ore, and so forth, and that her delegation in Congress should act accordingly.

Notwithstanding the State of Wyoming has but three articles from which she receives direct benefit through tariff legislation—coal, hides, and wool—the representatives from Wyoming in this body, during the consideration of the present bill, as in legislation heretofore which affected the tariff, have voted "aye" upon every proposition that the Committee on Finance has brought in for protection of the thousands of articles that Massachusetts desires to have protected.

Now, Mr. President, I beg the Senate to look upon these two statements.

Into that infant State of Wyoming—one which has perhaps greater undeveloped resources and industries than any other in the Union—went many natives of Massachusetts and of other Eastern States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and all New England—old manufacturing, commercial Commonwealths. Some went, as I did, directly to the Rocky Mountain country. Others went first to western New York or, mayhap, as far as Ohio, and from there later on to Illinois or Iowa, and still later made another move to Nebraska or Kansas, and from there to the Great Plains.

All of them revere—yea, love—the land of their birth and early environment, and they have hoped and believed that affection and a desire for cooperation might exist in the East, from whence they came. It will be a rude awakening to those stanch lovers of the "'Way back East" to find that, commercially at least, they must seek other alliances, even in the South, where political differences have existed, but where to-day there are sympathy and friendship and a desire to extend commercial support.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]—the north of the South—recently stated upon this floor that he had discovered that the protection policy of some people was "protection in spots," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], in the extreme South, not only reiterated that statement, but announced the fairest proposition, it seems to me, that can be made regarding a protective policy, to say nothing of tariff for revenue—that the raw material of the farmer must receive protection, and the farmer himself must be protected, or there can be no successful policy of protection, and no tariff act that can be long sustained by the votes of this Union. I indorse fully that statement.

We farmers of the West are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the opulent East, and willingly so, but we must not be stripped entirely of our wage, or our allowance of corn, wine, and oil. Even the worm will turn.

Does Massachusetts wish to change her alignment? Shall the Douglas of the far East force the Republicans of Massachusetts to adopt his policy of free hides? And, if so, will he reciprocate and become a supporter of the Republican leaders of that State?

I do not know what may be the best policy in Massachusetts, but in other localities the safest position for the party is to stand upon its own principles and smite the enemy hip and thigh, and not lose from the tail gate of the wagon scores from its own forces while pulling in over the dashboard a few of the enemy's no-account stragglers.

Mr. President, I stated yesterday that I wished to invite the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and others in the Eastern States to the fact that the great success they have boasted of, the great war to which they contributed so valiant a force, has also been largely contributed to by the States for which I am now speaking, comprising the great Northwest.

Who will say that those who went out after being reared and educated in those great States did not carry as correct ideas of principles of protection, of morality, and of business integrity, as those who remained behind? Bred in the same way, of the same blood, why not give them credit for standing at least equal with these great States that have not only had the efforts of those who now represent them, but that are to-day basking in the sunshine of the success wrought in part by the efforts of those of us who spent our early lives there and then went out to build new States in a new country and contribute anew to the great power and wealth of the Nation?

All of these men revere and love the States from whence they came. I meet in my daily rounds, when at home in the new State of Wyoming, 2,000 miles from here, men who came from every one of the New England and Middle States. We meet as brothers and are proud of our lineage, proud of the States we left.

We meet men from New York; we meet men from Pennsylvania; we meet men from Delaware; we meet men from the South, from the Pacific coast, and all over. Who shall say that we have gone wrong on these financial questions or on these political questions, made up as we are from those who have been drawn from all the old States, with all the experience and education that those States were able to furnish us in our time, and having added to that the experience and practical education of a new country and a busy life since?

Mr. President, I was born in the State of Massachusetts. I grew up in that State. I left there when a stripling, with a gun over my shoulder, under her flag and that of the United States, to serve her and the Nation in the civil war. And after the war was over, when so many of her sons had returned to their homes—but had left so many more on the battlefields where they had fallen—I moved from her borders with regret. There seemed to be no room then in the industries of that Commonwealth for the home-coming thousands, whose places in the industries had been filled while they were at the front. The industries of Massachusetts seemed, after the war, not to demand the influx of the remnant of her forces which had been loaned to the Union. And so, more than forty years ago, I joined with other pioneers, who, with gun and ax and spade in hand, went in advance of railroad and other civilization to that broad expanse of country, the "Desert." It fell to my lot to settle in what was then a part of Dakota, which afterwards became Wyoming Territory and later the great State of Wyoming.

I have loved, and do love, that old Commonwealth that gave me birth, with its vigorous, thrifty, and cultured people. I love her meadows, pastures, and woodlands, her granite hills and rugged climate, and I shall never lose my interest in her populous cities, her humming factories, and busy looms and spindles, which have made her such a power in the commercial world.

But I also love the State of my adoption—a land also habited by a vigorous, virile, and provident people. Every mountain and valley, every stretch of plain, every mountain stream and spring of clear, cold water, and every natural and acquired advantage with which Wyoming is blessed is dear to me.

And it is but a slight expression of my feeling to say that I am grieved to the heart—and I say this in sorrow, and not in anger—by the knowledge that Massachusetts—she who ought to be and has been in many ways the great leader in principle and progress and enlightenment—should seem, commercially speaking, to have forgotten the golden rule, to do as she would be done by, or at least as she is done by, and to be insisting that her distinguished representatives on this floor shall also forget or disobey it.

I submit, Mr. President, that no man from those States of which we are so proud, and from which we came, ever came to visit our country to ask assistance or anything that we had to give without being extended a welcoming hand.

We glory in the success of Massachusetts; we glory in the success of New England; we glory in the success of the Middle States and all their manufactories as we do in our own lives and pursuits. When we go back to these States, or when we meet in interest, as we do here, as friend to friend, we respectfully solicit and urge a return in some degree for the consideration and loyalty which we have so freely given all through these long days and nights, standing behind the committee in charge of this tariff bill, accepting its judgment upon all of these various products, and granting the protection asked. In the waning hours of the consideration of this subject shall the guns of the citadel be turned upon us, the sentries and reserves who have stood outside to protect it, and shall we be annihilated for our very loyalty to those forces?

Mr. President, to-day I stand here suffering as you all do from the heat, my mind filled with the pleasures that I hope to experience back in the old Massachusetts homestead, where I toiled barefooted and under a straw hat in the early days of my life. I hope to go back there for a short visit and be taken by the hand by my old Yankee friends whom I have always remembered. Do not let me—do not let the other men born in these States, who have spent their lives in building up a new State, meantime giving the most loyal support to the old States—feel that although we have spent all these years going on under a full head of steam, working for ourselves, it is true, but more largely for our "home States," as we term them, feel that now at this late day we are cut off entirely and are virtually orphans.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for the length of time I have used. I will ask, Mr. President, that I may include so many of these tables made up from official statistics as I have not already obtained permission to include with my remarks.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to insert certain tables in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, should I yield to my impulses in treating this subject, I would be content with the citation of a very few figures, and they would apply to the voting strength in this Chamber and the consequences to follow, placing this particular article on the free list.

With some amazement I listened to the mixture of eloquence, argument, and apology by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. While listening to what he said I could not but recur to the pages of this bill over which we have passed and consider what had been done. In this bill we have protected every product of New England and the Eastern States generally, whether of wood, or iron, or cotton, or wool, or any of the great staples entering into daily consumption in all avenues of life. Of course, all products of the hides of animals are protected according to the judgment of those engaged in the business to the measure of protection required.

Not content with protecting the print-paper pulp, not content with protecting cotton and woolen goods and cutlery and all manufactures of iron, we actually were called upon by the senior Senator from Massachusetts to stop an inundation of eels coming in as a supposed product of the pauper labor of Europe. The call for protection came from all along the New England coast, and, strange to say, we from the Rocky Mountain States, who never see an eel except when visiting the seacoast, voted to put a duty on eels; and then, in order that no raw material might escape, we actually went up to Vermont and put a duty on the sap running out of the maple trees. If you can point to anything manufactured or produced along the northeastern coast that is not provided for by some kind of protection in this bill, I am sure some Senator from that vigilant New England band will come forward to offer a rate of specific duty for its protection.

We are called upon to put a duty on the combination of sand and natural gas, the one found in the channel of the stream and the other flowing out of the earth, as the raw material of glass. This raw material is to be protected, and the protection increases when it reaches certain forms of plate glass. The knife we use to skin the beef is subject to a protective duty; the shoes the farmer wears you will find in this same bill with a protective duty; the harness on the horse, the saddle upon which the farmer rides, are all protected amply; yet the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] rises in this Chamber to echo the voice of a propaganda which had its origin not in a desire to alleviate the sufferings of any class of people, not to cheapen a necessity of life, not to give another day's labor to any human being, but to increase the already swollen profits of the most gigantic leather trust the world has ever known.

It may be well to take into account the arguments used. It has been suggested that if we take the 15 per cent duty off of hides, the laborer making the shoes will be paid a little more, the farmer will buy his shoes cheaper, and then the retail merchant can make a better profit. The Senator from Massachusetts readily concedes that the industry of making shoes, the making of harness, and all the products of leather is generally in a prosperous condition. It is useless to argue otherwise, because it is a notorious fact that greater progress has been made in this line of industry than in any other of all the chief industries of the country.

Now, mark you, the average difference in the cost of a pair of shoes would be at most 5 cents, if you assume that all the duty would be added to the cost. They propose to divide this 5 cents by giving the laborer who makes the shoes a little more, the middleman who handles the shoes in trade a part of it, and the farmer still another part; yet it is said that in the trade no account is taken of fractions of 25 cents.

A pair of shoes is either sold for a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and a half, or a dollar and seventy-five cents or two dollars, or two dollars and a quarter. The increase is always by the quarter, and sometimes by the half dollar. The 5 cents are to be divided up between the shoemaker, the retailer, the jobber, and the man who wears the shoes! Is there anyone sufficiently unsophisticated in this Chamber or elsewhere to believe that the 5 cents involved in the pair of shoes in consequence of the duty on hides would make one farthing's difference in the wages of the shoemaker; add one iota to the profit of the jobber or of the retail dealer, or that the man buying the shoes would buy them 5 cents cheaper? There is no pretense that

any such distribution would be made, and it is well to say, no such promise is made.

Mr. President, the raising of cattle is a great industry, widely scattered over the country. The farmers are about 9,000,000 in number, and, counting five to the family, there are between forty and fifty million people raising cattle, to a greater or less extent, on the farms large and small. To these people the crusaders for free hides present these arguments: "First, you will get the products of labor cheaper; you do not get the benefit of the present duty anyhow; you are cheated out of it by the packers; and the best thing for you, Reuben, is to take this 15 per cent out of the equation and let the hides you have to sell go on the free list, while we keep all the things you have to buy that are made of leather on the dutiable list."

If a confidence man at a circus ever presented a less plausible proposition to a farmer than that, he certainly was wanting in wit. [Laughter.]

The farmer has been the victim of many curious games of confidence, but never before has his intelligence been so discounted as in that form of presenting this argument: "First, the duty does you no good; we will therefore take it off; but the duty on leather will do the man who makes it some good; the duty on shoes will be of benefit to the manufacturer of shoes; and the duty on harness will benefit the manufacturer of harness; and therefore we will leave these duties on; and you buy in this protected market and sell in the open markets of the world the thing you have to sell."

Mr. President, as representing a State having a large number of farmers, I want to sum up the position in a very few words; and I believe there are 22 Senators on this floor who have with fidelity supported this bill who are prepared to say the same thing and act in accordance with the declaration, to wit: "If you desire that what the farmers have to sell shall be sold in the open market without any protection, we shall regard it as our duty to see that the things they buy are bought where they can be bought the cheapest in so far as leather products are concerned." How can the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], whose maple sugar has been protected, ask us to continue to sustain a proposition like that; or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] ask us to stand by the duty on eels, which he regards as a manufactured product, no doubt, while we except this great product, amounting to $16,000,000 a year in protective duties to the farmers of the country, from the dutiable list and place them in competition with the Argentine and other cattle raisers?

It was alleged by the Senator from Massachusetts that to place hides on the free list will benefit the farmer. Let us carry that proposition to its ultimate and logical end. Remembering that the retail price of manufactures of leather will not be lowered by removal of the hide duty, let us calculate. For instance, we will just assume that each farmer has only one beef to sell in a year. The duty would be a dollar and a half on the hide of the beef. We will assume now that he has three children, that there are five in the family, and that each member of that family has to buy 3 pairs of shoes a year, which will make 15 pairs of shoes.

Mr. WARREN. Will it disturb the Senator if I make a suggestion at that point?

Mr. CARTER. I should like to finish the calculation. I am not very good at mathematics and might forget the figures.

Mr. President, 15 pairs of shoes for the use of 5 members of the family might be subject to a tax on account of this duty, if the duty is added to the cost, of 75 cents. Five times 15 will make 75, according to Dayball's Arithmetic. The whole duty on all the shoes the family buy during the year will amount to 75 cents, and he will get a dollar and a half profit on that single hide as the result of the duty. Now I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in speaking of the farmer a moment ago, I did not mention the fact, which ought to be mentioned, that there are anywhere from one to two million hides called "fallen hides." A hide taken from an animal that is killed by accident or dies is the only return the farmer gets for that animal. That is all he has to sell of that animal, which has cost him as much as the rest.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. PAGE. I want to interrupt the Senator just for a moment right there.

Mr. CARTER. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator says that the duty on a hide is $1.50.

Mr. CARTER. I assume that hide will be worth $10; and 15 per cent of that is $1.50.

Mr. PAGE. Now, if the Senator from Wyoming and myself are correct——

Mr. CARTER. Which you probably are.

Mr. PAGE. I know—for I have tried it year after year—that the average of the New England hide is 48 pounds cured. The average of a steer hide will run, perhaps, 80 or 90 pounds; I should say in New England it is not over 80 pounds. Forty-eight pounds cured, based upon—we will call it 10 cents, if you will, which is more than the average for the last ten years for cows—would mean 10 cents a pound. Fifteen per cent would be 1½ cents on a pound. If a hide weighs 48 pounds, 1½ cents a pound is 72 cents. The duty on the great bulk of hides is 72 cents, instead of $1.50. That is susceptible of the same arithmetic that the Senator from Montana used in his computation.

Mr. CARTER. Then, Mr. President, you simply give back to the farmer the duty he pays on the shoes. For instance, if you take the duty off the hides altogether, the price of shoes will remain the same, unquestionably, and you will simply cheat the farmer out of 75 cents. That is the sum and substance of the transaction, according to the Senator's own figures.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to have the Senator from Montana correct the statement.

Mr. CARTER. If it is 72 cents, the farmer must lose 3 cents on the transaction. Assuming that the duty on the single hide would only be 72 cents, he would pay for 15 pairs of shoes an extra price of 75 cents during the year. Thus the duty on the hide of a single steer would offset the increased cost of all the family shoes for a year, leaving the remaining hides sold to swell net farm receipts.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, that is just what I was trying to show—that is, that the loss which the farmer sustains on the shoes and the harness he buys is just about offset by the gain he receives on the hides which he sells.

Mr. CARTER. I think that is probably true, where one or two hides are marketed. Now, certain Senators, well knowing—and no one claiming to the contrary—that the price of harness will not be changed and that the price of shoes will not be reduced, but will remain the same or go upward, insist that the pittance which comes to the farmer on the initial transaction of selling the hide, shall be taken from him without any compensating benefit whatever, thus compelling him to sustain a protective system in which he is denied direct participation.

Mr. President, coming from a State which, as I have said, is largely interested in cattle and only interested to a limited extent in manufacturing articles of any kind, I feel, as most of my colleagues from that section naturally feel, that I am justified in demanding that the protective-tariff doctrine shall not apply to our country wholly on the articles produced in other sections; that we shall not, in other words, be compelled to bear the burden and reap none of the benefits at all except by remote indirection. We have stood by this protective-tariff doctrine because we believed it was a broad and enlightened national policy.

The subdivisions embraced in the general term "Europe" cover a stretch of country bounded on the east by a line drawn from the Caspian Sea to the mouth of the Don, and extending a little east of the Ural Mountains, and taking all the country west thereof and north of the Mediterranean Sea on the other side of the Atlantic. That region embraces all the various nations of Europe, from Russia with its 2,095,500 square miles in Europe, with 129,000,000 of European population, down to the little gambling center at Monaco, with 8 square miles and 13,000 population.

The total population of this aggregation of states in Europe is 413,181,000 and the total square miles 3,789,540. We have in the United States, including Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, 3,612,655 square miles, with a population of approximately 90,000,000, equal to practically one-fourth of the population of all Europe and very nearly as many square miles as the total area of the countries of Europe. We have a great diversity of climate and we have resources equal to the resources of Europe, with the advantage that many of our resources remain to be developed, whereas the European condition is one of comparative exhaustion in many particulars. The European peoples have conditions so dissimilar from our own with standards of living, to which we do not desire to sink, that it has always appeared to me to be wise national policy for us to develop in the United States with the great homogeneous people we have, with the harmony existing under regular constitutionally defined limits between States and Territories and the Nation itself, a mighty, self-reliant, independent people capable of forging their way in the world according to standards of civilization and morality never before known in the history of mankind.

This protective-tariff policy merely vouchsafes to the people abiding here the benefit of the home market as against the heterogeneous mass of competitors living in the various states of Europe and Asia. The policy has proven good thus far. Our standards of living have been elevated, possibly, beyond the point where they can be permanently maintained. Our educational system is expensive; our methods of traveling to and from place to place are modern and expensive; but with them, and with the resources we have in the country, coupled with the genius and capacity of the people, we can under the protective system maintain the high standard of life which we have built up for ourselves against the competition of the copper-colored man in Asia and the mass of underpaid and underfed and poorly clothed people of Europe. But, Mr. President, the policy can not be maintained on partial lines, nor can it be maintained if it becomes an instrument for the oppression of the agricultural population of the United States.

The farmers of Colorado and Wyoming and Montana and all the sparsely settled Western States have had an intuitive sense of self-preservation in their devotion to this policy of protection. They have always had the American market, and they have recognized that it has been the best market in the world in which to sell the things they raise; but now comes forward the doctrine that these farmers as to an important staple, of which we do not produce a surplus, must go at once into competition with all the producers of the earth, while remaining subject to protective duties on the finished product of their so-called "raw material."

Let those who seek by their votes to saddle that policy on this country bear in mind that, before the voting is done on this leather schedule, they will have boots and shoes and harness and saddles and everything made out of the cowhide put upon the free list, where the cowhide is placed. There is no threat about that; it is a plain policy of justice.

The figures to which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] subscribed demonstrate that the small farmer with only one animal to sell just gets out even with this duty levied upon hides in his behalf when compelled to buy the leather in a protected market.

But there is another argument brought forward, and that is that this duty on hides does not tend to close the gap between the needs of the leather market and the production of hides. That is not true, unless the figures are at fault, because we find that since 1897 the cattle in the United States have increased, in round numbers, from 46,000,000 head to 71,000,000 head; and if that ratio of increase is continued for ten years more, we will be producing all the cattle hides our home consumption demands.

I do not claim that the increase in the number of cattle is wholly due to the duty on hides. The cattle product of the country would have increased materially if there had been no such duty.

I am not prepared to say that if the tallow had no commercial value at all, the stock of cattle would have diminished; but surely, Mr. President, the animal prepared for the market has a value made up of the value of its different parts. If you subtract the value of the hide, it is not as profitable to raise the animal. If you subtract the value of the tallow, you subtract another element of value, and therefore discourage the raising of cattle to the extent that the tallow adds to the market value.

The hide production in the United States, including the so-called "fallen hides," in 1908 was 19,500,000. I will, if there be no objection, insert in my remarks a statement with reference to the number of cattle hides, so as to avoid detaining the Senate.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. ELKINS. Do the figures the Senator gave, namely, 19,500,000, represent the cattle production in the United States outside of imported hides?

Mr. CARTER. Outside of imported hides.

Mr. ELKINS. As I understand, we import about 5,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. We import about from 14 to 20 per cent of the total consumption and export, and I suppose that is about 5,000,000.

Mr. ELKINS. Five million, I think.

Mr. CARTER. That makes 25,000,000 hides, in round numbers, then, consumed in and exported from the United States, as I understand, of which we produce substantially 20,000,000. The cattle and calves slaughtered during the year 1908 by Armour & Co., Morris & Co., and the National Packing Company amount to only 5,000,000, or to one-fourth of the total, whereas it has been suggested that they control the hide market of the country. The total slaughter of independent packers, local packers, and farmers was 13,500,000 head of cattle. That is 73 per cent of the total.

There were slaughtered, for instance, at Cincinnati, Cleveland, and throughout the State of Ohio approximately 627,000 head of cattle and calves, and in the State of Indiana there are slaughtered annually approximately 595,000 head. In these States there is no pretense that there is any combine of packers at all. In 1908 44 per cent of the cattle received at Chicago markets were sold alive, and were bought by numerous independent packers. As I have said, Mr. President, I will insert this statement in my remarks, with the permission of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SOME FACTS ABOUT HIDES.

Since 1897, the year when hides were placed on the dutiable list, the number of cattle in the United States has increased from 46,000,000 to 71,000,000. (Reports of Bureau of Statistics, United States Department of Agriculture.)

Hide production in the United States in 1908:

Cattle hides	13,000,000
Calf hides	5,500,000
Fallen hides (taken from cattle which die or are killed by accident)	1,000,000
Grand total	19,500,000

Cattle and calves slaughtered during the fiscal year 1908 by Armour & Co., Swift & Co., Morris & Co., and National Packing Company (these are the four concerns alleged to constitute the so-called "meat trust"). (Figures are furnished by the Bureau of Animal Industry):

Cattle	4,045,357
Calves	1,026,707
Total	5,072,064

Estimated number of cattle and calves slaughtered by independent packers, local butchers, and on the farm:

Cattle	9,000,000
Calves	4,500,000
Total	13,500,000

The total slaughter by independent packers, local butchers, and farmers of 13,500,000 head of cattle and calves is 73 per cent of the grand total slaughter of the United States of 18,500,000 head.

According to Bulletin No. 83 of the Department of Commerce and Labor, there are 929 packing establishments in the United States. The so-called "big packers" have 38 slaughtering establishments.

This slaughter by independent establishments, local butchers, and so forth, is carried on in every State and in nearly every community, and in each of them there is a hide buyer and a market for hides. The tanners and leather people have full oporptunity to buy from these independent slaughterers and hide dealers 14,500,000 hides of cattle and calves, which is 74 per cent of the total hide production of this country.

For example, there are slaughtered at Cincinnati, Cleveland, and throughout the State of Ohio approximately 627,000 head of cattle and calves, and the so-called "meat trust" have not a slaughtering establishment in that State. In the State of Indiana there are slaughtered annually approximately 595,000 head of cattle and calves, and no meat trust is interested in the slaughter. In Pennsylvania there are slaughtered about 509,000 head of cattle and calves annually, and in New York about 1,928,000.

In 1908, 44 per cent of the cattle received at the Chicago markets were sold out alive and were bought by numerous independent buyers for slaughter or feeding. According to statistics of two bureaus of the Department of Commerce and Labor, namely, Census and Bureau of Statistics, the imported hides bear the relation stated below to the domestic production:

	Pounds.	Per cent.
Cattle hides consumed by tanneries, 1904	922,635,538	100
Average imports, 1898-1908	128,879,885	14
Domestic production	793,755,653	86

For so much of that 14 per cent of imported hides as are manufactured into shoes and other articles for export the manufacturer receives a rebate of 99 per cent of the 15 per cent duty. Therefore, for the purposes of his export trade, he has, under the Dingley law, practically free trade in hides.

It takes from 1½ to 2 pounds of dry hides to furnish the sole leather for an average pair of shoes—say 2 pounds, for example. The average value per pound of imported dutiable hides during 1907 was 15.3 cents, and the duty per pound would be 2.3 cents, and for 2 pounds 4.6 cents. No one seriously claims that the removal of the present 15 per cent duty on hides would cheapen shoes to the consumer 4.6 cents per pair, or any amount. The difference would be absorbed by the tanner and shoe manufacturer.

The average weight of cattle hide is 6½ to 7½ per cent of the total weight of the animal, and the per pound value of the hide s double that of the per pound value of the balance of the carcass, making the total value of the hide from 13 to 15 per cent of the gross value of the animal.

Since 1897 the average price of American green hides has fluctuated between 8½ cents and 13½ cents per pound, and the price to-day ranges from 10 to 12½ cents per pound, according to quality. During the same period the foreign-hide market has averaged higher.

Branded hides sell from 1 to 3 cents a pound less than unbranded hides. Purchasers of live cattle pay from 10 to 40 cents a hundred less for branded than for unbranded cattle. There is in all hide markets a distinction made in the quotations of "clear" hides and "branded" hides. These facts show beyond controversy that there is everywhere a

recognized distinction between the hide value and the meat value in an animal, and successfully answer the contentions of the tanners and shoe manufacturers, and proves that the raiser of live stock does benefit by the duty on hides.

The average duty on all dutiable articles under the Dingley law, year by year, from 1898 to 1907, has been as follows (taken from reports of Government):

	Per cent.
1898	48.08
1899	52.07
1900	49.24
1901	49.64
1902	49.78
1903	49.03
1904	48.78
1905	45.24
1906	44.16
1907	42.55

The duty on hides during those years has been 15 per cent ad valorem, which is vastly less than the average protection accorded other dutiable articles.

Argentina hides produce more leather per pound than American hides, and if the duty on hides is reduced the American tanners will buy Argentina hides in preference to American product. The United States produces from 85 to 90 per cent of the leather consumed. Free hides would mean an absolute loss of approximately 2 cents per pound on the 793,755,653 pounds of hides produced in this country, or about $16,000,000 annually. The value of the cattle in the United States, exclusive of any investments in land, is estimated by the Government at $1,700,000,000, almost five times as much as the total capital invested in the tanneries and the boot, shoe, and other leather manufactures. The live-stock and meat industry is the largest single industry in the United States, and upon it depends the prosperity of this country. Is it to be sacrificed for the benefit of a few tanners and leather manufacturers? Are the live-stock raisers and farmers to be punished simply because a few independent tanners can not get all the hides they want on their own terms?

Mr. CARTER. The claim that the packers are the beneficiaries of the duty on hides is clearly exploded by the figures. They butcher but about one-fourth of all the cattle butchered in the country. So I think, Mr. President, we will have to go further and look into this trust interest a little more in order to find the real point to this agitation for free hides.

I think the crusade for free hides is the most remarkable that has been waged with reference to any article in this tariff bill. The volume of literature would fill one of the rooms of the Capitol. It comes to every Senator, and it has been transported to every shoe dealer and harness maker in all the country. The expense must have been enormous, and I believe it was all borne by the Central Leather Company, which is said, on good authority, to own two-thirds of the principal tanneries in the United States.

I have before me a statement taken from Moody's Manual for 1908, showing the condition of one of these leather companies. It has a total showing of $167,000,000. Its common stock is sixty-two million and odd dollars; its preferred stock is $62,000,000 plus; its bonds amount to $4,680,000. It has bills payable, reserve fund, insurance, and so forth, running up to $167,000,000. One of the curious items in this statement is "good will, etc., $62,832,300." A large number of dollars' worth of good will on which the American people are expected to pay dividends; and the first levy is to be made on the American farmer, by keeping him subject to the leather duty while taking off the duty on hides.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I may be able to give the Senator some light on that question.

Mr. CARTER. The question of good will?

Mr. PAGE. That seventy-two millions of good will, or sixty-two millions—I forget whether it is sixty-two or seventy-two——

Mr. CARTER. Sixty-two.

Mr. PAGE. That is pure water and air. There is not a dollar of assets in it. They started their organization several years ago, and agreed to pay a certain stated dividend on their preferred stock. That became a lien upon the stock of that company. Those dividends accumulated until their debt for dividends due was more than 40 per cent. Then the corporation tried to get a new corporation, known as the "Central Leather Company," to take it up. But it is a fact known to every hide dealer and every tanner in this country that that concern never has been a successful concern. Never since its organization, never after the first year, have the people of this country regarded it as a trust, because it was an unsuccessful corporation, not making money. I think you will find, if you go back, that the last dividend it paid on its preferred stock was a very small one—from 1 to 4 per cent.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I notice that this concern has cash in its treasury amounting to $4,318,178; that its cash increased between 1905 and 1907 from $2,230,000 to $4,318,000; that the accounts receivable have increased considerably; that the bills receivable have increased from $243,000 in 1905 to $3,569,000 in 1907.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. Will the Senator please give us, in the case of that enormous concern, the amount that stands on the assets side for leather in process of tanning?

Mr. CARTER. They seem to have sundry items of personal property. They have bark at the tanneries amounting to $2,386,316. They have hides and leather on hand amounting to $11,457,273.

Mr. PAGE. What are their total assets, as given there?

Mr. CARTER. Their total assets? One hundred and sixty-seven million dollars.

Mr. PAGE. Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question on another point.

Mr. CARTER. How does the Senator dispose of this cash, if it is a bankrupt concern?

Mr. PAGE. I will do that. This is a concern that started in to tan leather a few years ago. They bought up the tanneries of Pennsylvania, but with those tanneries they acquired very large properties in timber lands. It is the opinion of good judges that but for those timber lands this corporation would be out of business to-day. Year by year they have been selling those timber lands, which have been very valuable and have appreciated in value every year.

In that way they have kept their cash on hand and their bark at a fair amount. But, Mr. President, an asset of $11,000,000, representing the entire hide and leather business of a $170,000,000 corporation, shows upon its face that it is not a successful concern; that it can not be called a "trust;" and that it does not dominate the leather market in any sense at this time.

Mr. CARTER. Well, Mr. President, this company seems to be a rather strong, lusty concern. It may not be organized on principles of common decency and fair play to the outside; but, somehow or other, it has accumulated a surplus of $23,599,401. It has between four and five million dollars of cash on hand. It has $9,979,000 accounts receivable. It has $3,569,000 bills receivable. It has no doubtful debtors. It has on hand hides and leather of eleven millions and more. It has bark at the tanneries of over two million and a quarter dollars. It owns a railroad mortgage of $100,000. It has advanced to other companies $58,000. It has sundry personal property of $402,000. It has tannery plants, and so forth, to the value of $6,924,000. It has stock of other companies to the value of $58,152,000, and bonds of other companies to the value of $6,216,000. It has real estate interests of $501,000. And it seems to me, with this good will of $62,000,000 thrown in, that they are doing pretty well, all things considered. If this is a poor leather company, I should like to have the Senator state his estimate of a prosperous one.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I heard of a set of corporations that went to J. P. Morgan & Co. a few years ago and wanted to have a consolidation. They consolidated all their interests; and when they got through a certain stockholder said that the only change in the interests was that they had the same property, and J. P. Morgan & Co. had $6,000,000 of their money. I should like to have the Senator read the whole of that item. I think he will find it is "good will and expenses of organization, $62,000,000." And, with all of that to the good, they are still owing forty-odd per cent of accumulated dividends which they can not pay.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, this item is covered up under the very general and comprehensive expression "good will, etc." I will attach the statement to my remarks.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF APPROPRIATION.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator yield to permit me to make a privileged motion?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate joint resolution No. 33 was passed, and to request the House to return the joint resolution to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine enters a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate joint resolution No. 33 was passed.

Mr. HALE. I make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. ELKINS. What is the motion?

The SECRETARY. To reconsider the vote by which Senate joint resolution No. 33, relating to the provisions of section 10 of the sundry civil act of March 4, 1909, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered?

Mr. HALE. I will make the motion. I do not want to take it up until my colleague is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator makes the motion to reconsider, and asks that notice of that motion be sent to the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALE. And that the joint resolution be returned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And that the joint resolution be returned.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, let us understand what this is.

Mr. HALE. It is a joint resolution passed by the Senate in my absence, relating to certain unexpended balances of river and harbor appropriations. Had I been present, it would not have been passed, but I was not here. All that I ask now is to enter a motion to reconsider and that the joint resolution be returned to the Senate. When my colleague is present, I wish to confer with him about the language of the joint resolution. There are some things in it that ought to be changed. I have examined it very carefully; and while I do not object to the general scope of the measure, I do not want it to apply to any matters of the kind in the future. My colleague and I can easily arrange that when the joint resolution is returned.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand, then, that the motion of the Senator from Maine to reconsider does not contemplate anything further now?

Mr. HALE. Nothing further.

Mr. FRYE. But it ought to be disposed of immediately, because July 1 comes very shortly.

Mr. HALE. When we come to look at the language of the joint resolution, I do not think there will be any difficulty in arriving at an amendment that can be disposed of as soon as the joint resolution is returned.

Mr. FRYE. But it has already passed the House.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I know; but I was not present, Mr. President, when the matter was brought up. Had I been, it would not have moved an inch. I have looked at the resolution very carefully, and I do not want to convey the impression that any advantage was taken of my absence. I do not ask anything unreasonable; I simply enter a motion to reconsider and to have the joint resolution sent back from the House. Then my colleague and I will look into its language, and it can be returned at once.

Mr. FRYE. I was not aware that my colleague was absent when I asked the unanimous consent of the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution. But if I had known that he was absent, I think I should have made the same request, whether he was present or not, on account of the short time which intervenes between now and July 1. For that reason it is was absolutely necessary to have action, in order not to stop all operations of this character. When the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] asked unanimous consent, my colleague objected; but he objected on the ground that it was against the order of the Senate. His objection was not against the merits of the resolution at all, and I did not suppose he had any objection to the resolution itself. He only objected to having the order of the Senate laid aside.

Mr. HALE. When I came to examine the joint resolution, I found that there were certain things in it that ought not to be there and that are not needed to have it operate efficiently, as my colleague desires. I desire an opportunity to examine it in connection with my colleague and any other Senator who is interested in the passage of the resolution. There is plenty of time between now and the 1st of July for the passage of any proper resolution that will not hinder, but will help, the proper expenditure of money on these valuable public works. I do not object to anything of that kind, but I have no doubt that I shall be able to show to my colleague that there ought to be a modification of the language of the resolution to cover simply what he desires and nothing more.

Mr. FRYE. It was referred to the War Department and came back with their approval.

Mr. HALE. That is not absolutely sufficient, of course. The War Department wants all that it can get. It has too much in the resolution. I simply ask, Mr. President——

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, I think this debate is out of order.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator from Maine yield to me for a suggestion in regard to this matter?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, some one has suggested that the debate is out of order. I did not suppose that any objection would be made to my request.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from Maine that the language of the resolution was very carefully guarded. It provides that this provision—

> shall not be construed as applying to the unexpended balance of any river and harbor appropriation the use of which may be essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, for the further maintenance or prosecution of the work to which it pertains as heretofore authorized by Congress.

This carries out the spirit of the provision of the sundry civil act, which is that balances that are not needed of appropriations made a considerable time ago go to the surplus fund of the Treasury; but in case they are essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, for the further maintenance or prosecution of work, they are still made available. I will state that unless there is some such provision as that, there will be serious difficulty with many important public works. I wish to state another practical fact—that the House does not meet until Thursday, and does not at every meeting have a quorum; so that we could not be assured, at any rate, of a modification in the House. It was passed there to-day in the presence of a quorum.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator first whether he proposes that this shall operate in cases where no contracts have been entered into?

Mr. BURTON. If there have been no contracts, and the money is needed, it would nevertheless be applied upon the work. It would be applied where recommendations have been made, or where in the judgment of the Secretary of War the amount is needed.

Mr. HALE. Although no contracts have been made?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; although no contracts have been made.

Mr. HALE. That is, these appropriations that have lain for years without being used, and no contracts have been made for five years, shall now be revived and used?

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Maine will note that since the early seventies the law has been that these balances remain to the credit of the respective public works for which they were appropriated. After careful consideration, an exception was made in the case of river and harbor appropriations, because of the well-known fact that emergencies are likely to arise by reason of storms, by reason of the necessity of restoring a channel or such a structure as a breakwater; and for twenty-five years the law has been that those balances remain to the credit of the respective works. I can state that the most important——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will permit me one moment, I wish to call attention to another matter.

Mr. BURTON. I will state further to the Senator from Maine that the most important case is that in which these balances are required, with appropriations made by the last river and harbor act, to complete a public work. In some cases those are matters of emergency.

Mr. HALE. Let me say, Mr. President, that the points already touched upon are not the main things. But I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio and my colleague—and I will not take much of the time of the Senator from Montana—to this language:

> Shall not be construed as applying to the unexpended balance of any river and harbor appropriation, the use of which may be essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War.

The Senator can not object, I take it, nor would my colleague object, to the introduction, after the words "unexpended balance of any river and harbor appropriation," of the words "heretofore made," so that this shall not be claimed to be an exemption of all these funds in the case of future appropriations. That was not contemplated, I take it, when the resolution was drawn.

Mr. BURTON. I do not see how that would change the meaning of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. It is a matter of doubt as it stands. It might be claimed that this language would not only apply to appropriations heretofore made, but it should be the rule hereafter for this particular branch of the service and for no other branch. I take it the Senator does not want that.

Mr. BURTON. I would suggest to the Senator from Maine that that can be very readily taken care of whenever a further appropriation is made for rivers and harbors, notwithstanding the fact that for more than a quarter of a century, for reasons which seemed to be conclusive when the subject was discussed, these appropriations have been exceptional in their nature. They are on a different footing from the great majority of other appropriations. There is almost always something to do,

and no engineering officer can foresee when some expenditure may be necessary to maintain important public works.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order. I know how interminable these river and harbor discussions are.

Mr. HALE. The Senator must know, because he has had some experience along this line.

Mr. ALDRICH. I must call for the regular order, Mr. President. The Senator from Maine has a right to make the motion, but——

Mr. HALE. Yes; I will simply make the motion.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House recedes from its disagreement to amendment No. 15 of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1033) to provide for the Thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and agrees to the same; further insists upon its disagreement to the residue of the amendments of the Senate to the bill; agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and had appointed Mr. CRUMPACKER, Mr. BURLEIGH, and Mr. HAY managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. R. 33) relating to the provisions of section 10 of the sundry civil act of March 4, 1909.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) amending an act concerning the recent fire in Chelsea, Mass., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am advised that the joint resolution, as to which I made a motion to reconsider, has passed the other House. I therefore withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine withdraws his motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate joint resolution No. 33, relating to the provisions of section 10 of the sundry civil act of March 4, 1909, was passed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution amending an act concerning the recent fire in Chelsea, Mass., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

THE TARIFF.

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the United States Leather Company, pronounced by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] to be a struggling concern and the poorest of them all, is a fair sample of the estimate placed on prosperity by the individuals and combinations behind this movement for free hides. One of the most active concerns connected with the movement is the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin. The statement of that company was placed in the RECORD yesterday, at the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], but it is well to call it to the attention of the Senate again in this connection. Its capital stock is $6,000,000, and, according to Moody's Manual for 1908, page 2548, its surplus on November 1, 1907, was $3,500,000.

That is not much better as a showing of surplus, and yet it is a little better, than the $23,599,401 of surplus shown by the struggling United States Leather Company, the poorest managed and the least favored of them all, according to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE].

Manifestly, Mr. President, if this concern, the United States Leather Company, which has increased in such a remarkable way of late, is the poorest of all the dealers in this product, no change of tariff is needed to give to the entire leather combination the full measure of prosperity which even rapacity might claim.

Do the shoe manufacturers require any radical change of the basis on which they are operating in order that they may be prosperous? I rather think the figures will show that the boot and shoe industry is and has been most remarkably prosperous during the last twelve years. The number of pairs of shoes exported from the United States in 1898 was 1,307,031. In 1907 we exported 5,833,914 pairs, of the value of $10,666,000. The exports of leather and manufactures of leather in 1897, when the present duty was placed on hides, were $19,000,000 plus. In 1907 the exports and manufactures of leather had reached $45,476,969.

A study of the exports of hides is interesting.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. I shall be glad to have the Senator permit me to put these figures in the RECORD. I shall put the tables in later, and shall then be glad to answer any questions.

The exports of hides have, of course, been less, because they have been consumed at home; and much of the exports of boots and shoes have been made up of leather made from hides imported and then exported, with a drawback of 99 per cent to the manufacturers. We exported in 1897 31,000,000 pounds of hides. In 1907 exports of hides had been reduced to $15,000,000 plus. Thus, whether we consider the subject from the standpoint of the exports of the manufactured article—boots and shoes—or the marvelous increase in the exports of sole leather and all forms of tannery products, or as measured by the remarkable increase in the profits of the concerns engaged in the manufacture of boots and shoes and other manufactures of leather, we find no consolation whatever in seeking to justify this effort to remove the duty on the so-called "raw material" purchased from the farmers. If the industries were languishing, if the tanneries were doing ill or making no profit, if the shoemakers were doing a losing business or their trade was failing, we might, with propriety, direct our attention to the cause. And if, in seeking to ascertain the cause, we found that some burden should be placed upon the farmer in order to rescue the sinking manufacturing establishment, the poor, honest, public-spirited countryman would no doubt respond, as he has often done before, to an additional load, in order to maintain the prosperity of the country.

But, sir, when a combination of gigantic corporations, with good will and wind as capital to a degree marvelous to contemplate, with dividends paid upon nothing at all, and profits that are enormous, join in with the boot-and-shoe men, who can not point in all their history to a period of greater prosperity than that during which this tariff has been laid on the raw material—when, I say, they combine to tell us that the farmer must be made subject to the burden while being deprived of the benefits of the system, I insist that radical measures, if need be, should be resorted to in order to prevent this injustice being perpetrated upon a worthy and supremely important part of our citizenship.

Mr. President, I am glad to say that, in my humble judgment, there is not a Republican Senator or a protectionist on this floor whose honest conviction would support this proposition to strike down this duty on hides while maintaining the duty on manufactures of leather. I believe the Members of this Senate who subscribe to the doctrine of protection are sufficiently broad and enlightened to say that the whole country must be considered if this policy is to endure; that they are broad and enlightened enough to know that if the protective tariff is to be made the instrument of oppression in one section for the benefit of some other section, it will not long remain on the statute books.

I am permitted by the secretary and general counsel of the Home Market Club, of Boston, Mr. Albert Clarke, one of the most thoroughly informed protectionists in this country, to submit to the Senate as a part of my remarks a letter written by that gentleman to a Senator from New England, which states this case from the enlightened New England protective standpoint more clearly than I can hope to state it. I will ask the Secretary to read it, omitting the name of the Senator to whom the letter is addressed. The copy was delivered to me by Mr. Clarke.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

HOME MARKET CLUB,
Boston, Mass., June 14.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Not knowing your views on the subject of free hides, but knowing that you have long been a conspicuous advocate of national and impartial protection, I venture to invite your attention to some considerations which arise from our New England point of view and are different from those which special interests have brought into prominence.

More important, it seems to me, than any single interest is the great fundamental principle of protecting every domestic product that is exposed to foreign competition. Some exceptions to this rule have been made for local or political reasons, but they are uneconomic and do not justify further exceptions. Repealing the duty on hides would not have the poor excuse of being necessary to the prosperity of industries to which they go as a raw material, for those industries are prosperous, having greatly advanced under the Dingley law in both the home market and foreign markets. Every State has a considerable interest in cattle, and the aggregate value of the cattle of all the States is estimated by the Department of Agriculture at the large sum of $1,566,699,000. For both business and political reasons this interest is too large to be discriminated against.

In my opinion, the shoe manufacturers are making a great mistake in advocating free hides and offering as a consideration for the boon to accept a reduction of the duty on shoes from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. If, as some of them say, they do not need any protection because they have no foreign competition, their concession is illusive and of no

account. But the day is near when they are sure to have competition from several countries, which will show them the need of even a higher duty than 25 per cent. American shoe machinery has recently been introduced in every country which manufactures shoes. Skilled instructors are sent with it, and they stay with it until the foreign operatives develop a high state of efficiency. American shoes are imitated so perfectly that only experts can tell the difference, and they are just as good. On the continent of Europe the labor cost of their production is only about 40 per cent of that in this country, and in Japan it is lower still. Even in Scotland, according to the testimony of Mr. Charles H. Jones, of Boston, they are produced 20 cents a pair more cheaply than in Massachusetts. As Mr. Jones is an advocate of free hides, this testimony is to be taken most strongly against his cause.

I know it is said that the shoe manufacturers must be supposed to understand their business. In respect to technique, organization, and management they do; but they have not had occasion to study the effect of foreign competition as other manufacturers have, and one of their leaders, former Governor Douglass, of Massachusetts, in his enthusiasm for free trade, has publicly predicted that if they could get free materials they could export $100,000,000 worth of shoes each year, little knowing that the shoe export of all nations aggregates but about $37,000,000. We must face the fact that most foreign peoples are going to manufacture the greater portion of the shoes they wear and that before long, now that they have adopted American styles, machinery, and methods, some or all of them will compete in our market the same as they do in textiles, metal goods, gloves, chinaware, and a long list of other elegant manufactures.

There is no promise that our shoe manufacturers will get cheaper sole leather if hides are made free, and in turn they make no promise to reduce the price of shoes to the consumers. There has been a great deal of loose talk about this, but in the nature of the case no promise. Mr. Jones testified that shoes change by quarter and half dollars. Is it probable that the manufacturer, who will save only 2 cents on a pair of light shoes and only 10 cents on a pair of heavy shoes, of which both the shoes and the uppers may be cowhide, will reduce his price 25 cents? If he must, then it is to be remembered that Mr. Jones also testified that there are ways of covering up defects in quality. In my opinion, it would be the greatest possible mistake for New England, whose many manufactures enjoy national and even world-wide reputation for excellence, to bring about an economic condition which will induce depreciation in actual worth.

If the policy invoked should result in injury to the great shoe manufacturing interest in New England, as I am almost certain it would, our other industries would not escape. The people engaged in those industries have a right to protest against anything which threatens the displacement of labor and the impairment of the purchasing power of large numbers of people. The promised benefit is too remote, contingent, and uncertain to justify the risk.

Thus far I have presented only such general considerations as the tariff and industrial questions suggest. On its own merits the duty on hides seems to me perfectly justifiable. First, it raises more than $2,000,000 of much-needed revenue. Second, the proof is ample that it benefits the cattle growers. Third, it logically calls for a continuance of adequate duties on the manufactures of leather. I am aware that popular prejudice against the duty has been created by the claim that the packers get the sole benefit and that the packers are in a great trust. I have investigated this and am convinced that whatever may be the desire of the packers, the real, the great, and the dangerous trust to be guarded against is the Central Leather Company, which controls two-thirds of the principal tanneries in the country, and is the chief promoter of the campaign for free hides. The farmers, the packers, and the small collectors all over the country have hides to sell. If the leather trust can import hides free of duty, it will use the fact to beat down the price, and there will be no sufficient economic force to compel it to extend the benefit to its own customers, the users of leather. I do not think that trusts can be regulated through the tariff, but a protective duty, by developing and preserving some degree of domestic competition, tends to curb their exactions, and in the interest of both producer and consumer should be preserved.

Begging your pardon for imposing upon you so long a letter, I have the honor to be, with high respect,

Very truly, yours, ALBERT CLARKE.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I venture to say that any Senator here who will carefully consider the question at issue will reach the conclusion substantially as stated by Mr. Clarke, of the Home Market Club. If we are to have free hides, of course we will have free leather and everything made of leather, in so far as this bill is concerned. I should think little of either the judgment or spirit of a Senator from one of our Western States who would not very promptly and very emphatically resent such a discount on our intelligence or fidelity to our constituents as to expect that we would take any other course than to "let the tail go with the hide," as the Senator from Wyoming so well said.

If it is desired that leather and all the products of leather shall be free, well and good. The farmers of my section will be content, but they will not be content to leave the products of the hides on the dutiable list while they sell in competition with the man from the Argentine Republic.

Our people know something about this subject. I will insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Boardman, one of my respected constituents. He gives a very clear and lucid explanation of the effect of this duty upon the market price of hides. It will be perceived that in the market at Chicago a range steer branded heavily on both sides is sold at from 2 to 3 cents a pound less on the total weight of the animal than in the case of an animal that is not branded at all or is branded with some degree of care.

It will not answer for us to go home and repeat to our constituents, who know better, the puerile and trifling suggestions here made that they receive no benefit from the duty on hides, and therefore it is just as well to take it away from them. They are not children. You are dealing with a good, husky, lusty, vigorous body of people, who know something about their own business and are determined to have their rights in a general adjustment of affairs; and every Senator from that section of the country is here to maintain those rights. If those who elect to break down the protective-tariff policy persist in beginning the operation on the farmer they will find a resistance that will be most wholesome and effective. While I believe in the general prosperity brought to the country by preserving the American market to the American workman, the farmer of the United States must not be excluded from the body of toilers entitled to the benefits, and we do not propose to see him excluded in this case. That had just as well be understood now, and for good.

Mr. President, I will, with the permission of the Senate, abridge my remarks by inserting in the RECORD certain tables, figures, and letters bearing upon market quotations and statements therewith connected, which, I think, put together, will demonstrate that the benefit of this small duty does pass to the farmer and stock raiser and not to the special use and benefit of the packer. We have all the trouble we need to keep even with the packer, and we do not wish Congress and the Republican majority in the Senate to join the leather combine in helping the packers to fleece us out of what little we do get from the duty on hides.

I ask permission to append the statements as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Montana.

The statements referred to are as follows:

APPENDIX C.

	Area.	Population.
	Sq. miles.	
United States	3,022,600	[a]87,971,000
Porto Rico	3,606	958,243
Hawaii	6,449	154,001
Alaska	580,000	
Total	3,612,655	89,078,244

[a] Including Alaska.

European countries.

[The International Geography (edited by Mill), by 70 authors. Table compiled by G. C. Chisholm, M. A., B. Sc.]

	Area.	Population.
	Sq. miles.	
Russia	2,095,500	129,000,000
Austria-Hungary	261,000	45,400,000
German Empire	210,000	56,400,000
France	207,200	38,600,000
Spain	195,000	18,300,000
Sweden	171,000	5,100,000
Norway	125,000	2,200,000
United Kingdom	121,700	41,600,000
Italy	111,000	32,400,000
Turkey	65,000	6,100,000
Roumania	50,600	6,000,000
Bulgaria	37,300	3,700,000
Portugal	34,500	5,400,000
Greece	25,300	2,400,000
Servia	18,700	2,500,000
Switzerland	16,000	3,300,000
Denmark	15,300	2,400,000
Netherlands	12,700	5,180,000
Belgium	11,373	6,700,000
Montenegro	3,500	228,000
Luxemberg	1,000	236,000
Andorra	175	6,000
Liechtenstein	61	10,000
San Marino	23	8,000
Monaco	8	13,000
Total	3,789,540	413,181,000

According to the International Geography:

The area to be assigned to the Continent of Europe depends upon the limits assumed, which vary partly in accordance with physical and partly in accordance with political considerations. In the southeast the limit usually adopted is that of the valley of the Manych, stretching from the Caspian Sea to the mouth of the Don, and nearly coinciding with the administrative boundary of the lieutenance of the Caucasus, the whole of which is thus assigned to Asia. In the east the most obvious physical boundary is formed by the Ural Mountains and the Ural River. The area of mainland and the adjacent islands within these limits is about 3,750,000 square miles. The addition of Iceland and Nova Zembla brings it up to 3,820,000 square miles, and the further addition of Spitzbergen to nearly 3,850,000.

In the east of Russia, however, the political boundary extends some distance beyond the Urals so as to include all the mineral wealth of that region, and, on the other hand, it runs partly along the edge of a low plateau some distance to the west and northwest of the Ural River. If this political boundary is followed, it adds to the area of Europe about 100,000 square miles.

APPENDIX C 2.

Table showing imports of hides of cattle, dutiable, for ten years, their value, and amount per pound.

[From Statistical Abstract, Commerce and Labor, for 1907, p. 434.]

Year.	Pounds.	Value.	Per pound.[a]
			Cents.
1898	126,243,595	$13,624,989	10.8
1899	130,396,020	13,621,946	10.4
1900	163,865,165	19,408,217	11.8
1901	129,174,624	14,647,413	11.3
1902	148,627,907	17,474,039	11.8
1903	131,640,325	16,159,902	12.2
1904	95,370,168	10,989,035	12.8
1905	113,177,357	14,949,628	13.2
1906	156,155,300	21,862,360	13.9
1907	134,671,020	20,649,258	15.3

[a] Estimate ours (only approximate).

Tables showing imports of hides, other than goats and cattle, not dutiable, for ten years, and their average value.

[Taken from Table 161, Statistical Abstract, Commerce and Labor.]

Year.	Pounds.	Value.	Per pound.[a]
			Cents.
1898	54,607,534	$7,667,342	14
1899	66,965,785	9,877,771	14.7
1900	100,070,795	16,539,807	16.5
1901	77,989,617	12,995,567	16.6
1902	89,457,680	15,054,400	16.8
1903	102,340,303	16,942,982	16.5
1904	103,024,752	17,045,304	16.5
1905	126,893,934	22,868,797	18
1906	158,045,419	30,246,198	19
1907	135,111,199	30,841,989	22.8

[a] Estimate ours (only approximate).

APPENDIX C 3.

Table showing for ten years exports of boots and shoes.

[From Statistical Abstract, Commerce and Labor, 1907.]

Year.	Pairs.	Value.	Per pair.[a]
1898	1,307,031	$1,816,538	$1.39
1899	1,934,277	2,711,385	1.40
1900	3,016,720	4,276,656	1.41
1901	3,492,041	5,526,190	1.58
1902	3,966,766	6,182,098	1.56
1903	4,197,566	6,665,017	1.59
1904	4,642,531	7,238,940	1.56
1905	5,315,699	8,057,697	1.51
1906	5,672,249	9,142,748	1.61
1907	5,833,914	10,667,949	1.83

[a] Estimate ours (only approximate).

APPENDIX C 4.

Not only have our exports of boots and shoes increased largely, but also our exports of leather and its manufactures have increased, as the following table will show:

Exports of leather and manufactures of leather.

1907	$45, 476, 969
1906	40, 642, 858
1905	37, 936, 745
1904	33, 980, 615
1903	31, 617, 389
1902	29, 798, 323
1901	27, 923, 653
1900	27, 293, 010
1899	23, 466, 985
1898	21, 113, 640
1897	19, 161, 446
1896	20, 242, 756
1895	15, 615, 407
1894	14, 283, 492
1893	11, 912, 154
1892	12, 084, 781
1891	13, 278, 847

These exports have doubled in value under the protective tariff on cattle hides.

The manufacturers of leather goods, like all the manufacturers in this country, have practically free raw materials for the goods which they manufacture for export. This is due to the "drawback" clause, so called, which has been a part of our last three tariff acts. By virtue of that provision an American manufacturer can receive back from the Treasury of the United States any duty he may have paid upon the materials used by him in the manufacture of articles exported by him. This provision is not only a Republican or protectionist measure, but a Democratic or free-trade measure as well, for it was incorporated not only in the McKinley and Dingley bills, but in the Wilson-Gorman law also. Under its operation it is possible for a small percentage of the goods manufactured in America to be sold abroad for less than they are sold at home, because, if advantage is taken of the drawback, the cost of manufacture for export is reduced.

A study of our exports of hides is of interest:

Year.	Pounds.	Value.
1907	15,396,806	$1,760,032
1906	10,752,827	1,223,255
1905	10,268,722	1,051,641
1904	32,727,643	3,246,887
1903	12,859,949	1,224,409
1902	9,372,949	906,504
1901	11,161,749	1,064,952
1900	7,486,256	804,674
1899	10,140,840	929,117
1898	11,536,073	1,015,032
1897	31,119,166	2,338,530
1896	39,545,324	3,858,946
1895	36,002,859	2,310,323

During the year 1895, 1896, and 1897, when the industries of this country were idle and our farmers were receiving low prices for their grain and the wage-earners were paid small wages and our consumption was small, we exported about 35,000,000 pounds of hides each year. But with a return of a protective tariff and new conditions and the opening of our factories and the revival of agriculture, we kept our raw material at home and did our own manufacturing and sold to our own people and paid wages to our own wage-earners, and for six years our exports of this raw material were only about 10,000,000 pounds annually.

APPENDIX C 6.

PIONEER CATTLE COMPANY,
GENERAL MANAGER'S OFFICE,
Helena, Mont., April 10, 1909.

Hon. T. H. CARTER,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you in regard to the irreparable damage that will result to the live-stock industry of the United States if, in the passage of the new tariff bill, hides are put on the free list.

If you allow the eastern shoe and leather manufacturers tariff protection in addition to their manufacturers trade profit, you immediately, by governmental sanction, transfer to them the present value of the hide that rightfully belongs to the farmer and stock grower.

The farmer is a consumer as well as a producer of hide products, and by this free-trade process you "flimflam" from him a double tribute to the protected manufacturers of all hide products. The present tariff adds from $1.50 to $3 valuation to every beef animal in the United States, and the nearer the farmer is to the hide market the greater value in the hide.

This valuation is not guesswork or a mere estimate, as I will cite you from our own company books and experience: Two years ago this spring, and following the hard winter of 1906 and 1907, during which time many of our cattle had died, there was within a radius of 3 miles from our company's home ranch and in our feed lots a number of dead cattle; these cattle were skinned to the number of 167 head, all ages and classes. On May 22, 1907, we hauled these hides to our nearest railroad station, a round trip of 20 miles, and where a hide buyer was waiting to inspect and purchase these hides by weight. For these 167 hides he paid us $500.59, or nearly $3 each, all around. He in turn shipped these to the Chicago market, a distance of 1,179 miles. This is only one example. There are hundreds of other stockmen and farmers who did the same thing.

Under "free trade conditions" these hides would not have been worth skinning. This fact I also know from experience, as I have been engaged in the business of raising cattle for the past thirty years, and during all that time when hides were on the free list we never sold one. There was no market for them. Consequently no one saved the hides from butchered or dead animals; they rotted on the farms and ranches.

The present 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides means an increased valuation of about $3 per head for every beef animal now owned by the farmers and stock growers of the country. Put hides on the free list and you give this valuation of $3 per head to the shoe manufacturers and leather men.

For an approximate valuation of tariff protection to the middle west farmers and stock growers, take the Chicago cattle and calf receipts for the past ten years ending December 31, 1908:

Cattle.

1898	2, 480, 897
1899	2, 514, 446
1900	2, 729, 046
1901	3, 031, 396
1902	2, 941, 559
1903	3, 432, 486
1904	3, 259, 185
1905	3, 410, 469
1906	3, 329, 250
1907	3, 305, 314
1908	3, 039, 206
Total	33, 473, 254

Calves.

1898	132, 733
1899	136, 676
1900	136, 310
1901	181, 824
1902	251, 747
1903	271, 743
1904	267, 499
1905	380, 835
1906	413, 269
1907	421, 934
1908	421, 671
Total	3, 016, 241

These cattle were not all slaughtered by the Chicago packers, but were all killed and went into general consumption during the years specified, the largest percentage of them, however, being slaughtered

in Chicago. Taking the hides of these animals at the low valuation of $2 per head for the cattle and $1 per head for the calves, and you have a total of $69,962,749. Add to this the receipts and corresponding value of the same classes of cattle received at the other stock markets of the country, and you have a sum equal to $125,000,000.

Can our Government consistently take this valuation from the property of the farmer and stock grower and legislate it into the pockets of the tariff-protected eastern leather manufacturers? To place hides on the free list while retaining leather and shoes on the dutiable list would be the worst sort of discrimination against the farmer and stock grower, with no benefit to the public.

Looking at this question from another standpoint, namely, the health and sanitary condition of the live-stock industry, the late Nelson Morris, of Chicago, sounded the keynote of warning when he stated that the importation of hides into this country free of duty without disinfection would sooner or later result in a national calamity, as it was the greatest menace to the health and welfare of our live-stock industry, as with the importation of foreign hides into our seaports, and from there transported by rail in cars to the different tanneries located at various points through the country, would be the carrying disease of all kinds, and that if once our herds were inoculated with any of those diseases so common in foreign and South American cattle, the National Treasury would be exhausted in trying to stamp it out.

We ask no special favors; only fair and equal treatment in tariff schedules on live stock and its products and the adoption of a policy that will give the widest markets for our live-stock products both at home and abroad. To this end we urge that a reasonable tariff, consistent with the general policy of the law which shall be enacted, be retained on cattle and other live-stock animals and on hides and wool.

No doubt you have heard from other Montana stockmen upon this subject, and your know full well what protection will mean to our live-stock interests. The welfare of this industry is in your hands, and I trust you will use your influence to the utmost to give us the necessary protection in the passage of the new tariff bill.

When you have time, let me hear from you as to your views upon the final passage of this bill.

With kind regards, I remain,

Very sincerely, yours, J. M. BOARDMAN.

APPENDIX C 7.

PIONEER CATTLE COMPANY,
GENERAL MANAGER'S OFFICE,
Helena, Mont., April 13, 1909.

Hon. T. H. CARTER,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In Representative PAYNE's argument when supporting the new tariff bill favoring free hides I notice his statement was that the packers would be the only parties benefited by the tariff.

This is a fallacy, as my letter of a few days ago states. In further support of my statement I herewith inclose you an account of sales for 32 hides that I shipped some time ago from Oswego. These hides were shipped in the name of the Montana Hide Company, of this city, but were sold for our Pioneer Cattle Company.

These were all small hides, mostly from 2-year-old heifers that we killed at the ranch for beef during the past year. You will notice they have netted us $110.11, or a little over $3.44 each.

I take it that you may find some satisfaction in support of your ideas for tariff on hides in showing this account of sales at this time to some of your friends who may argue in favor of free hides.

Do not let them beat us out, as this tariff means too much to the stockmen and farmers.

Very sincerely, yours, J. M. BOARDMAN.

JOHN MILLER & CO.,
HIDE COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Chicago, April 9, 1909.

Loaded at Oswego, Mont., by Pioneer Cattle Company.

For account of Montana Hide Company, Helena, Mont. Shipment March 2.

21 D. F. fr. hides, $588.18½		$108.78
1 D. F. fallen hides, $23.15½		3.56
3 D. F. dwgd. kip. and lt., $41.17		6.97
7 D. F. bd. dwgd. hides, $85.11½		9.77
Trimmings		.38
32		129.08
Charges:		
Advances, per cent for handling	$3.23	
Freight	15.24	
Cartage	.50	
		18.97
Net proceeds		110.11

Inclosed we hand you our check No. —— for net proceeds as per statement.

Yours, truly, JOHN MILLER & CO.
Per H. W.

APPENDIX C 8.

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 8, 1907.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 24360, shipped by ——— ———, Oswego.

State board, 2 steers, passed	$72.08
State board, 1 steer, passed	30.54
Total	102.62

Held from sale September 23, 1907.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on September 27, 1907.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. (Incorporated). Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 989.

CREDIT.

By 4 quarters of beef, 690 pounds, $3.75		$25.87
By butter stock, 22 pounds, $5.61		1.23
By steer hide, 85 pounds, $10.30		8.75
By head, tongue, etc		.60
		36.45

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.01	
		1.98
Net proceeds		34.47

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on September 27, 1907.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. (Incorporated). Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 988.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 714 pounds, $4		$28.56
By butter stock, 26 pounds, $5.61		1.46
By steer hide, 87 pounds, $10.30		8.97
By head, tongue, etc		.60
		39.59

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.01	
		1.98
Net proceeds		37.61

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on September 27, 1907.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. (Incorporated). Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag. No. 940.

CREDIT.

By 4 quarters of beef, 669 pounds, $3.62		$24.24
By butter stock, 12 pounds, $5.61		.67
By steer hide, 70 pounds, $10.30		7.21
By head, tongue, etc		.40
		32.52

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.01	
		1.98
Net proceeds		30.54

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., August 17, 1906.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 13200. Shipped by ——— ———, Oswego.

State board, 1 steer, passed	$34.73
State board, 1 steer, passed	36.13
Total	70.86

Held from sale August 6, 1906.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on August 10, 1906:

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. Sold to Marsh. Tag No. 160.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 664 pounds, $4		$26.56
By butter stock, 31 pounds, $4.53		1.40
By steer hide, 76 pounds, $10.75		8.17
By head, tongue, etc		.60
		36.73

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$1.72	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.28	
		2.00
Net proceeds		34.73

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on August 10, 1906:

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. Sold to Marsh. Tag No. 161.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 746 pounds, $3.58	$27.04
By butter stock, 20 pounds, $4.53	.91
By steer hide, 91 pounds, $10.75	9.78
By head, tongue, etc	.40
	38.13

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$1.72	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.28	
		2.00
Net proceeds		36.13

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 30, 1906.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 16062. Shipped by ——— ———, Oswego.

State board, 1 steer passed $38.28

Held from sale October 17, 1906.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 19, 1906.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. Sold to Standard Slaughtering Company. Tag No. 57.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 735 pounds, at $3.50	$25.72
By butter stock, 24 pounds, at $5.25	1.26
By steer hide, 100 pounds	12.60
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	40.18

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.93	
		1.90
Net proceeds		38.28

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 11, 1906.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 14343. Shipped by ——— ———, Oswego.

State board, 1 steer passed $34.31

Held from sale September 20, 1906.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on September 28, 1906:

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. Sold to Standard Slaughtering Company. Tag No. 170.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 774 pounds, at 3¾ cents	$26.11
By butter stock, 20 pounds, at $5.02	1.00
By steer hide, 83 pounds, at $10.60	8.80
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	36.51

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$1.72	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.48	
		2.20
Net proceeds		34.31

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 18, 1906.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 15687. Shipped by ——— ———, Glasgow.

State board, 1 steer, passed $18.46

Held from sale October 2, 1906.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on October 5, 1906.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. Sold to Standard Slaughtering Company. Tag No. 518.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 553 pounds, at 1¾ cents	$10.37
By butter stock, 8 pounds	.42
By steer hide, 72 pounds	9.07
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	20.46

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$1.72	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.28	
		$2.00
Net proceeds		18.46

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 16, 1907.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 24640. Shipped by ——— ———.

State board, 1 cow passed $36.19

Held from sale September 25, 1907.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on September 27, 1907.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co. (Incorporated). Sold to L. Wall. Tag No. 123.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 649 pounds, $4.50	$29.20
By butter stock, 38 pounds, $5.61	2.13
By cowhide, 63 pounds, $9.80	6.18
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	38.11

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	.95	
		1.92
Net proceeds		36.19

ROSENBAUM BROTHERS & CO. (INCORPORATED),
LIVE STOCK COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill., October 30, 1908.

Sold for account of Pioneer Cattle Company. Sale No. 1709; shipped by ——— ———, Oswego.

State board 5 steers passed $214.33

Held from sale October 15, 1908.
Credit account.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 16, 1908.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 766.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 724 pounds, $4.25	$30.77
By butter stock, 26 pounds, $8.55	2.23
By steer hide, 68 pounds, $10.63	7.23
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	40.83

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.00	
		1.97
Net proceeds		38.86

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on October 16, 1908.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 767.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 797 pounds, $4.25	$33.87
By butter stock, 30 pounds, $8.55	2.56
By steer hide, 79 pounds, $11.38	8.99
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	46.02

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.00	
		1.97
Net proceeds		44.05

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois

at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 16, 1908.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 768.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 762 pounds, $5.25	$40.00
By butter stock, 16 pounds, $8.55	1.37
By steer hide, 75 pounds, $11.38	8.54
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	50.51

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.00	
		1.97
Net proceeds		48.54

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 16, 1908.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Sold to Armour & Co. Tag No. 769.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 869 pounds, $4.50	$39.10
By butter stock, 22 pounds, $8.55	1.88
By steer hide, 92 pounds, $11.38	10.47
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	52.05

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.00	
		$1.97
Net proceeds		50.08

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on October 16, 1908.

Owner, Rosenbaum Brothers & Co., Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 770.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 676 pounds, at $3.75	$25.34
By butter stock, 20 pounds, at $8.55	1.71
By steer hide, 67 pounds, at $10.63	7.12
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	34.77

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.00	
		1.97
Net proceeds		32.80

APPENDIX C 9.

Hides, green, salted, packers'; heavy native steers.

[Price per pound in Chicago on the 1st of each month, 1890 to 1896, and average monthly price, 1897 to 1908; quotations from the Shoe and Leather Reporter.]

Month.	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.
January	$0.0925-$0.0950	$0.0950-$0.0975	$0.0975	$0.0900	$0.0675-$0.0700	$0.0800	$0.0850
February	.0900-.0925	.0875-.0900	.0950	.0900	.0650	.0775	.0800
March	.0800-.0813	.0900	.0850	.0875	.0575-.0625	.0750	.0800
April	.0800-.0813	.0888-.0900	.0750	.0750-.0800	.0550	.0875	.0650-.0675
May	.0800-.0825	.0888-.0900	.0775	.0750	.0550	.0925-.0975	.0675-.0700
June	.0800-.0825	.0900	.0725-.0750	.0675	.0500-.0513	.1250	.0825-.0850
July	.0875-.0900	.0925	.0800-.0900	.0650	.0500-.0550	.1350	.0850-.0875
August	.1050-.1075	.0975	.0800-.0925	.0600-.0625	.0550-.0300	.1325-.1350	.0700
September	.1075-.1100	.0975-.1000	.0950-.0975	.0600	.0675-.0725	.1200	.0750
October	.1050-.1075	.1025-.1050	.0900	.0750	.0800	.1200	.0675
November	.1000-.1025	.1025	.0900	.0775	.0775	.1000-.1100	.0925
December	.0975-.1000	.1025	.0925	.0725	.0775	.0800	.0975
Yearly average	.0933	.0951	.0870	.0749	.0641	.1028	.0811

Month.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
January	[a] $0.0920	$0.1116	$0.1149	$0.1355	$0.1194	$0.1327	$0.1311	$0.1100	$0.1380	$0.1537	$0.1627	$0.1116
February	[a] .0921	.1130	.1172	.1315	.1165	.1242	.1243	.1075	.1349	.1509	.1620	.1037
March	[a] .0922	.1100	.1160	.1224	.1097	.1206	.1183	.1052	.1300	.1424	.1531	.0944
April	[a] .0888	.1061	.1168	.1223	.1054	.1189	.1130	.1071	.1311	.1433	.1441	.1050
May	[a] .0873	.1168	.1192	.1184	.1119	.1255	.1166	.1094	.1345	.1484	.1437	.1175
June	[a] .0931	.1242	.1194	.1118	.1207	.1285	.1186	.1118	.1342	.1490	.1488	.1325
July	[a] .0995	.1222	.1204	.1045	.1295	.1319	.1168	.1131	.1413	.1502	.1472	.1500
August	[b] .1056	.1176	.1233	.1087	.1258	.1458	.1137	.1186	.1525	.1572	.1411	.1563
September	[b] .1105	.1173	.1281	.1130	.1292	.1491	.1194	.1175	.1519	.1645	.1411	.1575
October	[b] .1117	.1181	.1325	.1162	.1375	.1454	.1134	.1231	.1534	.1633	.1470	.1565
November	[b] .1125	.1111	.1358	.1267	.1400	.1444	.1085	.1369	.1536	.1637	.1364	.1581
December	[b] .1102	.1128	.1382	.1217	.1389	.1382	.1086	.1395	.1577	.1650	.1185	.1600
Yearly average	.0996	.1151	.1235	.1194	.1237	.1338	.1169	.1166	.1430	.1543	.1455	.1336

[a] Free-hide period. [b] Dutiable-hide period.

APPENDIX C 10.

Actual returns to owners of cattle suspected of disease, which, after post-mortem examination, were pronounced pure and fit for food. These cattle were held by order of federal and state inspectors for post-mortem examination. They were then killed, skinned, and quartered, after which the post-mortem examination was made. The Chicago Live Stock Exchange in each case made report to the owners of the cattle as follows. About 200 to 300 "suspect" cattle are handled on Chicago market weekly in this manner.

Particular attention is called to the differences between the meat and hide prices; also the varying prices at different dates.

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on February 5, 1909.

Owner, Smith Brothers Commission Company. Sold to J. Wall. Tag No. 377.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 745 pounds, $6.50	$48.42
By butter stock, 40 pounds, $7.65	3.06
By steer hide, 86 pounds $12.30	10.58
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	62.66

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.06	
		$2.03
Net proceeds		60.63

Owner, J. H. Hall, Breckenridge, Mo.

[Duplicate.]

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on January 22, 1909.

Owner, Iowa Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 743.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 387 pounds, at $5.75	$22.24
By butter stock, 17 pounds, $7.61	1.30
By cow hide, 46 pounds, $10.80	4.97
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	29.11

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.23	
		$2.20
Net proceeds		26.91

Owner, Johnson Brothers, Round Lake, Minn.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

[Duplicate.]

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on the 22d day of January, 1909.

Owner, Iowa Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 742.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 512 pounds, $5.37½	$27.50
By butter stock, 14 pounds, $7.61	1.06
By steer hide, 64 pounds, $10.80	6.91
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	36.07

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.23	
		2.20
Net proceeds		33.87

Owner, J. W. Eddy, Osceola, Iowa.

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

[Duplicate.]

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois, at a post-mortem examination thereof, held in the city of Chicago on February 11, 1909.

Owner, Iowa L. S. Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 564.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 554 pounds, at $6.62½	$36.70
By butter stock, 23 pounds, at $7.65	1.76
By steer hide, 62 pounds, at $11.15	6.92
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	45.98

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.17	
		2.14
Net proceeds		43.84

Owner, I. R. Lord, Aredale, Iowa.

APPENDIX C 11.

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION
AND CATTLE RAISERS' ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Washington, D. C., ——— *190*—.

The shoe and leather men who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee contended that the packers and not the cattle raisers received the value which the tariff added to the price of hides. It is surprising that such an absurd statement should have been made to so intelligent a body of men as those who comprise the membership of that committee. To attempt to give credence to such a statement would put too much of a strain on the credulity even of simple-minded men. Of course any buyer of a steer considers the market value of the hide as well as the market value of the meat. Why did they not carry their contention further and assert that the buyers of cattle robbed the farmers and cattle raisers of the entire hide value of the steer? That statement would be quite as easy of belief as the former.

Fortunately we are not compelled to rely on the assertions of shoe and leather manufacturers as to what consideration is given by buyers to hide values in cattle. J. W. Radcliffe, a farmer and cattle raiser, of Dexter, Kans., has forwarded to Hon. P. P. CAMPBELL, his Representative in Congress, a statement from the secretary of the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, which confutes the contentions in this respect of the shoe manufacturers and leather men. Mr. Radcliffe's statement of this transaction is: "The particular beef steer that Mr. Searle refers to was cut out of my cattle because he had a lump on his neck. He was sold subject to post-mortem examination. The State of Illinois slaughtered him and had the meat inspected. It proved to be good meat, and was sold according to the bill I got of it." The bill follows:

CHICAGO LIVE STOCK EXCHANGE,
OFFICE OF THE SECETARY,
Union Stock Yards, Chicago, Ill.

Statement of the disposition of one carcass of beef and its offal, pronounced fit for food by the state veterinarian of the State of Illinois at a post-mortem examination thereof held in the city of Chicago on October 23, 1906:

Owner, Lee Live Stock Commission Company. Sold to M. O'Dea. Tag No. 8.

CREDIT.

By four quarters of beef, 765 pounds, $6.50	$49.72
By butter stock, 38 pounds, $8.55	3.25
By steer hide, 79 pounds, $11.38	8.99
By head, tongue, etc	.60
	62.56

DEBIT.

To slaughtering, dressing, chilling, and delivering carcass	$0.97	
To feed and petty incidental expenses	1.18	
		$2.15
Net proceeds		60.41

Radcliffe Brothers, Dexter, Kans., October 19.

APPENDIX C 12.

General balance sheet of the United States Leather Company.

[Taken from Moody's Manual, 1908.]

	1907.	1906.	1905.
ASSETS.			
Cash	$4,318,178	$2,505,159	$2,230,337
Accounts receivable	9,979,789	10,761,665	9,562,293
Bills receivable	3,569,624	1,277,339	243,507
Doubtful debtors, valued at	4,245	8,832	4,125
Other debtors		1,070,602	984,196
Hides and leather	11,457,273	15,269,784	12,716,388
Bark at tanneries	2,386,316	1,677,962	1,871,105
Sundry personal property	402,108	654,627	590,839
Advances to other companies	508,703	1,920,921	1,923,030
Drawbacks		464,492	508,223
Railroad mortgage	100,000	100,000	100,000
Tannery plants, etc	6,924,693	6,847,706	6,756,081
Stock of other companies	58,172,225	56,760,181	52,823,603
Bonds of other companies	6,216,888	6,879,888	8,404,888
Real estate interests	501,116	490,235	232,625
Treasury stock			
Good will, etc	[a] 62,832,300	62,832,300	62,832,300
Unexpired insurance	123,247	106,298	71,576
Total	167,496,705	169,627,987	161,855,116
LIABILITIES.			
Common stock	62,882,300	62,882,300	62,882,300
Preferred stock	62,282,300	62,282,300	62,282,300
Bonds	4,680,000	5,080,000	5,280,000
Accrued interest, etc	52,470	67,960	59,550
Current accounts	342,461	609,585	629,949
Exchange, not due	453,582	2,072,904	1,516,822
Bills payable	12,785,019	13,080,000	7,900,000
Reserve for fire insurance	419,172	639,729	632,666
Surplus	23,599,401	22,913,209	20,641,529
Total	167,496,705	169,627,987	161,855,116

[a] Represented by hides and leather, tannery plants, extract works, glue plants, sawmills, lumber, railroads, bark, timber and lands in fee, bark contracts, bark at tanneries, personal property, cash, and sundry debtors.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] permit a suggestion before he resumes his seat? It has occurred to me that if we had a good tanner and a good shoe manufacturer in the Senate, with the Senator from Wyoming, who is understood to be one of the great cattle producers of the ranching States, and myself, a hide dealer, we might together make up a quartet that could give the Senate all the information necessary for the intelligent consideration of this hide proposition. I am sure the Senator means to be entirely candid, as I intend to be, and I feel that if the sum total of our combined knowledge can furnish the Senate the essential facts for a proper consideration of this subject, it is entitled to them.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let me say, if I may be permitted, that it is the absolute bottom facts that we want; and I rest my case entirely upon facts.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator what, in his opinion, is the number of pounds of leather entering into the sole of a shoe?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have worn shoes all my life, and I have had several teeth filled. If a man should ask me the weight and value of the amount of gold I have had put in my teeth, I should be unable to say how many pennyweights there were, and what it would be worth if I were to sell it; but I might tell him what it had cost me. I am in the same fix regarding the sole of a shoe. I have never been interested in the cutting or making of shoes, so I would be compelled, as far as personal knowledge is concerned, to consider the shoe from the point of what it cost me.

Mr. PAGE. But I am certain that the Senator has been very careful to read all that has been said about this question in the hearings before the House committee, and I think the fact there appeared that there are about 2 pounds of sole leather in a pair of shoes. Am I right about that?

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly the Senator would be right as to some shoes; but if he will observe the testimony, he will remember that there was quite a divergence of opinion, and it was also stated that it depended a great deal on the kind of leather and the kind of shoe.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, would not a big shoe have more leather in its sole than a little shoe?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am serious about this. I would like, if possible, to get at a fair estimate as to this matter. I

do not ask for any further opinion from the Senator in this regard if he does not wish to give it. My judgment is that there are about 2 pounds in the average pair of soles.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me just there? I have searched the evidence pretty fully, and while I think there was one wild statement made, which was afterwards taken back, I believe the tanners and the shoe men have gone all the way from 2 cents a pair to 8 cents a pair in their estimates. I believe there have been some that have reached the figure of 6 to 8 cents upon the soles and uppers in shoes made of split leather or dutiable leather. But I have not seen a single statement under oath, and I do not know that I have seen a single one when they were not under oath, that claimed more than 8 cents for the dutiable leather, or that it made more than that difference in an entire pair of shoes.

Mr. PAGE. As far as that is concerned, there were statements that claimed, I think, that the added price was 25 or even more cents per pair to the consumer, but I do not care to go into that.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator stake his reputation upon that being so?

Mr. PAGE. No, sir; I will not. I want the facts as the Senator and I know them. Does the Senator know, or has he an opinion, in regard to the number of feet of upper leather that enter into those shoes?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, they used to say that it took 1 foot for me; but I find out that it takes 13 inches to make a shoe for me.

Mr. PAGE. Thirteen inches of upper leather in one of your shoes?

Mr. WARREN. I think it takes 13 inches in length to make one for me, yes; but I could not tell you how much it is.

Mr. PAGE. I think the statement before the committee was that there were about 3 feet of leather in a pair of uppers. I thought that was a fair statement, and that was the consensus of opinion as near as I could draw it out. I am not trying to get at any overestimates or any underestimates. I thought that perhaps on both of these points the Senator and I could agree; and I should like to get the facts for the benefit of the Senate.

About what, may I ask the Senator, is the added price per pound on sole leather because of the 15 per cent duty, as near as the Senator remembers the testimony before the committee?

Mr. WARREN. The difference?

Mr. PAGE. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I observed that the difference between the various witnesses who testified was so great that I gave no credence whatever to it; there were so many "ifs" and "ands," and whether it was domestic or whether it was imported hide, or whether it was a split-leather shoe, and so forth. So I am going to leave the Senator to make his own deductions there, because I could not make either head or tail of their statements.

Mr. PAGE. Split leather does not enter into the manufacture of the sole of the shoe, as I understand it.

Mr. WARREN. Hardly that, unless it would be the soft-sole shoe. It enters into them, of course. But the Senator will not doubt that, I presume.

Mr. PAGE. But not into the outer, the main, sole of a shoe?

Mr. WARREN. Ordinarily not; no.

Mr. PAGE. And as I recollect, there was nothing that appeared in the testimony of any of the witnesses that made the difference less than 2 cents per pound because of the 15 per cent duty. Am I right about that?

Mr. WARREN. I do not know that I get the Senator's proposition.

Mr. PAGE. That the added price per pound in the value of sole leather because of the duty might be 2 cents?

Mr. WARREN. If it amuses the Senator—and I say it respectfully—to go into the make-up of the figures of the shoe men themselves, which I have accepted without cavil, I shall be unable to help him. I have simply taken the statements as they made them; and I would rather take the statements of the men that make the shoe as to what it takes and what it amounts to than to take the word of the tanner. For while I have splendid friends, let me say, in New England, among the tanners, those for whom I have the highest regard, yet it is a regrettable fact that these misrepresentations have arisen among the tanners, and not among the boot and shoe men.

Mr. PAGE. In short, what do you understand to be the difference in the cost of the shoe made of all imported leather and one made from domestic hide?

Mr. WARREN. I should say, if I were to answer the Senator's question, less than a penny to a pair of shoes of all sizes. But I credit this statement, made from the apparent sincerity of men showing shoes made, as they say, for heavy work, made of heavy leather. There may be 6 or 8 cents additional cost to a pair of shoes when finished because of the imposition of 15 per cent, provided it raises the price that much.

Mr. PAGE. I am willing to leave it there.

Mr. WARREN. I am always looking for final results. I do not care to go stage by stage into the making up of a shoe as against witnesses, when they themselves give the final figures.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator, in his statement in regard to the number of cattle in this country, what it included? Did it include simply the steers and cows, or did it include calves?

Mr. WARREN. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. PAGE. The Senator gave the number of cattle in the United States, I think, at 71,000,000. Did that include all cattle, including calves and cattle producing nondutiable hides?

Mr. WARREN. I should say that in the make-up ordinarily of the farmer, when a farmer counts the number of his cattle prior to January 1, he will state the cattle without including the calves at all. If after the 1st of January, he will count the number of calves 6 months old and older. That is the usual way of determining the number of cattle.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator referred to the records, and I think if he will take the trouble to again look them up he will find given in detail the number of calves, the number of steers between 1 and 2 years old, the number between 2 and 3 years old, the number of bulls, the number of heifers, the number of dairy cows, and other stock.

Mr. WARREN. Who gives that?

Mr. PAGE. The census report gives it.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will investigate further, he will find that from that very census report the Agricultural Department has made certain deductions, and if he will look further along, he will find somewhere in the document the best estimate they can make, but I have not verified it as to the particular division of the cattle.

Mr. PAGE. But what I was seeking to have the Senator tell me is whether that statement giving 71,000,000 as the number of cattle covered calves as well as grown cattle?

Mr. WARREN. I will say now, and I will put on record what I firmly believe, that every steer's hide weighing less than 25 pounds comes in free; that every cow's hide weighing less than that comes in free. Therefore, the weight as determined is always in favor of the importer, and not in favor of the farmer, and a great many of the hides that should be dutiable come in free of duty.

Mr. PAGE. I am not talking about imported hides.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator tell the Senate how many pairs of shoes are made in this country? Will he then divide the total number by the amount of money resting in the Treasury per annum taken from the dutiable hides, and state what proportion per pair that makes in addition to the cost of the shoes?

Mr. PAGE. I have not looked up those statistics. I do not know where I could find them.

Mr. WARREN. I will say, and I say it very respectfully, that the figure is so infinitesimal I think the Senator would lose it if he laid it down anywhere; that is to say, the amount of money that we get as a net revenue distributed over the entire production of shoes, thus stating it, is infinitesimal.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is leading me away from the fact I want to show.

Mr. WARREN. I purposely do that, because I propose at a later time to give the correct statistics.

Mr. PAGE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so. What I am trying to show, if the Senator will permit me, is this: He gave a statement showing 71,000,000 cattle. I have a statement of a year or two before, which gives the number as 67,822,000. That is probably near enough for all purposes. The census report gives the total number of steers 1 year and over at 15,000,000, 7,000,000 1 to 2 years old, 5,000,000 2 to 3 years old, 3,000,000 3 years old and over. I should like to ask the Senator where he would place those steer hides—the 7,000,000 steers which are 1 year and under 2 years old—that is, whether in the hide or in the kip selection, the dutiable or the nondutiable?

Mr. WARREN. Where does the Senator get his figures of 15,000,000 steers? I have seen nothing of the kind. Let me say another thing. The boot and shoe men state the number of cattle at seventy-three million and something, but the Agricultural Department says seventy-one million and something. In my judgment the figures of the Agricultural Department, when

made January 1, will be all of the cattle above calves, and will be so many of the calves as are spring calves.

Mr. LODGE. That was the February bulletin. It gave 71,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. I say it did not include the calves of the fall and winter, but calves of the spring before.

Mr. PAGE. As to the number of cattle, under the general head of "Neat cattle," the last census report gives "total number of calves under 1 year," "steers over 1 and under 2 years," "steers 2 and under 3 years," "steers 3 years and over," "bulls 1 year and over," "heifers 1 and under 2 years," "dairy cows 2 years and over," "other cows 2 years and over."

I do not know of any other statistics on this point other than these from the last census report. It seems to me that unless the Senator from Wyoming has some other statistics, it will be fair to take these as the basis of the calculations that I wish to make at this time.

Mr. WARREN. I have not found yet what the Senator wants to determine, and I should like to help him out if I can.

Mr. PAGE. I want to know what part of these cattle—steers and cows—produce hides coming under the 25-pound limit.

Mr. WARREN. So far as the steers and cows are concerned, the Senator knows that there are divisions of various kinds, less closely cited than the total number. I think if the Senator will take the figures he will find that the better figures are taken at slaughtering.

Mr. PAGE. I now wish to ask the Senator, because he is a great cattle raiser, what is his idea as to the weight of the hide of a yearling steer. Is it under or above 25 pounds?

Mr. WARREN. Under.

Mr. PAGE. Then you think the hide from a steer under 2 years old would come within the nondutiable class?

Mr. WARREN. When you apply the weight of skin, the question can only be considered in the most general terms, because if you are breeding shorthorn cattle you have a hide that will weigh about half as much as if breeding Hereford cattle.

Mr. PAGE. I realize that.

Mr. WARREN. If you are breeding Devonshire cattle, there is a different hide. This weight comes in and destroys all kinds of denominations. It is simply the net weight of whatever it may be—a bull's hide, a steer hide, a heifer hide.

There is another thing I will say. I have information from the appraisers, who have the best information they can get as to the weight of calfskin, and they state that calfskin will weigh nearer 10 pounds than 25, and dry nearer 8 than 12.

Mr. PAGE. But I am trying to get the Senator's idea as to the proportion of hides in this country which run 25 and above and 25 and below, and I think it is fair that he should give me his opinion on that point, and then I will not pursue the inquiry further.

Mr. WARREN. We have, of course, the statement as to imports and exports.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me a moment?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. In discussing this matter Saturday, that was one of the points which I sought to emphasize. Confessedly the source of information is not the best. The point is, what I think the Senator is seeking to make ultimately, that it is only a small proportion of the hides of all the animals slaughtered in this country that would come in competition directly with the class of hides which it is proposed by this amendment to have dutiable.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is exactly right. I am trying to show precisely that.

Mr. WARREN. Now, I am going to ask the Senator this, if he will pardon me: I believe that he has even a much better source of information than I have, although that which I had reduced it to a very small proportion. If the Senator will give us that information, I wish he would do so.

Mr. PAGE. I will, later on, furnish it. I should like the Senator from Wyoming to answer another question. What do you say as to the weight of the hide from the average dairy of the farmers of this country?

Mr. WARREN. What was the Senator's inquiry?

Mr. PAGE. I ask the Senator if he will give me his judgment as to the weight of the hide as it comes from the average cow in this country?

Mr. WARREN. When you talk about the average cow, the average cow of Vermont might be a Jersey, the average cow of Connecticut might be a Dutch Holland Friesland, the average cow in Wyoming might be a Hereford, a shorthorn, a polled Angus, or a Devon.

If the Senator will tell me what he is trying to get at, I will help him; but his figures seem to me merely to befog the question, because they can not be answered categorically. I say the question of weight of the milch cow depends upon the breed of the cow and the size of it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. PAGE. That is absolutely correct; but I think, if the Senator will be candid about it, he can tell me about the average hide of cows, counting the Holstein, counting the Jersey, and counting grades, as we term them in the East. What I desire is the average weight of all classes as they run.

Mr. WARREN. I shall be glad to have the Senator tell me about that.

Mr. PAGE. I can.

Mr. WARREN. I hope he will, but I do not know where he proposes to touch the question with it.

Mr. PAGE. That will appear later, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. WARREN. If he proposes to glory in the fact that after the Senate and House had passed the bill and the President had signed it, putting a tariff on those things, by some—I will not say hocus-pocus, but by some determination of authority, a wrong was perpetrated, I will admit the wrong.

Mr. PAGE. I am trying to get facts, and all I ask is the Senator's opinion. Can you tell me, approximately, the average weight of the hides taken off in New England and New York?

Mr. WARREN. What has that got to do with the hides of Colorado or the hides of Wyoming?

Mr. PAGE. I know the average hide of New England and New York weighs 58 pounds green, untrimmed, with the horns and tail bone in.

Mr. WARREN. I am glad to know that in New England the tail goes with the hide, as it does in the West.

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, eastern hides, trimmed and cured, weigh 48 pounds. I imagine that in the West they weigh a little more; indeed, I know they do. Can the Senator, from his long experience in taking off hides, tell me the average weight of the western hide? I should like to know what it is. My purpose will appear later on.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator, I think, is being rather enamored with the idea of my engaging in the butcher business.

Mr. PAGE. I think you stated Saturday——

Mr. WARREN. I have not been very largely interested in that class of work, although I have done everything that a man does on a farm. I have been subjected to the skinning process, metaphorically speaking, many times.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say that I am not a tanner; and the Senator from Wyoming, I imagine, is to some extent a hide dealer and a butcher, and no man can be interested in cattle as much as he is without knowing something about hides.

Mr. WARREN. I have seen the time when, after three or four days' camping out without food, except the dry food we started out with, we would find a bunch of cattle, and would butcher some, enough to sustain life and strengthen ourselves with meat. That makes me a butcher to that extent, but that is about all.

The Senator says I have been interested in raising cattle. So I have. I have nothing now of my own. I own stock in a corporation that has a few cattle. My personal interest is entirely nil in this subject. My only interest in it, and the only reason why I take the time I have, and exhausted myself in this Chamber, is because of my idea of right and wrong, and I am doing it just as much for the State the Senator represents as I am for the State I represent.

Mr. PAGE. I am not seeking to debate this matter. I want the facts, and I want the Senate to know the exact facts in regard to the matter, and I am trying to ascertain them. I think I know them, but I thought I would get the Senator to confirm them.

Mr. WARREN. I believe I have given the facts as far as I have gone. If the Senator will accept them, all right. If he questions them, I will undertake to correct them and undertake to accept the Senator's figures unless I have some personal information. I will volunteer it as the Senator goes along, if he will permit me. I am willing to take the Senator's figures.

Mr. PAGE. I think the Senator can inform me on one point; that is, about what age the farmers or your corporation usually slaughter the cow. When do you think they become so inefficient that you slaughter them? What is the age?

Mr. WARREN. I suppose in the dairy business you slaughter cows at an age of 12 years and 15 years; that is the average. I should say in the western country they would slaughter a cow not used for dairy purposes, but for rearing, whenever the cow happened to be barren and fat, whether 4 years or 12 years old. That is the way it is usually done. The dairy

business of the West is very much as it is in the East. I will say, for instance, in the Senator's State the product of hides from his State would be in less proportion to the number of animals, probably not over half as much as in another State where they do not have dairy stock, where they raise beef stock; beef stock is sold at 1, 2, and 3 years old generally, but the average would be less than 3.

Mr. PAGE. That would apply to steers?

Mr. WARREN. As to steers. Now, as to cows raised on the range for the purpose of breeding and raising, whenever a cow has arrived at a proper age, and that usually on the ranges and with our farmers runs from 12 to 15 years.

Mr. PAGE. Seven or eight?

Mr. WARREN. Hardly.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he can give the number of pounds of leather that enters into the manufacture of harness? That is a matter of importance here.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I submit the Senator must think I am a sort of Pooh Bah and know all about all these trades.

I might tell him what the harness would weigh, and then ask how much of it is iron, how much is leather, how much is wood, hames, and so forth. I do not think I should like to enter into that domain.

Mr. PAGE. I did not know but the Senator knew.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know. If the Senator can give the statistics, I would be delighted to have them produced.

Mr. PAGE. I thought the Senator could help me out.

Mr. WARREN. As far as that is concerned, let me say that some harness is five times as heavy as others.

Mr. PAGE. We are talking about the average. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he knows about the average price of hides for the last ten years?

Mr. WARREN. I know what the market rates are. I have the quotations here, for instance, and if the Senator wishes, I will insert them in my speech.

Mr. PAGE. I think that is all I desire to ask. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask that I may add in my speech the price in Boston and the price in Chicago at the latest date I have.

The VICE-PRESIDENT Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I believe that, coming from the State I do, I do not need to apologize for my Republicanism. I do not believe the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Montana have ever discovered in any Vermonter a disposition to withhold from the farmers of the West any fair reward for their labor.

It has been stated here by the Senator from Wyoming that the packers have not entered upon the business of tanning hides. That is the statement of some one, I think, hailing from Chicago, and the Senator from Wyoming affirms that, in his judgment, the statement is true. They have deluged those who favor a duty upon hides with a very large number of statistics showing how the tanner prospered prior to the passage of the Dingley tariff act.

I want to say, Mr. President, that if they are correct, if the situation to-day is as it was in 1897, if the packers are not entering into the business of tanning leather in competition with the "independent tanner," so called, then I will waive all I have to say in favor of free hides, and if I do not convince the Senators from Wyoming and Montana that I am right about that, I will accept their verdict about the matter and withdraw my opposition and vote for the 15 per cent duty.

But if I am right—if the packers having control of a large percentage of the hides of this country are entering into the business of tanning leather in competition with the independent tanner, and if the percentage, from year to year, which they control is increasing very fast, as I believe it to be, so that within a few years they are liable to constitute the greatest trust that this country has ever seen—then I believe the Senators will agree with me that we should be very slow to put up this tariff wall which the 15 per cent duty provides.

I start upon the theory that no line of trade, I do not care what it is, no manufacturing industry of this or any other country, can succeed if the manufacturer is handicapped in the purchase of his raw material. That is one of the fundamentals of business economics.

Mr. CARTER. Upon that theory, then, the Senator would favor free iron ore, of course?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am not to be drawn away from my argument on hides.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to know whether the principle is applicable exclusively to hides, or whether it applies generally to raw material that is absolutely necessary in manufacturing?

Mr. PAGE. When I get through I think I will have demonstrated to the Senator from Montana that there is a wide difference between the conditions attaching to hides and those attaching to iron. If I can not——

Mr. CARTER. Why not wool, Mr. President? Would the Senator have free wool? That is a raw material.

Mr. PAGE. I can appeal to my vote here in the Senate. I have never voted for free wool. Vermont is a woolgrowing State. She has always been as firm as the everlasting hills in the support of protection on wool.

Mr. CARTER. When the Senator states that no manufacturer can thrive when hampered by a duty on raw material, he desires us to understand that it applies only to hides?

Mr. PAGE. No, sir; I do not. I will repeat what was said by the distinguished Senator from Iowa the other day. He said that the young men of this country, the vigorous, pushing, energetic men of the country, would see to it that no trust existed if you would give them an even chance on raw material. I believe the converse of that proposition must be admitted—that if a man who is making leather or anything else has got to go into the market and buy his raw material of his competitor, and, of course, at a great disadvantage or handicap, he must in a little while go out of business or go to work for his competitor. Am I right about that?

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. HEYBURN. If I do not disturb the Senator, I should like to contribute toward laying a premise, because I shall probably make some remarks after the Senator is through. How long does it take to convert the raw material of the shoe, unmanufactured, into the merchantable article?

Mr. PAGE. If the Senator will allow me, I will give him the record time. The editor of the Boot and Shoe Recorder went down from Boston to Weymouth some time ago with a party of editors. They went to a manufacturer of shoes there, who was also a tanner. They arrived at Weymouth at 11 o'clock. There was at that time a calf, alive, out in the yard. At 3 o'clock the editor of the Recorder sat down to dinner with a pair of shoes made from its skin.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is very interesting, but, if the Senator will permit me, how long does it take the maker of shoes to realize his money upon the enterprise of making shoes, approximately?

Mr. PAGE. It may, perhaps, be turned over twice a year. I do not know certainly about that.

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator permit me to suggest that it takes those who raise cattle to carry hides of a dutiable weight three years to convert their raw material, which is the calf, into a merchantable article, which is the hide, and that during those three years there is the continual expense of feed and care. Had the Senator considered that proposition?

Mr. PAGE. As I am an older man than the Senator from Idaho and was brought up on a farm until I was a young man, I think I know all that the Senator does about that matter.

Mr. HEYBURN. My question was, had the Senator taken it into consideration?

Mr. PAGE. I have.

Mr. HEYBURN. In determining the raw material?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Now, I will repeat my proposition. It is that the manufacturer must stand upon a par with his competitor in the matter of raw material or he can not live.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. DIXON. I do not want to divert the Senator's argument, but I was interested in the story about killing the calf and tanning the hide and making the shoes in three hours.

Mr. PAGE. In four hours.

Mr. DIXON. What kind of tanning was used in that process?

Mr. PAGE. Chrome.

Mr. DIXON. Is it as successful in making leather as the old tan bark? Can it be done as successfully? Does it make as good leather?

Mr. PAGE. I am going to come to that later on, if I think of it, because the Senator from Wyoming told us about the great destruction of forests that was going on because of tanning. I shall try to show to the Senator from Montana that that statement was not founded upon a proper consideration of facts.

But to proceed. Let me go with Senators, in fancy if I may, over to Liverpool. There is an area there larger than this room by three or four times; I do not know but it contains half an acre, and standing around at different points in that area you will see groups of men. If you inquire what they are

doing, they will tell you this group here handle sea-island cotton; that group over here handle Egyptian cotton; another group handle American cotton. I can not tell the names of all the different kinds of cotton handled there, but the men standing there have telegrams and letters from all over the world about the kinds of cotton which is there bought and sold. When they have concluded their brief conference of an hour the cotton market of the world for that day is fixed, and telegrams go therefrom to our friends in the South, and indeed everywhere that cotton is sold, telling what price has been fixed on the different kinds of cotton for that day.

What I want to emphasize is the absolutely equitable system which prevails there in the transaction of business. One cotton spinner can buy his cotton just as cheaply as any other cotton spinner.

Go with me across the channel to Antwerp. I will show you there a similar area, but instead of being devoted entirely to cotton, you will there see one group of men that deal in grain; another group that deal in pork and lard; another that deal in hides, and so on.

Antwerp has come to control the market for South American hides, and the tanner from this country, if he is able to pay the duty and wants to buy South American hides of the green-salted variety, sends to his agent at Antwerp. That agent goes to the exchange, or area which I have described, and, approaching the group which handle hides, tells them, for instance, that he has an order for "10,000 South American steers, running from 80 to 100 pounds, No. 1's." He solicits bids; and in five minutes he has offers from the different members of the group, and the lowest bid gets the business, of course. What I wish to particularly emphasize is the idea that the trade there is absolutely free. One man stands on an absolute parity with his competitor; no one is handicapped.

Go a little farther east, to Russia, and go with me to the Nizhni Novgorod fair. There the calfskins of Russia, which is the great calf and colt skin producing country of the world, are sold. There the hide dealers from all Russia gather together, as well as the tanners from this country and from every other country on the face of the globe. Each man meets on a level with every other man as regards prices.

Go with me to London. There the business is handled differently. London does not control the product of any particular country, but it has hides from all over the world. You can go there and buy Java, Chinese, Japanese, Calcutta, or almost any other kind of hides. Go with me into that little upper chamber where hides are sold at auction, and you will find there on file a catalogue of all the hides that have been received in London from different parts of the world, and you will find there the group of men who every two or three weeks gather there to buy these hides at auction. Those of you who have attended an American auction know how it is run. The auctioneer says, "Give me 7 cents for these hides. I am offered 7; give me 8." He goes on in the old-fashioned auctioneer's way for a few minutes until he has sold the lot of hides. Not so there. The auctioneer knows about what those hides are worth. We will suppose they are worth 6 pence a pound. He stands up and says, "Gentlemen, I call your attention to lot No. 1 on this schedule. They are Calcutta hides. There are 5,000 in the lot, which weigh from 40 to 60 pounds. They are No. 1's. Am I offered 7 pence? Am I offered 6 pence 3 farthings? Am I offered 6 pence half-penny? Am I offered 6 pence 1 farthing? Am I offered 6 pence?

Am I offered 5 pence 3 farthings? By that time the hides are sold. I have seen two or three hundred thousand dollars' worth of hides sold there in two or three hours. Everybody there stands on a parity with everybody else. One man can buy as well as another—nobody is handicapped.

Now, Mr. President, much as I regret it, I want to bring Senators over to this side of the Atlantic and show them another picture, and I want them to tell me, when I am through, whether the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is correct when he says that the packers are not going into the hide business.

Let me say to you I am a hide dealer; I am not a tanner. I commenced as a boy handling hides. I know whereof I speak from what I have seen; and, as the Good Book says, "A part of which I was."

A few years ago in the city of Lowell, Mass., one might in passing up the street have noticed a new sign reading "The Lowell Rendering Company." Stepping inside he would, on inquiry, have ascertained that they there bought hides, sheep pelts, calfskins, tallow, bones, and market waste. I presume nobody knew or cared whom this Rendering Company represented, but there was the sign, and the concern was doing business.

A little later—I do not know but the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM] may remember the circumstance—an old hide concern in Manchaster, N. H., that had been there for many years retired from business. As they were friends of mine, and men with whom I had traded, their retirement surprised me, and I was further surprised when I noted that their successor was the Manchester Rendering Company.

A little later, had one traveled to Portland, Me., he would have seen there another new sign—that of the Portland Rendering Company. Up in Vermont, at Burlington, a little later, there was erected a very nice hide house, and over the door appeared the words "Burlington Rendering Company."

To cut it short, Mr. President, to-day there is not a city of any size in New England where you will not find one of these "rendering companies," and if you will go with me to Boston, I will show you a modest little room upstairs, at 44 North Market street, where you will find a corporation bearing the somewhat comprehensive name of "Consolidated Rendering Company." It is there that the hides of these different rendering companies are sold. The manager is a good, bright Vermont boy, Mr. H. W. Heath. I know him, and I knew his father. Let me say that in all these criticisms, if they may be called such, I am casting no reflection upon the men who are doing this business, nor upon my Vermont friend, the manager, Mr. Heath. He is a good, clean business man, and he makes no concealment of the fact that the Consolidated Rendering Company and all these other rendering companies are controlled by Swift & Co. The Senator from Wyoming tells us that the Swifts are not interested in the hide and tanning business. He will at least confess, I think, from what I have shown, that they are interested in the hide business.

Let me now go back to the time of the passage of the present tariff law. About that time one of the big tanneries of Peabody passed into the hands of the A. C. Lawrence Leather Company. That tannery has been enlarged and the business extended until to-day the A. C. Lawrence Leather Company and the National Calf Skin Company, both under the management of Mr. Lawrence, are the largest producers of leather in New England. It is a fact well known in New England that Swift & Co. control—and it is believed that they practically own—both of these tanning companies.

I could go further and show you, from papers which I have here, that there are several other large tanneries which, as the tanning world understands, are controlled by the Swifts.

But let me go a little further. Fifteen or twenty years ago New England hides were a leading commodity in the Boston market. My friends from the South would be surprised if I should tell them that you might lay down here side by side two hides, one from Georgia and one from New England, both of the same size, the same weight, the same color, and in every appearance alike, and yet the New England hide would bring from 1 to 2 cents a pound more than the southern hide. New England hides make splendid upper leather. They were popular, and twenty years ago there were tanneries in New England that used them almost exclusively. You could then go into any one of a half dozen hide stores in Boston and buy 5,000 New England hides in ten minutes. They could be furnished on call at any hour of the day.

Now, at the risk of being dramatic, I want to draw another picture. When I used to go to Boston to study the hide market, it was my practice to call upon my brother hide dealers and talk over the hide situation with them. One of my honored friends there, an old gentleman by the name of Charles Buck, commenced in hides about the time I did. He has gone to his long home now. I was accustomed to go to his warehouse or office to get his opinion as to the future of the hide market. Not long since I called up Mr. Buck by telephone to see about calling upon him, as was my custom, and they said his firm had departed from their old place of business; that they were now handling hides in Swift's warehouse over in Charlestown. I knew what that meant. Everybody else in the hide business in Boston knew what it meant.

Let me give you another instance. A few years ago two men by the names of Porter and Meader were doing business in Boston under the style of the Boston Hide and Skin Association. Their capital was $200,000. They were bright, thrifty men. I knew them well. One day, picking up my hide paper, I read that the Boston Hide and Skin Association had increased its capital from $200,000 to $400,000. I began to scratch my head and wonder what it could mean. It could not, I thought, be possible that they had made $200,000. Hides are sold on a very fine margin.

The hide business is safe, but it grows very slowly. What did it mean? Perhaps they had gone into some mining speculation and "struck it rich." The next time I was in Boston I

went into the store, as I was wont to do, and said, "Boys, how is the hide market?" They said, "We do not know; we guess it is looking well." I said, "Had we better advance the price?" They said, "We do not know; we will call up Heath"—Heath was the manager of the Consolidated Rendering Company, as I have told you. In a flash that $200,000 extra capital dawned upon me, and I knew that another of the independent hide concerns of Boston had gone out of business!

Mr. President, I tell you what I know, and I know it as well as I know anything; and that is, that there is not a concern in New England, outside of one in Vermont and the Consolidated Rendering Company, of Boston, owned by the Swifts, where any tanner can buy 5,000 New England hides. I would almost take my oath as to that. I do not believe there is one outside of those two where a tanner can buy 2,000 New England hides. Still the Senator from Wyoming says that the Swifts have not gone into the hide business or the tanning business.

I tell you, Mr. President, it is almost pitiful to think of the condition of the hide trade as it exists to-day in New England. Before the passage of the Dingley Act of 1897 there were a half dozen vigorous hide concerns in Boston, and their men went out into Ontario and Quebec and Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and every State in New England and into northern and eastern New York scouring the country for hides, and hides came into Boston by the thousands, and they were for sale to anybody who wanted to buy, and the tanner who bought New England hides was not handicapped. One could buy as low as another. How is it to-day? The Swifts tan hides, and, if they can get more for them than they are worth to tan, they sell them. If they are worth more to tan than they are to sell—I will not say they tan them, though it is a fair guess that they do. But there is no longer any competition worth mentioning in that great commodity.

Some time ago I read that the Swifts had gone to Albany, N. Y., and that there was now an Albany Rendering Company. I think there is one of those companies in Syracuse and another in Buffalo, but how far or to what extent they have gone into the West I do not know.

Let me say, as I pass by, that I knew Edwin C. Swift. He was a vigorous, clean, upright business man. I would trust him with my money uncounted. He and his brother, George F. Swift, started on a farm down on Cape Cod. They killed a few cattle now and then and sold them. They were successful, and in a little while George F. went to Chicago, while E. C. stayed in Boston to look after the East. They did a business in those two cities that mounted up into the millions, and I do not know but into the hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

George F. Swift was a Christian gentleman, than whom we have had none finer. I did not know George F. Swift personally, but I esteem it an honor to have known and to have enjoyed the friendship of E. C. Swift. He has been to my place of business in Vermont. When he found I was in Boston it was his wont to telephone over to my hotel and to say, "PAGE, I will come over to see you if you will tell me when I can meet you; or if you can make it entirely convenient to come over to my office, I would be glad to have you do so." That meant, of course, that I visited Mr. Swift at his office. We talked about business matters. I found him honorable, upright, straightforward, and as good a competitor as a man ever wanted. I wish to say here and now, and I want it distinctly understood, that what I am saying is not said as a criticism upon the Swifts. They are doing what they think is right, I presume, but the fact nevertheless remains that the independent tanners are no longer buying New England hides in large lots, except at two points in New England.

I doubt if there is more than one independent tanner or tanning firm in this country that is doing a larger business in tanning to-day than Swift & Co. I think the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, of Milwaukee, probably produce more leather than the Swifts; and, in passing, I wish to say one word about the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, for they illustrate what persistency, pluck, and perseverance will do in this wonderful country of ours.

Fifty years ago two German boys, Guido Pfister and Fred Vogel, landed at Castle Garden. They had their assets in little handkerchiefs hung over their shoulders. Pushing on to Buffalo, they found work in a tannery there. They had worked in a tannery in their native country and knew something of that trade. After a little time, having saved a few hundred dollars, they pushed on to Milwaukee, and there, in the most primitive and limited way, went to tanning leather.

Mr. President, they are to-day the largest individual tanners upon the face of this globe, and the tanning fraternity everywhere are proud of them. They are honorable, progressive, enterprising business men, and when I hear them spoken of with sneers, as I have in this Chamber, it grieves me.

Let me instance still another example of success in the tanning industry, for I wish to emphasize the fact that the American tanner, if given a square deal and not handicapped by adverse conditions, can beat the world. I refer to Robert H. Foerderer.

Those of you who sat in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol some half a dozen years ago will remember him as the honored Representative at large from the great State of Pennsylvania. Like Pfister & Vogel, young Foerderer was a foreigner. His father was a tanner and he was taught the tanning trade. When he became of age, like many another enterprising boy, he said: "Father, I think your business is a little too slow for me. Lend me a few thousand dollars and I will leave you and start in for myself." Within a few years he had accumulated a handsome little sum; I have heard it placed at from $40,000 to $50,000, but whether that is or is not true I do not know and it is not material.

I wish at this point to incidentally refer to a suggestion made to me by the junior Senator from Montana with reference to hemlock bark.

Young Foerderer saw that hemlock bark was fast passing from the face of the earth, and he had an idea that chrome—which is bicarbonate of potash and some other bicarbonate, perhaps bicarbonate of soda—had tanning properties. He had heard that somebody in Europe had tanned, or had been trying to tan, with those ingredients, and so he went to experimenting. After a little while his money was all gone. He then went over to Boston to his friend—and a friend of mine, I am happy to say—Junius Beebe, a tanner of the firm of L. Beebe & Sons.

He said, "Junius, I have got to the foot of the ladder; I have been experimenting in chrome; my money is all gone; will you help me?" Junius, great big-hearted fellow that he is, said: "Go back, Rob, and draw on me for what you want." Within a very short time he picked out a piece of leather from his preparation of chrome which was perfect, and in his ecstasy of delight exclaimed, "I have conquered." There are probably very few Senators in this Chamber who have not worn "vici kid," for he named it "vici" from the words "I conquered." I have a pair of shoes on now made from vici kid, and my good friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] is at this moment wearing a pair made from the same material.

But let me come now to the point I wish to make. Up to that time this country was importing annually millions upon millions of dollars' worth of foreign goat skins. I picked up Foerderer's eulogy the other day. It read substantially like this: "Robert Foerderer before his death had brought his tannery to such a state of enlargement and perfection that he was tanning 50,000 skins per day." I said to his Boston friend, Junius Beebe, the other day: "Can that be true?" He said: "I think that was done, but it was the record of a day or a week only;" but he said that Robert Foerderer actually did tan 36,000 skins day after day and month after month for many months.

Mr. President, the largest calfskin tannery in the world is Baron Heyl's, at Worms, Germany. I am told that it is his proud boast—or it was a few years ago, and I think it is to-day—that he puts in 10,000 skins a day, six days in a week, and fifty weeks in the year—two weeks were devoted to the repairs of machinery—in other words, 10,000 skins, as against Robert Foerderer's 36,000. It is only fair to say that Heyl tanned calfskins while Foerderer tanned goat, a smaller skin. Within five years from the time Robert Foerderer discovered vici kid, the importation of goat or kid skins into this country had pretty much stopped, and we are now exporting annually millions upon millions of them.

I tell you, Mr. President, I think highly of men of his class, and I dislike to hear them maligned or spoken of in the way they have been spoken of here in the Senate. These tanners are entitled to live. They come here to plead for their very existence, and one would think, to hear them talked about, that they are a set of thieves and robbers. I have known them intimately from my boyhood, and I know that a more honorable set of men than the independent tanners of this country does not exist.

I think Senators who are in business know that when we sell commodities in carload lots the well-nigh universal practice is to draw therefor with bill of lading attached; but for years and years it has been a very rare occurrence for me to sell a carload of hides to any tanner and draw against the shipment. I send the consignment to my tanner customer and say, "When the hides have reached you, unload them; and if you find the count right, the quality right, and the stock satisfactory, pay

for them." And, Senators, from January 1, 1898, up to January 1, 1909, with the single exception of one tanner, my entire losses on sales of hides and skins, aggregating millions, have been less than $3,000. I state this fact with great pride, because I am proud to be connected with this class of men.

I say that business to be successful must be free and untrammeled as to the raw material. Let me give you an illustration of this, because it introduces a new feature: A few years ago there was a young man up in Frederick, Md., by the name of B. E. Baker. He came down to Washington and began to buy green calfskins, shipping them to me.

I knew him well. He finally drifted to Boston and went into the leather business or went to work in a leather store. He was an enterprising fellow; and pretty soon he began to see, as he thought, possibilities in colt skins, to be made into a patent leather to compete with German patent leather. He began experimenting along that line, and after a time he won out, and the Corona colt skin was the result.

But what I want to emphasize is this: His business grew, and his requirements finally called for a million colt skins. He went to Kidder, Peabody & Co., and Brown Brothers, the Boston bankers, and said: "I want to go to Russia to buy my colt skins. I can not afford to buy them at secondhand, and I want you to give me a letter of credit." They said: "Baker, how large a letter do you want?" "Well," he said, "I do not want you to put it in that way. Come down to my office, go over my books, and give me a letter of just such size as you feel safe in giving." The young man told me with pride that they went to his office, as suggested, looked over his books, and without conferring with each other, as he believed, each said: "Baker, we will give you a letter of credit for a hundred thousand pounds." There was that boy who had been buying calfskins in a small way here in Washington, and who did not, I believe, have at that time a thousand dollars to his name, being trusted by those bankers with letters of credit aggregating a million dollars. Think of it!

I mention this to show the great confidence the bankers of this country have in the leather men; and I want to say to you now that if you will give these tanners a fair show on their raw material, they will beat the world. I believe they would tell you to-day that with free raw material they could live without any protection. They might claim—and truthfully, too—that there would be times when the tanners of Europe might dump their surplus products upon us, and we, perhaps, ought to give them a little protection; but some of them tell me, and I believe they are right, that as conditions exist to-day, if we will give them free hides they can beat the world.

I do not know but this would be equally true with the shoe men. I believe it to be to-day, beyond any question. I believe that with free hides, and the consequent lower price of leather, the shoe men to-day could compete with anybody on the face of the earth.

It is true, as has been stated here by some one, that the American manufacturer of shoe machinery is now taking his patterns to England, is establishing manufactories there, and is building machines for the shoe men of England and of the Continent. And I presume, as has been stated, that they are taking over American foremen to run those shoe-manufacturing machines. It is not impossible that within a few years some protection may be necessary in that line. But think of it! Only a dozen years ago we were exporting only a million dollars' worth of shoes, and, I think, last year we exported $11,000,000 worth. There are few lines that are growing faster—and that, too, handicapped by dutiable hides! What could they do with free hides? What would they do if they had a free field and fair play?

Mr. President, let me repeat: If what the senior Senator from Wyoming says is true; if the great beef producers are not entering into the hide business; if they are not going into the tanning business, then his conclusions touching free hides may be correct. But if he is wrong about this matter, and I know beyond a peradventure that he is, he is simply starting from a false premise, and, of course, has reached wrong conclusions. Of my own personal knowledge, I know, and assert unqualifiedly, that the Swifts control a very large proportion of all the hides taken off in New England, and I think I know that they are to-day the largest tanners in New England; and to-day the independent tanner who produces leather from New England hides must buy his raw material of his larger and stronger competitor. There can not be any question about this condition of affairs, and the Senator from Wyoming is certainly very much at fault in his statement that the beef men are not going into the hide and tanning business.

Suppose that out here in the suburbs of this city there were three, four, or half a dozen men who owned a few hundred acres of oak trees. Suppose that alongside there was a man who owned a sawmill. Every year, as those trees matured, the farmers cut down a few, and, using the tops and limbs for wood, carried the logs to the sawmill. Suppose that the sawyer, whom we will call "Smith," cuts those trees into hubs and spokes and fellies, and sells them to Brown, a man who makes wagons here in Washington. After a time, let us suppose that Smith observes that Brown is making money a little faster than he ought to. He perhaps gets the idea as to manufacturing profits which was conveyed by those figures in regard to Pfister & Vogel which were read here this afternoon, and he becomes a little jealous, and says: "I guess I will go to making wagons, too."

Brown may feel a little nervous about his new competitor, but he continues to buy his raw material of Smith; and everything goes all right, even though Smith does make wagons, until one day they conclude to build a wall around the city so that Brown can not go over to Baltimore and buy hubs and spokes whenever his neighbor Smith does not treat him right. Smith keeps on in his wagon business. By and by, finding that the wagon business pays pretty well, Smith says: "I guess I will enlarge my wagon business and take the best of all my stock and make it into wagons myself, and what I can not use profitably myself I will sell to Brown." Brown is dissatisfied with the price he pays, and says: "Smith, you are not treating me squarely and I will not buy my raw material of you; I will go over to Baltimore." "No, you will not," says Smith, "for we have built a wall over which you can not climb. You can not help yourself. You have got to buy your hubs and fellies and spokes of me." What is the result? Why, in a little while Brown goes to work for Smith.

Now, Mr. President, if present conditions continue in regard to the raw material of the tanner—the hides; if the Armours, as I know or believe to be the fact, are entering into the tanning business; if the Swifts are entering into the tanning business, and I believe I know they are as well as I know I am standing here; if already they are in the tanning business and are becoming the largest tanners in this country, it will only be a little while before the tanners will say to the Armours and the Swifts, as Brown did to Smith, "I want to go to work for you."

Mr. President, I do not want to pass this matter without speaking well of Armour. I sometimes buy all the calfskins he takes off of a certain weight and kind during the season at his Kansas City, St. Joseph, Fort Worth, and Chicago abattoirs. I have to trust to his honor to give me just what I buy; he can cheat me or not, as he pleases. But I want to say that my experience justifies the assertion that no more honorable and upright concern ever did business than Phil Armour, or Armour & Co. Whether they are right or wrong in not contenting themselves with handling beef and letting Pfister & Vogel and the other independent tanners do the leather business is not for me to say. I will not judge my brother. But I do say that the packers are to-day tanning, in my opinion, a large per cent of all the hides taken off at their abattoirs, and I say further that to-day the Swifts are, in my judgment, handling from 60 to 80 per cent of all the hides taken off in New England. If that does not mean the handicap of the independent tanner, I do not know the meaning of language.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why does not the independent tanner get those hides? Is it not because he does not pay enough for them?

Mr. PAGE. I am glad you have brought that matter to my attention.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am exceedingly glad if I have satisfied the Senator in the question——

Mr. PAGE. You have.

Mr. McCUMBER. Because I want to know why the independent tanner can not buy those hides that are being purchased by Armour if he will pay as much for them.

Mr. PAGE. That is a very pertinent question, and I think before I get through I will satisfy the Senator why it is.

In every city in New England the Swifts and the Armours have their agents who sell beef. They are good, bright, sharp, clean, quick-witted fellows, and they know their business in beef first rate. When the Swifts want to put a man in any city to buy hides, they do it, and while he is entirely independent of their beef man, he has the benefit of his counsel and the indirect benefit of his acquaintance with the butcher who has hides to sell. Bear in mind, too, that the Swifts not only buy hides and tan leather, but they make oleomargarine; they make soap; they make fertilizer. They are the largest wool pullers in this country. E. C. Swift during his lifetime was a director of the Amer-

ican Woolen Company, and I presume Swift & Co. may now have a representative on the American Woolen Company's board of directors. They send their teams to the door of the butcher, and take every conceivable commodity he has at the butcher shop except the meat. They have an organization that is so perfect that if a man falls out at one place, they have another to put in his place. The perfection of that organization was never equaled by any military regiment. It is simply perfection personified; and no man need expect to go into the hide business and compete with them unless he wants to take on the whole line, and make oleomargarine and soap and fertilizers, and pull wool and tan sheepskins. The largest sheepskin tannery in New England, I believe, is run by the Swifts.

Have I satisfied the Senator in regard to that point?

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator yield to me for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly; with great pleasure.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator's argument was exactly along the line that I expected it would be. Then, does not the whole question resolve itself down to a question of economy in operation? Swift & Co., Cudahy & Co., the Armour Company, by reason of their economy in the production of hides, in the running of their slaughterhouses, where there is not lost a drop of blood, a hair, a hoof, or an entrail, are thereby enabled to make a profit upon the tallow, a profit upon everything, a profit upon the meat which is under the hide, which the tanner can not make a profit upon. Does that not enable them to have cheaper hides, to produce cheaper leather, or, at least, to produce it without as much profit as the tanner ought to have in order to have a profit to live upon? And does not that result finally in the fact that the tanner can not compete with the great packer because he can not get his hides cheaply enough? In order to get them cheaply enough he wants to cut 15 per cent away from the farmer upon the imported hides and get them at 15 per cent less; and if he can save that 15 per cent in importations, he can at least more nearly equalize the differential of advantages between him and the packer. But at whose expense? At the expense of the farming people.

Let me call the Senator's attention to this fact: These same manufacturers of leather goods and tanners and manufacturers of shoes have had protection from the farmer for forty years, and during that time that protection has at least been sufficient to give them the entire domination of the American trade. Having the entire American trade at their disposal, they now want to get their materials cheaply enough, so that they will not only have the entire American trade, but so that they can also get into the foreign trade and drive the manufacturers out of other sections of the world.

Somebody has to pay for that. Who is it? According to their scheme, the only way they can get cheaper hides is to reduce the cost of importation. Everyone knows, and I think the Senator agrees with me, that where we import quite heavily, and where we have not a sufficient amount in our own country to supply the demand, our price is fixed by the price of importations.

Suppose you have a thousand dollars' worth of hides in New York raised in this country, and you have a thousand dollars' worth of imported hides that are at the port of entry. Those hides will cost a thousand dollars with the duty paid, and that thousand dollars fixes the price of the other lot of hides that is produced here. If you drop off of that thousand dollars on the imported hides $150, of course, the thousand dollars' worth of American hides there for sale has got to go down $150, because no one will pay $150 more for the American product when they can get the same amount of imported hides of the same quality for $150 less. Therefore the price of that thousand dollars' worth of American hides is driven down the extent of $150. And who pays for it? Somebody loses it. Is it not the farmer who loses it? And is it not unjust, after the farmer has given to the manufacturer of shoes and leather the exclusive trade of the United States under protection, to now ask the farmer that he shall not only give them that, but in addition that he shall give them the little 15 per cent duty that he has to protect his thousand dollars' worth of hides that lie in a warehouse in New York? Does it not resolve itself right down to that proposition?

Mr. PAGE. I want to thank the Senator again for bringing that matter to my attention, for I should not otherwise have thought of it. I think I can answer it. The trouble is that he starts from the wrong premise, and consequently reaches a wrong conclusion. I will try to show him why.

The Senator from Wyoming started with the premise that the packers were not going into the hide business and were not going into the leather business. If that were true, I would not be here discussing this matter. But the trouble is that he was wrong about that—not intentionally wrong, for I give him credit for candor.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am assuming that they are going into the leather business.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; that is right. The Senator assumes that somebody is suffering. If he will allow me, the "hide of commerce," as it is known in this country so far as the East is concerned, after eliminating the hide under 25 pounds, weighs on the average, as I have stated, 58 pounds in the green; that is, with the skull, the horns, and the tail bone in; or, as it is sold in the market, 48 pounds. The shrinkage is about one-sixth. It is possible—and I think it is probable—that the hides of the West would increase that weight somewhat.

Mr. McCUMBER. We have thicker hides out there.

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir; it is true that the western hide and the southwestern hide is thicker than the New England hide. The New England hide is called a "spready" hide.

I asked the Senator from Wyoming if he would tell me what the hide of a yearling weighed—whether it would come above or below 25 pounds. He said below. I am going to give him credit in this computation for the reverse of that. I think he is partially right; but I will be candid enough to say—and I do not want to make a single statement here, even though it is against me, that is not exactly true—that the hide of a steer between 1 and 2 years old will certainly weigh more than 25 pounds. The hide of a cow between 1 and 2 years old will, in my judgment, to the extent of 75 or 80 per cent, go above rather than below 25 pounds.

We will suppose that the price of a hide is 11½ cents a pound. I am going to give the Senator the benefit of the doubt in figuring, because the price for the last ten years is probably between 9 and 10 cents; but I am talking now about the average country hide, which we will suppose brings 11½ cents. You can see that the price of the foreign hide must be 10 cents, because the difference is just the difference of the duty. Ten cents, with 15 per cent duty added, means 11½ cents per pound duty paid. We will suppose that the yearling steers, the yearling cows, and all the other classes of American hides taken together make a hide averaging 50 pounds. Fifty pounds at 1½ cents a pound duty makes the duty 75 cents a hide. I believe that is fully enough; but we will call it 75 cents a hide. The Senator from Montana says that 15 pairs of shoes will supply the average farmer's family for a year. I think he has been very liberal with me about that. I should say he has probably gotten a little above rather than a little below the facts, but I should like to be liberal about that matter. The number of cattle in the United States, after taking out the calves, is 48,826,500, according to the census report. It may vary a little from that, but we will call it that. The Senator from Wyoming said today that there were a million farmers who raised hides.

Mr. WARREN. O Mr. President, I can not allow that statement to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I did not say that a million farmers raised hides. There are more than a million farmers who raise hides.

Mr. CARTER. Nine million.

Mr. PAGE. All right; 9,000,000. I beg pardon.

Mr. WARREN. I said there were 10,000,000 farmers, most of whom raised hides.

Mr. PAGE. Yes; the Senator from Montana, I think, said yesterday that it was 9,000,000. If you will figure that out and divide the number of hides by the number of farmers, you will find that it means only 1½ hides to each farmer. And do you not see that the benefit the average farmer gets from the duty is only $1.50, even if he has 2 hides?

I do not know that it is fair—I do not really think it is, I will say to the Senator from Montana—to say that the farmer gets the benefit of every cent of the advance in duty on his hides, but does not pay any part of the added cost of the shoe because of the same duty. If I were to be absolutely candid, I should say that no one could tell whether the packer paid the farmer the whole amount of the duty or not, and I should say, too, that no one could unqualifiedly state whether the shoe consumer did or did not pay the whole of the added cost of the shoe because of that duty. But if I were to figure upon any basis the comparative losses and gains to the farmer, I think, to be absolutely candid and fair, I should say, as the senior Senator from Montana practically admitted yesterday, that the farmer gets about as much benefit on the hides he sells as he loses on the shoes and harness he buys. The Senator did not say anything about harness, but I put harness in. The losses

and gains are unquestionably about even. I think that is a fair deduction from the argument of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER rose.

Mr. PAGE. Perhaps I am wrong about that.

Mr. CARTER. I submit I coupled it with the further statement that practically the duty on hides has not affected the price of shoes or harness or saddles or anything the farmer has to buy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, one of the brightest shoe men in New England is Charles H. Jones, of Boston. I asked him to give me the figures, and I wish to say now that, in my opinion, there is not one single figure given by him that is not below, rather than above, the facts. He says that on the average pair of shoes worn by the workingman it would take 2 pounds of sole leather for each pair manufactured. You can see, therefore, what would be the added cost of the shoe. The added cost for sole leather is approximately 2 cents per pound. Add to that the cost of the upper leather, which he finds to be about 6 cents, and we find the added cost of a pair of shoes on account of hide duty to be from 9 to 10 cents a pair.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, it is known to the Senator and known to Mr. Jones that the uppers of 90 per cent of the shoes, or a greater per cent than that, are not subject to any duty at all—the calfskins, the light hides, the goatskins, horse skins, and various skins out of which the uppers of shoes are made.

Mr. PAGE. That is all confessed, Senator.

Mr. CARTER. So the truth is that cattle hides are used chiefly for soles and heels on the average shoes. The only portion of the leather subject to any duty because of the duty on the hides is that embraced in the sole and the heel, which, according to the concurrent opinion of all, is not to exceed 2 cents on each pair of shoes.

Mr. PAGE. I want to confess to the Senator he is right as to the uppers in the shoes that he and I wear, but I am very much mistaken—and I have been somewhat observant—if the ordinary farmer, at home and around the farm and in his daily work, does not wear a shoe the uppers of which are made from a hide weighing 25 pounds and above.

I know that both pairs of the shoes exhibited here on Saturday were made of grain leather, and I am very certain that I am not mistaken as to the upper and sole being made from hides that, because of their weight, would be dutiable.

What I was about to say in regard to fair play is this: The tanneries here in this country are endeavoring to do not only the business of this country, but the business of the world, and the statistics shown by the Senator from Wyoming prove their success. They are having a wonderful development in producing leather made from nondutiable hides.

It has been my pleasure to visit tanneries in Europe. In Germany there are four, called the "Big Four." Cornelius Heyl is the largest tanner of the four. He is a baron. When the Czar of Russia goes through Europe he stops at Cornelius Heyl's. He has a magnificent home on the beautiful square where there is a monument erected to Martin Luther, who said he was going to Worms if there were as many devils there as there were tiles on the roof tops.

His son, young Baron Heyl, I know personally. They commenced generations ago to make calfskins, and they have laid the foundation deep and strong. They are vigorous, they have abundant means; and I tell you the tanner of this country who rubs up against them in trade must be both progressive and vigorous. Yet our American tanners are doing it.

The next largest tanner of the "Big Four" is Carl Freudenberg, of Weinheim, Germany. The grandfather long years ago started the business which the grandchildren are now continuing. Walter Freudenberg, one of the grandchildren, buys the raw material. He is a young man of excellent ability. When he reached that point in life where his father thought he saw some fine business ability in him, he decided to make him the purchaser of the raw material for the firm's business. The father wrote to me asking that I allow young Freudenberg to enter my service for a two-year period to learn the raw-material end of the business and was kind enough to compliment me with the suggestion that he believed my system of handling and grading calfskins was the best in the world. The boy came, and putting on his overalls like a common day laborer—millionaire though he was—went into the hide house and worked alongside of men who were receiving eight, nine, and ten dollars per week.

That is the way they build up business in that country, and it is establishments built up in that way that the tanners of this country must compete with in the world's market; and they are doing it and doing it successfully. As against the Heyls, as against the Freudenbergs, I place our Robert Foerderer, who in five years from absolute poverty was making 36,000 goatskins per day. We do not want to turn down our plucky, enterprising young tanners; we do not want to abuse them; and I know the Senator from Montana does not want to abuse them any more than I do. If the farmer does not reap some material benefit from the duty on hides, a benefit which exceeds the added cost in the purchase of his shoes and harness, why not remove this handicap which is greatly impeding the American tanner and let him compete for the world's business?

There are no more pushing, enterprising, progressive business men than the American tanners. Give them a square deal—an opportunity to buy their raw material without handicap or disadvantage—and they can beat the world.

I will take the statistics of the Senator from Wyoming as to the growth of our mountain States. They have made wonderful progress. I admit it, and I am proud of it. I am glad to see them growing. But because they are is no reason why the tanners should be driven from business by compelling them to buy their hides of a competing concern. Throw down the bars and let them have the world in which to buy. Do this, and I tell you we will have tanneries here that we shall all be proud of, and my judgment is that with the lower-priced leather, which free hides will give, the shoe men in this country will become as flourishing as the tanners, and instead of showing exports of $11,000,000, as we did in 1908, I believe we shall show twenty, thirty, or forty million in 1920.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Clarke, the secretary and general counsel of the Home Market Club, of Boston, whose letter was read from the desk at my request, makes the statement that the Central Leather Company now controls two-thirds of the tanneries of the United States. He makes that statement, he avers, after very careful investigation. His methodical way of going at an investigation impresses me with the idea that his conclusion is probably correct, since the Central Leather Company now controls two-thirds of all the tanneries. I ask the Senator how the general leather trade can be injuriously affected by some competition with this Central Leather concern, even if the competition comes from Chicago?

Mr. PAGE. I am very glad to answer the Senator. The Central Leather Company is probably the largest producer of leather in this country. I admit it.

Mr. WARREN. Do they not produce over 70 and perhaps 75 per cent of all the sole leather of this country?

Mr. PAGE. I do not think they do, but I have the statistics.

Mr. WARREN. I think they are so recorded over their own averment as to the amount of their business.

Mr. PAGE. I will listen now to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I would be glad to have the Senator direct his attention to this phase of the question, candid, acute, and well informed as he is, because it is to my mind very important. It seems to me that if it is confessed that the Central Leather Company now controls two-thirds of all the sole leather produced in the country, it comes nearer being a monopoly than any of the many octopuses to which attention has been called here during the present session of the Senate. It seems to me if the Senator rests his case upon a complaint that opposition to this tanning output is about to arise, the basis of his case is founded upon illogical ground from the present view point of American people with reference to monopolies.

Mr. WARREN. Let me prompt the Senator from Montana by saying that the sole leather the Central Leather Trust produces led me to remember that there is the American Hide and Leather Trust Company, composed of a hundred and some companies, according to their own averment, that are engaged in producing leather of the lighter hides, which do not enter into this dutiable line.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly. Now, Mr. President, if the demand for free hides comes from those who desire to still further fortify this concern, which now controls two-thirds of the output, there must be some very persuasive but undisclosed argument to warrant any support for that contention. Why would it not, in other words, be beneficial to the people at large, to the leather trade, to the farmers, and the shoemakers to have some competition with the Central Leather Company in tanning the leather?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for calling my attention to this matter. I had forgotten about it. I did not know I had the proof right at hand, but I have. Anybody who knows anything about the tanning business knows that

you turn your stock over in sole leather only about twice a year. It may be done oftener than that, but that is about the rule. Let me say there are $242,000,000 invested in tanneries at this time, and the statistics show that the annual output is $252,000,000; the annual output and the amount invested are practically the same. It is turned over only about once a year. I have before me the statement of the United States Leather Company for February 24, 1909. Among their assets are "Hides and leather on hand and in process of tanning, $10,299,665.99."

Mr. President, I can not assure you beyond a peradventure that the output of that company is not more than double the amount of hides and leather on hand, but if I were to be asked my opinion as an expert—and I know something about it, although not a tanner—I should say the probabilities are 5 to 1 that the output of the tannery was not more than double the amount of their hides on hand and in the process of tanning.

But let us suppose they turn stocks over three times a year, and that instead of tanning $20,000,000, let us call it $30,000,000 per year. Would that be fair? I think so. And now let us see how near they come to being a trust.

The American Hide and Leather Company produce about $16,000,000 annually—that is the other corporation to which the Senator from Wyoming referred—and if I do not forget it, I will take it up when I get through with the United States Leather Company.

Next in importance comes the Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, to which I have referred, and which produces about $13,000,000 annually.

Mr. DIXON. Sole leather or uppers?

Mr. PAGE. All kinds. I can not separate them. The Swifts, at their Lawrence and other tanneries, are said to tan $9,000,000 worth annually. I know something about that matter, and I should say this was not an overestimate. All these estimates are given to me by a man who ought to estimate quite accurately.

The American Oak Leather Company, who make entirely sole leather, are said to tan from eight to ten million dollars' worth annually.

England & Walton, of Philadelphia—there may be some one here who knows about that firm—are said to make about $8,000,000 worth of leather annually, and it is, I believe, all sole leather.

J. K. Mosser is said to be one of the Swifts' tanners, and is said to make from six to eight million dollars' worth of leather annually, all sole leather.

Leas & McVitty make from five to six million dollars' worth annually, all sole leather.

The Fred Rueping Leather Company, of Fond du Lac, Wis., are said to make three to four million dollars' worth of leather annually, but I think it is largely calfskins.

Deford & Co., of Baltimore, and perhaps the Senators from Maryland can tell us about them, are said to produce three to four million dollars' worth of leather annually—all sole leather, I am informed.

Mr. President, there is not a particle of doubt but that the United States Leather Company is not a monopoly, is not a trust in the sense that we generally speak of trusts.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. PAGE. One word further about this matter and then I will yield. The United States Leather Company organized a few years ago to take possession of a goodly number of Pennsylvania tanneries. The tanneries of themselves, or at least many of them, were not very valuable properties, though of course, valuable. Some of them were good, but the greatest value of assets, as I was informed at the time, was in their hemlock lands, and I still believe that to be the case, although I am not prepared to state unqualifiedly. I do not want to state what I do not know.

But, Mr. President, they did not organize that company as they organize now. They did not go over to the State of New Jersey for their charter. They got their charter from another State, a State where they do things differently. When they organized, they issued a certain amount of common stock and a like amount practically of preferred stock. I can tell by examining their statement, which I have here, just the amount. Here it is. I find they issued $62,282,300 of preferred stock and $62,882,300 of common stock.

Mr. WARREN. What is the Senator reading about—the United States Leather Company?

Mr. PAGE. I am.

Mr. WARREN. Of course he knows that nearly all that stock is held by the Central Leather Company.

Mr. PAGE. I know that the larger part is, but not all, and I will explain about that in a moment.

Mr. WARREN. And the Central Leather Company has among its assets sixty-two million and odd dollars of water. After naming everything else, after estimating the tan bark, after estimating the grease, after estimating every possible thing at these higher figures, they then estimate the good will at sixty-two million and some odd thousand dollars, upon which they ask the community to help them pay a dividend.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is perhaps correct.

Mr. WARREN. Over $62,000,000 of water and entered as water, although sometimes called "good will."

Mr. PAGE. But one thing is true, at least I believe it to be true, that from the day of its organization to this day it never has paid one single cent on that common stock.

Mr. WARREN. Their stock, even the preferred, has never been above par until the House of Representatives a short time ago put hides on the free list. You will find, if you notice in to-day's or yesterday's paper, that now the preferred stock is about 106, and that it was ninety-odd cents a year ago and seventy-odd the year before, and so on. It never was at par until the House the other week put hides on the free list. The common stock is listed on the market now at between 30 and 40 cents; considerably higher than formerly.

Mr. PAGE. Let me ask the Senator if he is not mistaken about the company?

Mr. WARREN. If there is any question about it, I have the figures here on my desk, and I will ask now that I may put them in my speech.

Mr. PAGE. That is the Central Leather Company.

Mr. WARREN. I am speaking of the Central Leather Company now.

Mr. PAGE. Exactly.

Mr. WARREN. Because the Central Leather Company owns the United States Leather Company, and it owns several others.

Mr. PAGE. I will, in one minute, give you a statement of that which will be absolutely satisfactory, if you will let me have that time.

Mr. WARREN. To yourself, undoubtedly.

Mr. PAGE. To you, too.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he understands that this stock of the Central Leather Company has gone from below par to a premium of 106 with the prospect of plucking the American farmer on the free-hide question?

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CARTER. Prospective profit?

Mr. WARREN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CARTER. And better opportunity?

Mr. PAGE. After you get through, I will be very glad to proceed with the matter.

Now, Mr. President, when that corporation, the United States Leather Company, was started they had to stretch things mightily to make the real assets, the $62,000,000, on which they issued preferred stock; but that was called at the time, I think, the real value.

Like some of the other stocks of this company, they had a prospective value, and they believed that this trust would be successful. So they put down as an asset an item which the Senator from Montana did not fully read. I will read it just as it is, because he got it pretty nearly right:

Good-will account and organization expenses, $62,000,000——

Mr. CARTER. And $832,000.

Mr. PAGE. I am using round numbers. The men who financed that United States Leather Company are said to have put this good, big, round sum, predicated upon good will, into common stock, which they put into their personal pockets. I do not know the inside facts of this organization, but one thing is certain, and that is that the common stock has never paid one cent of dividends. The company agreed under its charter, I am told, that the preferred-stock dividends should draw 6 per cent and be cumulative. They commenced the first year by paying the promised dividend on the preferred stock. In a very short time the dividends on the preferred stock lapsed. They not only could not pay anything on the common stock, but they could pay only a part of the promised 6 per cent on the preferred stock, and they never have paid all the dividends on the preferred stock up to this time.

I understand that there are 40 per cent or more of these cumulative preferred dividends in arrears now. I will not state absolutely that this is so, but that is as I am informed and believe.

I want now, Mr. President, to come down to another proposition. A few years ago the managers of the United States Leather Company went to Phil Armour. They said, "Mr. Armour, we want you to step in and finance this institution." To make matters safer, the Central Leather Company was organized to take over the United States Leather Company, and they proceeded to elect Armour's right-hand and confidential man, Mr. Darlington, as a director to represent Mr. Armour. I know Mr. Darlington well, and am pleased to count him as a friend. For

thirty years he was Phil Armour's confidential man. They did not elect Phil Armour as a director, but Phil Armour's best man was there to represent Armour & Co., and Armour & Co. were invited to take over the concern.

Mr. WARREN. Did they do it?

Mr. PAGE. No; for when Armour's representative came to look over the assets he found there was too much water, and Armour said he would not touch it. The Central Leather Company, as I have said, had been organized to finance the United States Leather Company, but when they came to make the final change some of the stockholders of the United States Leather Company refused to ratify the proposed change and would not accept what the new company offered to give them, and Mr. Armour having quietly folded his tent and stolen away, the company stands to-day as it did then, with those deferred cumulative dividends wholly or in part unpaid. It is my judgment that they do not produce over one-fourth of the sole leather made in this country to-day.

It is true that the Central Leather Company is worth 100 cents on the dollar. They have simply put in the money to finance this concern, and I would not be surprised if the stock of the Central Leather Company should pay its dividends regularly out of its connection with the United States Leather Company; but that does not change the fact that the United States Leather Company is not a prosperous, successful concern, and there are many intelligent tanners who do not believe they are making 25 per cent of the sole leather produced in the United States to-day.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I should now like to know the views of the Senator from Vermont as to how the people who buy leather from which shoes are manufactured and who sell shoes are going to be injured by competition in the tanning of leather?

Mr. PAGE. Before I take that up, let me take up the next thing to which the Senator called my attention, and that is the American Hide and Leather Company. Something like ten years ago the American Hide and Leather Company organized and took on a large number of upper-leather tanneries of this country. I know many of the men who were conducting the tanneries taken on by that company, because they were tanners of calfskins, and I sold them their raw material. While they are, of course, large tanners, they never have produced even 25 per cent of the upper leather tanned in this country, and are not regarded by any of the tanning fraternity as a trust or as seeking to control unduly the upper-leather trade. I will have their statement, with others, inserted as a part of my remarks.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, the statement of Mr. Clarke, if the Senator from Vermont will permit, is that the Central Leather Company controls two-thirds of the tanneries of the United States. He makes that statement, he avers, after careful investigation. My question, directed to the Senator from Vermont, is, since we find a company commanding the leather trade by the control of two-thirds of the tanning interests, how can we engage in anything detrimental to the public interest by encouraging some competition with this great monopoly? As I understood the Senator from Vermont, to start with, his proposition was that because certain people in Chicago bearing odious names contemplated tanning leather, therefore——

Mr. PAGE. I wish to correct the Senator. I did not say "bearing odious names." I said——

Mr. CARTER. I understand that all of the names were the names of beef packers, which is synonymous with odious names.

Mr. PAGE. I did not say that.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that the names of the beef packers have been used from the beginning for the purpose of diverting attention from the real merits of the controversy we are now engaged in. If the beef packers or the James Brothers or any other class of people are willing to engage in tanning hides in competition with this Central Company, why not permit them to do so? Why should we take away from the farmers of the country the little pittance of protection which is there, because, forsooth, if we do not, then the Central Leather Company will have competition—a terrible thing to contemplate?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, when I was 26 years old I had the good luck to win out in a fight for representative of my town, and the county, to pay me for the good work I did for the party, elected me state senator as soon as I was constitutionally eligible. When I went down to the state capital I found there a young senator, three years older than myself—I was 31—and they called us the "boy steers" of the senate. That other man was the Albert Clarke to whom the Senator calls my attention. He was a good, bright Vermont boy, and I decline to enter into any discussion that will reflect a particle upon Albert Clarke. He is my friend. I want to say, however, that I think Colonel Clarke is probably mistaken. He does not intend to make a misstatement, I am sure. I feel confident that the Central Leather Company do not own a single tannery. They simply finance the tanneries owned by the United States Leather Company, and it seems to me impossible that the United States Leather Company either own or control two-thirds of the tanning interests of the United States, as stated by Colonel Clarke.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if I own all the stock in a concern, and among the stocks of that concern is the controlling stock of another, I should say, fairly, that I control that other stock.

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I say that the Central Leather Company owns the stock of the United States Leather Company, and they can not do business without the consent of the Central Leather Company.

Mr. PAGE. But, Mr. President, does the Senator understand that the Central Leather Company owns or controls any other tanneries than those controlled and owned by the United States Leather Company?

Mr. WARREN. According to the statement whether or not they took in new tanneries through the United States Company, there are many tanneries in the control of the Central Leather Company that were not in the United States Leather Company at the time they made an amalgamation; but I think they took in at that time the United States Leather Company and several others. Those others may have first gone into the United States Leather Company and then into the Central Leather Company. I could tell as to that by consulting my papers.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am very happy that my attention has been called to this matter, because I happen to have the facts right here before me. I have before me the last annual report, signed by Edward C. Hoyt, the president, dated February 27, 1907. I have a statement of the assets here, and they do not include a single tannery; they do not include a single cord of bark; they do not include a single hide. The chief asset is the stock of the United States Leather Company, $95,679,570.

Mr. WARREN. That does not change the statement I made, that at the time of the amalgamation—and I state it again—they took in several companies, and I shall later give the Senator from Vermont their names, if he wishes me to do so. They very likely went in as a matter of form with the United States Leather Company, so that the Central Leather Company is very much like the Northern Securities Company, which carried the ownership of the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern railroads. The Senator understands that.

Mr. PAGE. That is absolutely correct. But the Central Leather Company finances the United States Leather Company, and the United States Leather Company, on December 30, last, owned only $10,000,000, in round numbers, of leather and hides in the process of tanning. I think it would be fair to presume that a company only owning $10,000,000 of raw material and material in the process of tanning probably does not have an annual output of more than twice that sum, or more than $20,000,000; but, conceding it to be three times that much, or $30,000,000, it is still probably true that they do not tan 25 per cent of the total output of the sole leather tanned in this country, much less than two-thirds, or 66⅔ per cent, as stated by Colonel Clarke. But this is not all, for I have before me a statement of the United States Leather Company, for December 31, 1906, showing that they then owned hides and leather in the process of tanning valued at 50 per cent more than when they made their annual statement for 1908; in other words, they owned 15,000,000 December 31, 1906, as against 10,000,000 December 31, 1908; and I think it is conceded as a principle of economics that no manufacturing concern can properly be designated a "trust" if it is not a vigorous, healthy, and, more important than all, a growing concern. What, then, shall be said of the United States Leather Company, which was 50 per cent stronger in 1906, measured by its material in the process of tanning, than it is to-day, or was December 31, as shown by their own official statement?

I want to say here, before I leave this matter, that I know some of the men who manage the Central Leather Company, and I believe that a more clean, upright, honorable set of men never managed a company than the men who are connected with the Central Leather Company. Many of them are old tanners, and I have known them personally or by reputation all my life. I do not say they are doing wrong, but I simply say that it is wrong to class the United States Leather Company, which I confess is the largest tanning combination in the country, as a trust, because it has not, in my judgment, sought to control the legitimate business of the country, and I doubt if they produce over 30 per cent of the sole leather of the United States. Certainly not two-thirds, as suggested by Colonel CLARKE.

In order that anyone wishing to do so may examine the statements, to which I have referred. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

Mr. PAGE. Those are the facts about it. There is no question that the United States Leather Company owned $15,000,000 worth of hides two years ago, and now own but $10,000,000 worth. They are running down instead of going up, as their own statements show.

Mr. WARREN. Does the stock go up when their business goes down?

Mr. PAGE. So far as the stock of the United States Leather Company is concerned, it is cheap. I do not know what it is worth, but the common stock probably is not worth very much.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that Central Leather Company common stock is quoted in the papers and market reports to-day at from 30 to 40 cents on the dollar.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is of course correct, but I would not be surprised if he found upon investigation that the common stock of the United States Leather Company is not worth to-day above one-fourth of that price. I know nothing about it; but in the last two years, since the financial troubles in 1907, hides have gone up so fast that a concern that owned $15,000,000 in hides then could not help making considerable money on the advance on hides alone.

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator like to have hides again go low?

Mr. PAGE. No. But when the Senator mentioned the other day, as he did, the fact that packers' steer hides got down to 4 cents a pound, he made a quotation current at a time when we had struck a Black Friday and there was no demand for them at any price. Those hides have very rarely gone below 8 cents.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator is entitled to an explanation. I want to say that that averment was entirely taken from a statement made by the tanners and the shoe men, who are arguing for the reduction of the duty on hides. It is a part of their argument.

They said it, and I accepted it. I will state, upon my own knowledge, that the price of hides was so low that in the State in which I live branded hides were not shipped out for more than two years because they would not bring the cost of railroad transportation.

Mr. PAGE. That was a good many years ago.

Mr. WARREN. It was just prior to the passage of the Dingley law. We have not had such an occurrence since then.

Mr. PAGE. I will not detain the Senate much longer. I have already wearied it, but I have had to answer many questions. I now desire to say just a word more about the American Hide and Leather Company, because I know all about that concern. They started in with a set of managers who were good men, but they took on too much water, and the common stock at some time last year—I will not go back further than that—sold for less than 4 cents on the dollar, and the preferred stock sold for 12 cents and a fraction on the dollar.

Mr. WARREN. But the Senator will admit that that was because they watered it to overflowing when the company was organized.

Mr. PAGE. I think that is right.

Mr. WARREN. That company is also a holding company, and it not only holds tanneries, but it holds the stock of other tanning companies.

Mr. PAGE. But the point I make is that they, in my judgment, are not, and they are not considered by the tanners of this country as a trust or as having anywhere near the vital, vigorous, virile, force in the tanning business that Pfister & Vogel and some other large companies, notably the A. C. Lawrence Leather Company, owned by Swift & Co., have.

Mr. WARREN. Speaking of trusts, I want to say that whenever I use the word "trust" in regard to the leather business in Chicago, I do not mean to infer that the Chicago houses are, strictly speaking, trusts. They are separate corporations. Those in Chicago have no holding company—that is, one company holding the stock of all the others. The Central Leather Company does that. We speak of their being "trusts," but of course that is a misnomer. They are all corporations. The "Big Four," as they are called—Armour & Co., Nelson Morris & Co., Swift & Co., and the National Packing Company—are all separate corporations.

The National Packing Company does not tan a hide. None of them tans all its hides. I call them trusts, as a matter of convenience; but I maintain that the Central Leather Company comes nearer to being a trust than any of the others. It is a holding company, and merely holds the stocks, bonds, and properties of the others.

Mr. PAGE. I want to say, while upon this subject of trusts, that some five years ago the Swift Company had a capitalization of $10,000,000. Three or four years ago they wanted to increase their business, and they said to the public, "We should like to have you take $10,000,000 of our stock." It was taken in a twinkling, and they raised their capital to $20,000,000. A very short time after, they said, "We want more capital; we would like to increase our stock from twenty to thirty-five million dollars;" it was taken very readily. A little later, they said, "We want to increase our capital to $50,000,000." It was readily taken. I do not know whether the capital to-day is fifty or sixty million dollars; but, Mr. President, that stock has gained in one year in value $10,000,000, and to-day you can not buy it for less than 120. It is one of the big corporations, and it can go out into the markets of the world and hire a hundred million dollars if it wants to.

Think of what the independent tanner has in the Swifts and the Armours to compete with. As compared with the United States Leather Company or the American Hide and Leather Company, these Chicago concerns are like giants to pygmies.

Take Armour & Co. I have read the history of Phil Armour. It is like the story of Aladdin's lamp. He started a poor boy. He went across the continent on foot to California, and began to dig ditches. Having accumulated a few dollars, he came back and began to kill a few cattle. To-day the capital of Armour & Co. is so large that his wife and children do not really wish to publish it; but it is generally believed to be from eighty-five to one hundred and ten million dollars.

A few weeks ago they said to the bankers of this country, "We want $30,000,000 more capital," and to-day the bankers of Chicago are incensed because Armour permitted the bankers of New York, Boston, and the East to take a part of that $30,000,000 loan, bearing 4½ per cent interest. When you come to think of it, to think what Armour & Co. and Swift & Co. can do with their organization and their aggregations of immense capital, you can appreciate how their entrance into the tanning industry, with their control of such a large per cent of the raw material, affects the independent tanner. The Armours and Swifts are good men and I hesitate to say what I do because of the pleasant personal relations I enjoy with their managers.

Let me say, Mr. President, that when I was a boy 12 years old I began to handle hides, and for more than fifty-four years I have been dealing in that commodity.

For more than forty-five years I have alone, in my own name and at the same place, been handling hides. I have rubbed against these independent tanners a great deal. I can say, I think, that not a single tanner of prominence, not a single hide dealer of prominence, that was in business when I commenced dealing in hides is in existence to-day. Some of them have gone into bankruptcy; some of them have incorporated; some of them have passed the business on to the boys; but, Mr. President, the great body of those in business in 1855, when I commenced in hides, have "passed over the river." I have been in close business contact with the younger men, until I have come to greatly respect them. I can not tell you how great is my regard for them. Sometimes I think my love is like that of David for Jonathan.

I feel like apologizing to the Senate for taking its time; but I would feel more like apologizing to these young men if I failed to stand up here when I hear them maligned, as they have been here, and defend them to the best of my ability. I believe we have no better business men on this continent than these tanners. They are honest; they are energetic; they are good, clean business men. If you were going to help the farmer out in Montana or elsewhere by this 15 per cent duty, I do not know but I would stop and reason with you; but I know, and the Senator from Wyoming, I think, knows, that what the farmer puts into one pocket he takes out of the other; what he gains on his hide he loses on his harness and his shoes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Right there, if the Senator will permit a question——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PAGE. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator will admit that there is some satisfaction in taking money out of one of your pockets and putting it into the other. There is not, however, so much satisfaction in taking money out of one of your pockets and putting it into the pocket of the other fellow.

Mr. PAGE. You may go through the country at large, and talk with intelligent business men, and they will tell you that the farmer does not sell his beef cattle for materially more because of this 15 per cent duty on the hide; indeed, some claim that he does not get any advantage from the duty; but I do not want to argue anything of that kind. It is only fair to admit that he does receive a part of the duty; indeed, for the sake of argument, perhaps I might say that he does get the larger part of that benefit. I want to be perfectly fair about this matter, and I want the Senator from Wyoming to be equally

fair when I ask him if the farmers do not pay it all back when they buy shoes and harness?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. PAGE. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator. I do not want to speak harshly of anybody, but when I see the tourniquet placed about the jugular vein of the tanner and see his business lifeblood shut off; when I see the strong grip of the packers tightening around his windpipe; when I know that these men are actually struggling for the right to exist, I want you to show me some better reason for this 15 per cent duty than that a farmer may simply take a dollar or a dollar and a half out of one pocket and put it into the other. Show me that he makes some real gain. Let the tanners have the opportunity and the right to go into the world and buy hides where they can and compete with the men who to-day, in my judgment, are controlling 45 to 50 per cent of the entire packer kill, and controlling—I know whereof I speak as to New England hides—controlling 60 to 80 per cent of all the hides taken off in New England.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. DIXON. Unfortunately I was called out of the Chamber and have not heard all of the Senator's most interesting speech. Suppose we put hides and leather and shoes on the free list—I am ready for it—will that settle this question? This suggestion is made in good faith and sincerity.

Mr. PAGE. I accept it as such. On many occasions here in this Senate during the past few months it has been said that certain tariffs seemed to be higher than were absolutely necessary. My good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] looks me in the eye. How many times he has said, "I do not want to put the duty just barely high enough so that they can not jump over the tariff wall."

There are times—and I have seen those times—when the European tanners were loaded up to the muzzle with an excess of leather—leather tanned from heavy hides, from calfskins, and from goatskins. I believe—and I am going to say it, whether it cuts one way or the other—that the shoe men in this country to-day, on all shoes except those of the most ordinary kind, can live and can beat the world if we have free hides.

On the lower grades, which do not require much finish and style, I am rather inclined to think that the cheap labor of Europe may perhaps give the foreigner a little advantage. On leather I am going to take the same position. I believe that on goatskins, on many kinds of calfskins, on colt skins, and on the finer qualities of upper side leather, they can to-day, with free hides, compete with the world. I believe this, and I believe that they believe it; and yet, were you to ask them if they would consent to have the duty all taken off, they would plead, and I think rightly, that we do not do so. They would say: "Gentlemen, you have reduced the duty from 20 per cent down to 5 per cent on beltings, on sole leather, and on certain other classes of leather; do you not think we are entitled to a very slight protection?" So far as I am concerned, and I am talking with absolute frankness, I think they could compete with the world except on the cheaper grades; but when you ask me to speak for them, I think I should say, "They are of age and can speak for themselves." I am simply giving you my opinion.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask the Senator a question right there. He is eminently fair in all of his discussions, and, if I remember rightly, he has admitted that the farmers are getting some benefit from this tariff.

Mr. PAGE. They are getting no more than they pay back.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is just what I want to find out. The Senator believes they are getting something?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly, sir; I would not be ungenerous enough in this discussion to say they get absolutely nothing.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator if he seriously believes that shoes, harness, and other goods manufactured out of leather would be cheaper to the consumer if we were to take off the tariff?

Mr. PAGE. I do, absolutely; and I will tell you why, if you will give me the chance.

Mr. McCUMBER. I supposed that the Senator had explained that completely. I was not in, possibly.

Mr. PAGE. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. McCUMBER. Of course I do not believe that they will get it a penny cheaper, any one of them.

Mr. PAGE. Let me tell the Senator what my judgment is. The time has passed when the manufacturer or the jobber in this great shoe-manufacturing industry can make anything more than the closest margin of profit. I have been informed that some of them make as little as 2 cents a pair, and I believe that to-day the average net profit is not 7 cents, and perhaps not over 5. Everything is figured down to the finest margin.

Admit, if you will, that the Senator from Montana is right, and that the added cost of manufacture is not over 8 or 9 cents a pair. Everything to-day is sold on percentages. If the shoe manufacturer makes a shoe that costs him $1.20 and gets 5 per cent profit, he gets $1.26. If that shoe, because of the added value of leather, costs him $1.30 and he gets 5 per cent profit, he gets $1.36½. In other words, he gets a little more on the $1.30 shoe than he does on the $1.20 shoe. My judgment is that that ratio of increase goes right along through. The jobber who gets the shoe from the manufacturer adds a certain percentage, and the retail dealer, when he gets it from the jobber, adds a certain further percentage. These percentages from the manufacturer to the retailer aggregate 60 or perhaps 62½ per cent, as has been shown here. Consequently the 8 cents added cost to the shoe manufacturer, by reason of this hide duty, becomes 14 or 15 cents to the consumer; and I believe that sum is really paid by the farmer, by reason of this hide duty, on the heavy farm shoes he buys.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator just one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would not that same principle apply to all manufactured products? Are not all of them sold upon a very slight margin?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir; as a general proposition.

Mr. McCUMBER. Owing to the competition?

Mr. PAGE. I believe so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well. Then, why would not the same rule apply on all manufactured products? Why should we not take the tariff off of all of the material that goes into those manufactured products—practically all raw material?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, let me repeat what I said. If the conditions as to hides to-day were as they were in 1897, I rather think I should say, as to hides, "yes." But they are not the same. Since 1897 the Swifts and the Armours have gone into the tanning business. I am glad you called my attention to that matter, because I have the facts right here, and I will read them, if the Senator will permit. Here is a list of some of the large, vigorous tanners of this country, with the names of the packers who stock or control them, and I will read it to you:

W. F. Mosser Company, Westover, Pa., controlled by Morris.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What is the Senator reading from?

Mr. PAGE. I am reading from the Boston News Bureau. I can not vouch for its correctness. I will simply say that it is what I have before me, and I have reason to believe, and do believe, that the greater part of it is true. I think I will be frank enough to say that I know a part is not true. So I will place you on the same level that I am:

W. F. Mosser Company (Morris), Westover, Pa.; W. F. Mosser Company (Morris), Richwood, W. Va.; Gensamer & Salen (Armour), Pine Grove, Pa.; Dubois Tannery (Armour), Dubois, Pa.; Van Dynes Tannery (Swift), Troy, N. Y.; Adam Kinley & Son (Swift), Breesport, Pa.; Adam Kinley & Son (Swift), Olean, N. Y.; J. K. Mosser & Co. (Armour), Newberry, Pa.; L. R. Gleason & Sons (Morris and Armour), Driftwood, Medix Run, and Gleasonton, Pa.; Pocahontas Tanning Company (Armour), Pocahontas, W. Va.; Garrett Leather Company (Swift), Hutton, Md.; England, Walton & Co. (Swift), Westminster, Md.; England, Walton & Co. (Swift), Harrisburg, Va.; England, Walton & Co. (Swift), Gambles and Wallin, Tenn.; England, Walton & Co. (Swift), Waynesville, N. C.; Ashland Tannery Company (Swift), Ashland, Ky.; Weddekind & Hallenberg (Armour), Louisville, Ky.; James C. Harris (Armour), Sylvia, N. C.; Toxaway Tanning Company (Armour), Toxaway, N. C.; A. C. Lawrence Leather Company (Swift), Peabody and Salem, Mass.; Winslow Brothers & Smith Company (Armour), Norwood, Mass.; American Hide and Leather Company (Morris), Manistee, Mich.; American Hide and Leather Company (Morris), Merrill, Wis.; Fremont Leather Company (Armour), Fremont, Mich.; National Rawhide and Belting Company (Swift), Niles, Mich.; Badger Leather Company (Armour), Sheboygan, Wis.; Hans Rees' Sons, Asheville, N. C.

That is the list. In 1897 no such conditions existed. To-day the men who control the raw material have gone to tanning.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator complete the statement from which he is reading, and say that the total number of tanneries owned by all these packers amounts to 27, while the total number of tanneries in this country is in excess of 1,000?

Mr. PAGE. That is right, Mr. President. The same line of argument would apply when I say to you frankly that I think that neither the American Hide and Leather Company nor the United States Leather Company own any great percentage of the tanneries of this country. These tanneries that I have referred to are the large ones of this country. You will probably find 500 tanneries in this country that are barely alive. They hardly exist. And when the Senator from Wyoming was speaking this morning relative to tanneries—that there were several thousand tanneries away back in the eighties—I wanted to say to him that "away back in the eighties" there were tanners in

almost every village of any size in the East. They bought their bark at home; they bought their hides at home. They tanned the hides into what we called "rough" leather, and the leather went to Boston and was finished there. After a time improvements in manufacture came. These country tanners could not make a nice piece of finished leather out of a rough-tanned hide or skin. They had to be "tannery finished," so called. They had to be tanned and finished practically in the same building, at the same time. The hides and skins in process must not be dried. The result was that the country tanners that were making rough leather had to go out of business. Of what earthly use is it to quote statistics like these to prove any fact when we know that behind those statistics are special conditions which explain the whole matter?

Mr. McCUMBER rose.

Mr. PAGE. I should be glad to hear from the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. The question I asked involved a principle. The Senator, for instance, voted for a duty that would average about 45 per cent ad valorem upon wool.

Mr. PAGE. I presume I did. I confess I did not know very much about that schedule.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is absolutely true that if woolen goods are sold upon a close margin, if the duty was taken off of wool, the consumer would get his products cheaper; and the argument that the Senator makes in reference to hides would seem to me to be applicable in the case of wool—that what the farmer would make by the added duty upon the wool he would save by getting more cheaply the products of the cloth that he would buy. If that were all there is to the protective principle, I admit that I would never be in favor of it at all. Every producer always produces a great deal more than he consumes of his own article. The farmer that raises sheep or raises cattle on the average always produces a great deal more of the skin itself, of the hide, upon those cattle than he buys back in value of hides from these shoe men. Otherwise there would be no profit in any business, and we have got to assume that to be the case.

Assuming, then, that he is always selling more than he buys, that he gets a profit by reason of this tariff on what he sells, it seems to me that we are bound to say that the same rule would apply to the leather that would apply to the wool itself.

Mr. PAGE. I will answer that, Mr. President, by saying that if the time ever comes that the American Woolen Company goes into the killing of sheep and they come to take off 80 per cent of all the sheep pelts that are taken off in this country, it will be a matter of a good deal of question in my mind whether to allow them to go on and crush out every independent woolen manufacturer in this country or say to the farmer: "We are going to let down the bars and let in wool free." It will be a matter of great doubt in my mind what to do.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know, Mr. President, that is a serious question. I appreciate the fact that we are drifting away from little concerns and drifting into the greater combinations of capital which not only produce one thing, but produce the hundred incidental things connected with that. But I do not see that we can meet this by taking off the tariff. I can not understand why they would not do the same thing and try to economize still more if they were compelled to do it by reason of the tariff being taken off. But in every instance the farmer, the producer of the hides, is affected by exactly the same law of supply and demand, whether it is the packer that buys his product or whether it is the tanner.

Mr. PAGE. So far as I am concerned, I am going to insist that I can not see where the hide producer loses a single cent. I think he loses and he makes an equal sum. And for the little privilege of allowing the farmer to receive a dollar more for his hides, only to pay that dollar back for added cost of shoes, we are going to drive out or destroy, as I look at it, a business that is ninth in magnitude in this country. There are only eight larger in the gross amount of their products, as I understand it. I tell you, Mr. President, you do not want to drive the independent tanner of this country out of business or compel him to go to work for the beef packers of Chicago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont says that there are some things about the quotations from the statement in the Boston News Bureau which are true, and some things which are not true?

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask whether he believes this statement to be true:

> During the last two years there has been a quiet but remarkable expansion of the interests of the big Chicago packers in the tanning business of the United States. At the present time it is estimated that the packers control, either by direct ownership or by contracts covering the tanning of their hides, between 35 and 40 per cent of the entire tanning industry of the country.

I should like to ask whether the Senator believes that statement to be true?

Mr. PAGE. I should not want to give an opinion on that subject, because I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator know anything about whether it is true or not?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator permit me a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. The statistics of the department show that those figures might apply to the total number of hides that the Chicago people take off; but they do not apply to the amount they tan by any means.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is another sentence here, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, that I should like to call to his attention.

Mr. PAGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (reading). "Of the 7,500,000 hides which the packers take off yearly, they are now tanning themselves about 70 to 75 per cent." Is that correct?

Mr. PAGE. I can not speak on that point. I know they are tanning a great many of them.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is a very important statement. I do not know whether it is correct or not.

Mr. WARREN. It is important if true; but it is not true. Their tanning may amount to 25 per cent.

Mr. PAGE. The statement in this paper, which I said was incorrect, is this: "Hans Rees' Sons Company, of Asheville, N. C., controlled by Armour."

There is an evident mistake there. There is another concern by the name of Rees which I think may be tanning for the Armours, but it is not Hans Rees, for I sell him his hides, and think I know that he is not controlled by the Armours. It must be another Rees.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And that was the particular thing that the Senator did not wish to say was correct?

Mr. PAGE. Yes.

Statements previously referred to are as follows:

THE UNITED STATES LEATHER COMPANY.

The board of directors of the United States Leather Company submits to the stockholders the following statement of the company's assets and liabilities as of December 31, 1906, and based on inventory of that date. The method adopted for purposes of inventory is the same as that of last year.

As usual, the item of surplus is subject to the payment of the 1½ per cent quarterly dividend on the preferred stock, which was payable on the 2d day of January next ensuing (1907).

ASSETS.

Cash	$2,505,159.45
Due by customers	10,761,664.70
Bills receivable	1,277,339.28
Doubtful debtors, valued at	8,832.82
Sundry other debtors and book accounts	1,070,602.35
Hides and leather on hand and in process of tanning	15,269,783.70
Drawbacks due	464,491.64
Bark at tanneries	1,677,962.24
Sundry personal property	654,627.35
Advances to other companies	1,920,921.39
Tannery plants and lands	6,847,705.73
Stocks of other companies [a]	56,760,180.79
Bonds of other companies	6,879,887.59
Railroad mortgage	100,000.00
Real estate interests—New York City and Boston property	490,235.23
Unexpired insurance policies	106,292.99
Good-will account and organization expenses	62,832,300.01
Total	169,627,987.26

LIABILITIES.

Accrued interest	67,960.00
Current accounts	609,585.34
Bills payable	13,080,000.00
Exchange (not due)	2,072,903.90
Bonds	5,080,000.00
Reserve for fire insurance	639,728.54
Preferred stock	62,282,300.00
Common stock	62,882,300.00
Surplus	22,913,209.48
Total	169,627,987.26

On behalf of the board of directors:

FRED E. KNAPP, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, *February 27, 1907.*

THE UNITED STATES LEATHER COMPANY.

The board of directors of the United States Leather Company submits to the stockholders the following statement of the company's assets and liabilities as of December 31, 1908, and based on inventory of that date, and also the income account of the company and its subsidiaries. The method adopted for purposes of inventory is the same as that of last year.

As usual, the item of surplus is subject to the payment of the 1½ per cent quarterly dividend on the preferred stock, which was payable on the 2d day of January next ensuing (1909):

ASSETS.

Cash	$3,492,932.53
Bills receivable	5,041,880.56
Accounts receivable	9,574,346.40

Doubtful debtors, valued at	$5, 727. 11
Hides and leather on hand and in process of tanning	10, 299, 665. 99
Bark at tanneries	2, 472, 768. 30
Sundry personal property	409, 553. 02
Tannery plants and lands	7, 001, 226. 44
Stocks of other companies [a]	59, 900, 297. 98
Bonds of other companies	6, 216, 887. 59
Bonds for sinking fund	428, 063. 75
Railroad mortgage	100, 000. 00
Real-estate interests—New York City and Boston property	628, 196. 06
Unexpired insurance policies	125, 792. 55
Good-will account and organization expenses	62, 832, 300. 01
Total	168, 529, 638. 29

LIABILITIES.

Accrued interest	47, 810. 00
Current accounts	171, 031. 68
Due subsidiary companies	1, 985, 122. 75
Bills payable	10, 910, 000. 00
Exchange (not due)	960, 531. 96
Bonds	4, 280, 000. 00
Reserve for fire insurance	419, 172. 44
Reserve for depreciation	400, 000. 00
Preferred stock	62, 282, 300. 00
Common stock	62, 882, 300. 00
Surplus	24, 191, 369. 46
Total	168, 529, 638. 29

INCOME ACCOUNT OF THE UNITED STATES LEATHER COMPANY FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1908, INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARY COMPANIES.

Gross earnings		$21, 242, 883. 58
Less:		
Manufacturing costs and distributing expenses	$13, 312, 472. 80	
Depreciation, maintenance, and repairs	1, 151, 217. 13	
		14, 463, 689. 93
Net manufacturing, producing, and operating income		6, 779, 193. 65
Less:		
Salaries, pay roll, and department expenses	$846, 519. 33	
Taxes, insurance, legal, and other expenses	680, 770. 79	
Interest on debentures, bills and accounts payable	922. 996. 78	
		$2, 450, 286. 90
Net profits		4, 328, 906. 75
Less dividends		3, 736, 938. 00
Undivided profits for year		591, 968. 75

On behalf of the board of directors.

FRED E. KNAPP, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK, *February 24, 1909.*

Balance sheet of the Central Leather Company, December 31, 1906.

ASSETS.

Stock of the United States Leather Company	$95, 679, 570. 00
Investments in subsidiary companies, including stocks	6, 845, 056. 20
Bills receivable, Union Tanning Company	2, 705, 000. 00
Accounts receivable, Union Tanning Company	2, 826, 350. 94
Current accounts receivable	10, 683. 84
Accrued interest	15, 528. 85
Cash	370, 917. 57
Total	108, 453, 107. 40

LIABILITIES.

Bonds outstanding	34, 382, 000. 00
Capital stock, preferred	30, 878, 900. 00
Capital stock, common	38, 161, 570. 00
Bills payable	4, 730, 737. 39
Accounts payable	24, 564. 86
Undivided profits	275, 335. 15
Total	108, 453, 107. 40

American Hide and Leather Company and subsidiary companies.

BALANCE SHEET, JUNE 29, 1907.

LIABILITIES.

Capital stock:		
Authorized, 175,000 7 per cent cumulative preferred shares of $100 each	$17, 500, 000. 00	
Authorized, 175,000 common shares of $100 each	17, 500, 000. 00	
Issued, 130,000 7 per cent cumulative preferred shares of $100 each	13, 000, 000. 00	
Issued, 115,000 common shares of $100 each	11, 500, 000. 00	
		$24, 500, 000. 00
First mortgage 6 per cent bonds:		
Authorized	10, 000, 000. 00	
Issued	9, 000, 000. 00	
Less:		
In treasury $475, 000		
In sinking fund 1, 331, 000		
	1, 806, 000. 00	
		7, 194, 000. 00
Current liabilities:		
Bond interest accrued	170, 500. 00	
Loans	262, 775. 00	
Foreign exchange	113, 865. 25	
Trade accounts	207, 657. 06	
Wages accrued	34, 911. 16	
Taxes and water rents accrued	33, 499. 97	
		823, 208. 44
Sinking fund for redemption of first mortgage bonds:		
Appropriations and accretions to June 30, 1906	1, 122, 155. 44	
Appropriations for year ending June 30, 1907, charged to profit and loss	150, 000. 00	
Interest accretions during year	76, 230. 00	
Difference between cost and par on bonds purchased out of interest accretions	9, 404. 47	
		1, 357, 789. 91
Surplus:		
Per annexed account		1, 482, 338. 39
		35, 357, 336. 74

ASSETS.

Cost of properties:		
Including 4,517 shares preferred and 2,259 shares common stock of the American Hide and Leather Company held in trust		$26, 479, 073. 13
Sinking fund assets:		
Cash and accrued interest ($1,331,000 par value of bonds in sinking fund held by trustees not treated as an asset, see contra)		26, 789. 91
Current assets:		
Hides, skins, and leather on hand and in process of manufacture, and general supplies	$6, 305, 659. 16	
Sundry debtors for bills and accounts receivable $2, 318, 809. 12		
Less reserves for doubtful debts and discounts 148, 104. 24		
	2, 170, 704. 88	
Claims, duty drawbacks, and sundries	12, 657. 63	
Insurance unexpired	64, 114. 74	
Cash in banks and on hand	298, 337. 29	
		8, 851, 473. 70
		35, 357, 336. 74

INCOME ACCOUNT, YEAR ENDING JUNE 29, 1907.

Replacements, renewals, and repairs		$159, 054. 96
Bad debts and reserve for doubtful debts		8, 422. 67
Interest on bonds:		
In hands of public	$435, 270. 00	
In sinking fund	76, 230. 00	
		511, 500. 00
All other interest		66, 065. 83
Sinking fund appropriation, 150 bonds at par	150, 000. 00	
Less difference between par and cost of bonds purchased	14, 332. 40	
		135, 667. 60
Balance, profit carried to surplus account		270, 336. 64
		1, 151, 047. 70

Trading profits	$1, 151, 047. 70
	1, 151, 047. 70

SURPLUS ACCOUNT.

Balance carried to balance sheet	$1, 482, 338. 39
	1, 482, 338. 39

Balance at July 1, 1906	$1, 212, 001. 75
Balance from income account for the year ending June 29, 1907	270, 336. 64
	1, 482, 338. 39

LEE, HIGGINSON & CO.'S STATEMENT CONCERNING CUDAHY PACKING COMPANY IN CONNECTION WITH OFFERING $4,000,000 CUDAHY PACKING COMPANY'S BONDS.

Four million dollar Cudahy Packing Company first-mortgage 5 per cent gold bonds, dated May 1, 1909. Due May 1, 1924. Interest payable May 1 and November 1 in Chicago and Boston. Callable as a whole or for sinking fund at 102½ and interest on any interest date. Authorized, $5,000,000. Outstanding (now offered), $4,000,000.

Sinking fund, 5 per cent per annum of bonds issued, beginning November 1, 1910. Application will be made to list these bonds on the Chicago and Boston stock exchanges.

The Cudahy Packing Company, organized in 1887 under the laws of Illinois, is now one of the largest packing-house concerns in the country, having plants in South Omaha, Kansas City, Sioux City, Wichita, and Los Angeles.

From letters of the vice-president of the company, and Messrs. Price, Waterhouse & Co., chartered accountants, copies of which will be sent upon request, we summarize as follows:

1. First mortgage.
2. Profitable business under same management since formation of company twenty-two years ago.
3. Annual net earnings last five years averaged more than nine times interest on these bonds.
4. Value of physical properties subject to this mortgage, $9,100,000, over double the outstanding bonds, $4,000,000.
5. Net current assets more than $11,000,000, making total assets more than $20,000,000, or five times this issue.
6. Sinking fund will retire at least 68 per cent of this issue before maturity.
7. Gross sales last five years:

1904	$50, 828, 638
1905	62, 722, 755
1906	69, 319, 158
1907	79, 886, 479
1908	71, 988, 213

8. Average losses from bad debts during last five years less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of gross sales.

Price 99, yielding 5.10 per cent.

LEE, HIGGINSON & CO.,
New York, Boston, and Chicago.

GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.'S STATEMENT CONCERNING SCHWARZSCHILD & SULZBERGER COMPANY IN CONNECTION WITH OFFERING $6,000,000 SCHWARZSCHILD & SULZBERGER COMPANY'S BONDS.

GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.,
New York, June 3, 1909.

SPECIAL OFFERING OF A CHOICE INDUSTRIAL BOND.

We own and offer you, subject to prior sale, all or any part of the following bonds in denominations of $1,000 each:

One hundred thousand dollars Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Company debenture 6 per cent gold bonds, interest June 1 and December 1, at 100 and accrued interest; due June 1, 1916; yielding 6 per cent.

Authorized and outstanding, $6,000,000, with exception of $599,000 drawn for the sinking fund and canceled or held in the treasury.

Optional at 105 and interest, as an entire issue or in part, and for the sinking fund at 102½, to be drawn by lot.

Sinking fund: June, 1909, $150,000; June, 1910, $200,000; June, 1911, $250,000; June, 1912 and 1913, each, $275,000; June, 1914 and 1915, each, $300,000; to draw bonds at 102½ and interest, if not purchasable in the open market below that price.

Security: These bonds are a direct obligation of the company, which agrees that no mortgage or lien shall be placed on any of the three present plants during the life of the debentures. The company owns plants, real estate, buildings, etc., free and clear, in Kansas City, Mo.; Chicago, Ill.; and New York, N. Y., which, as appraised January 2, 1909, are valued at $8,047,517. Branch houses and other properties are appraised at $1,452,705, giving a total valuation for property directly owned of $9,500,222.

The Schwarzschild & Sulzberger Company is one of the four largest packing concerns in the country, doing a business of upward of $75,000,000 a year. It has facilities for killing over 100,000 cattle, sheep, and hogs per week. On January 2, 1909, the company reported a total surplus balance of $8,505,338.

We consider the above a first-class industrial bond, which, in our opinion, yields at the present time as attractive an income as any bond of its kind.

Awaiting the favor of your reply, believe us to be,

Yours, very truly,

GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.

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

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I believe the question before the Senate is an amendment which I offered to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], or that of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McLAURIN. Before the amendment is submitted, I wish to say just a few words in reference to it. I will preface them by saying that I do not argue this matter from the standpoint of the Senators who have been wrangling over it. I am not a protectionist in any sense of the word; and I do not discuss it from the standpoint of protection, but from the standpoint of revenue and from the standpoint of justice and equality. I was glad to hear the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] say that if we were going to have free hides we would also have free leather and free shoes; and I was glad to hear the proposition made by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. DIXON] to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] to put shoes, leather, and hides all upon the free list. If I understood the response of the Senator from Vermont, he accepted that proposition, and I should be glad to see that proposition accepted and adopted by the Senate. But that to which I wish to call attention is the inequity and the injustice of the amendment of the committee, taken in connection with the construction that is given to it by the Treasury Department.

As I understand, this duty on hides, which is intended to be a protective duty, if only to a small extent of protection, includes only hides weighing 25 pounds and upward, or probably only those weighing upward of 25 pounds. I am not willing to vote for a duty on hides with that definition of hides. If there is any advantage to be derived by anybody from a duty upon hides—and necessarily a revenue duty must carry some incidental protection—that advantage ought to go to the farmer who has hides weighing 20 pounds just as well as to the man who has hides weighing 25 pounds. I can not understand how a protectionist can go to his constituents and justify himself in voting for protection to the man whose hides weigh 25 pounds and against protection to the farmer whose hides weigh 20 pounds.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me for interrupting him?

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

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Does not that become still more difficult when we realize that it is only the heavy leathers covered by this protection that go into the cheap shoes, while the other leathers go into the more expensive shoes?

Mr. McLAURIN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for that suggestion. I think that is true.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator can not maintain that proposition. The cheapest shoes that are used to-day are those that are not made of thick leather, unless it is in the case of the soles. The Senator ought to know that. I refer to children's shoes and ladies' shoes and tan shoes. The heavy leather only goes into the stogy shoes.

Mr. CLAPP. Stogy shoes and split-leather boots and shoes.

Mr. WARREN. It is only a very small percentage.

Mr. CLAPP. That does not make any difference. It is the cheap shoe that the poor man wears. This leather goes into any part of a shoe except the heel or sole. It goes into cheap shoes.

Mr. WARREN. But there are cheap shoes of two kinds—one for men working in quarries or other places where heavy, strong boots are necessary, which may be the split leather and sole leather; and the other for men working in offices, which may be cheaper still. Such shoes are made from a thinner leather.

Mr. McLAURIN. I believe, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wyoming admits that it does intensify the difficulty, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested. But whether it does or not, there is no difficulty or trouble about this proposition—that it is unjust, if there is to be any protection to anybody in this matter, to protect the man who is able to produce high-grade hides weighing 25 pounds, and deny that protection to the farmer whose hides weigh only 20 or 22½ or 24 pounds or anything less than 25 pounds. Therefore, if there is to be any duty at all upon hides, it ought to be upon all hides of cattle.

I suppose that there are no cattle the hides of which would weigh as much as 25 pounds except those of the bovine kind, and that, I suppose, is the kind of cattle to which this item of the tariff would apply.

But there is no question that there is no justice in making this distinction against the farmer who is not able to raise a cow or steer that will produce a hide weighing 25 pounds. I have nothing to do with the explanations that Senators have to make to their constituents about this discrimination between the hides that weigh 25 pounds and those that weigh 20 pounds; but I do have something to say with reference to the injustice of it.

A great war has been made by the shoe manufacturers and the leather tanners against any duty at all on hides. They have organized a combination by which they have sent letters all over this country; for I take it for granted that they have bombarded the Senators from every State of the Union as they have the two Senators from the State of Mississippi—and I know as to these two Senators—with letters asking that you "join in a fight against the packer trust, and therefore vote for free hides." I was talking the other day to one of these men, a shoe manufacturer, one of the largest, if not the largest, in the United States, who came to see me for free hides. I said to him: "You have sent your letters out all through the State of Mississippi. You have sent them out into the country, and you have had my colleague and me bombarded with letters from these people asking us to vote for free hides, because you have told them that this is a fight that they are making against the packers; and they are making that fight, as you

told them, in order to get cheaper shoes." "Well," he said, "I am willing to have free leather and free shoes." "But," I said, "have you made any combination with these people for free leather and shoes in which they are interested? Have you made any combination with them and urged them or urged anybody else to vote for free leather and free shoes? You say you are willing; but you have not stopped with your willingness to have free hides, but have made a fight for free hides. You have enlisted with you these men who are interested in a tariff on hides in a fight for free hides, when you are only willing to have free leather and free shoes."

Mr. President, the doctrine of protection finds its refutation in the minds of impartial men in the very wranglings you see on the other side of this Chamber in the discussion of this question. The consumer of hides is the tanner of the leather. The consumer of leather is the manufacturer of shoes. The consumer of the shoes and boots is the wearer of those shoes and boots. You find the consumer of hides, who is a protectionist upon what he sells, a free trader on that which he consumes. You find before this Senate the manufacturer of shoes a free trader on leather—that which he consumes—but he is a protectionist on shoes. At least he is a protectionist on that which he sells; he is a free trader upon that which he buys. The inequity and the injustice of the doctrine is nowhere better exemplified than in this very wrangle.

Mr. President if we can have the skins of all cattle put upon the dutiable list, as proposed by the amendment which I have offered, thereby putting all skins of cattle upon the dutiable list, then I favor putting a tax upon hides, unless we can also have free shoes and free leather. I will read the definition as contained in the amendment:

The word "hides" as used in this bill shall be understood to include all skins of any and all kinds of cattle, of any weight or size of such skins, however small.

Put that in, and there will be some justice in your contention. We must necessarily have revenue, and the tariff which produces this revenue must necessarily give some incidental protection to somebody. I will state that, while the State which I have the honor to represent in part does raise beeves, the hides of which will weigh 25 pounds and upward, it raises probably a larger proportion of hides that do not weigh that much. And I am not willing to say to the widow or to the poor farmer, who ekes out a living in the sweat of his face, according to the injunction of his Maker, "I will protect the man who drives a thousand steers to the market, and give him an advantage which I am not willing to give to you."

I am not willing to say that, and you ought not to say it. If you will do justice and right and equity, you will not say it. I favor free hides if we can also have free shoes and leather. Free shoes make shoes cheap to the wearer; free hides make hides cheap to the manufacturer of shoes.

I ask that the amendment to the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of making some few remarks on hides, raw materials, and platforms, three things a good deal correlated with each other.

Before I proceed, I wish to produce certain exhibits which I desire to embody in my remarks. I will ask, to start with, that some data on the lumber schedule by Mr. Z. W. Whitehead, of Norfolk, Va., who has studied that matter a good deal, may be printed as a document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Virginia will be complied with.

Mr. DANIEL. I may not care to read all the tables which I shall submit and insert in my remarks. They are of a nature that this body is already made familiar with, and I ask that I may insert them at their proper places.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. I also wish to insert as an appendix to my remarks a collation from the expressions of Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under President Polk, in his report on the tariff in 1846, to which I shall refer. I presume there will be no objection and the Senate will give me unanimous consent to insert this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the matter suggested may be inserted as an appendix to his remarks. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. Poor mechanics are God's ambassadors to mankind. This is an expression, if I remember aright, from Benjamin Franklin. It is certainly worthy of him and of his practical wisdom which has been of great advantage to the whole people of the United States. He started his career as a poor working boy. Out of the wisdom of the mechanics and workers of the world has grown a great body of proverbial philosophy. One of them reads thus:

To him who hath a shoe under his foot the whole earth is covered with leather.

It contains the wisdom of the ages. It is found in the ancient Persian and also the ancient Sanscrit and percolates through literature. In short, it is one of those rugged maxims hewn from the life of man by those who plod in the ways of toil for the support of their families. It is worthy, in my judgment, of all acceptation.

CHEAP SHOES FOR UNIVERSAL BENEFIT.

There is no single item of this tariff bill which will carry more beneficence to every hearthstone in the United States than that which stands for free hides. Gentlemen may relieve themselves, I think, at this stage of our progress about accentuating and preserving every item of revenue. All battles have unexpected features. Those that I have seen lost were won before they were lost. Those that I have seen won were lost before they were won. And the fluctuations of the field of all of man's contentions, whether in political or in military life, are the constant astonishment of those who are engaged in them.

When this tariff bill commenced I had the honor to submit a somewhat crude amendment for a corporation tax to meet the deficit. It was designed as suggestive rather than as fully executive. It was instantly refused. I said nothing. In the meantime evolution has been going on in its work, and those who when this debate began stood against that tax in any form are now looking for the best form in which to express it and embody it in legislation.

The reason of the changed spirit and the realization of the overhanging deficit appears in the fact that President Taft has spoken.

It may be that the corporation tax of 2 per cent on net receipts, which he has recommended, will flourish only on the Senate side of Congress. It may disappear in the House of Representatives. If it does, inheritance tax or something else will take its place. In any event the hide tax no longer portends as a revenue necessity.

THE 15 PER CENT HIDE TAX LEVIED AT INSTANCE OF MEAT PACKERS.

Previous to 1842 there was no tariff tax on hides and skins. For thirty years thereafterwards, until 1872, there was a tariff tax of from 4 to 10 per cent. For the next quarter of a century or more, that is until 1897, they were free of duty. In the tariff act of 1897 15 per cent tax was put on cattle hides and no tax on other hides or skins. This occurred in the last days of Congress, which are always dangerous. This was not done at the request of the shoemakers. It was proclaimed to be for the benefit of the cattle raisers, but it is generally believed, and has since been repeatedly stated, to have been done at the instance of the combined meat packers. I believe that information is true. As the meat packers originated the present hide tax so they by common repute are now its chief supporters and beneficiaries.

CATTLE NOT RAISED FOR THE SAKE OF HIDES, BUT ARE A BY-PRODUCT OF A FOOD PRODUCT.

Oranges and lemons are not raised for the sake of their rinds nor cattle for the sake of their hides. They are a by-product of a food product.

No man raises cattle for the sake of their hides.

No tariff can stimulate the production of cattle by putting a tax on the import of foreign hides.

There is no organization of labor for the production of hides; not even a single laborer is employed for the purpose of producing hides.

Cattle are raised for the purpose of making food.

They produce milk, butter, and cheese from year to year, and these products are, so to speak, the crops raised for family use from a few domestic cattle or for market use from many cattle.

The sheep produces successive crops of wool from year to year.

The hides of cattle are by-products, things aside from the principal yield of the herd, and arise only when the cattle are consumed.

The steer or cow is killed. The hide possesses some value. If it be taken care of and marketed, that value will be realized. If there be no opportunity to market the pelt, as may often happen, or if it be an isolated case, it is apt to be neglected and lost. The few domestic cattle around a farmhouse are not factors in the hide market and are not raised for their hides.

The hide is the rind just as lemon peel and orange peel are rinds. Nature made them to hold their contents, and their contents are the real thing for which they are raised and the real thing for which they are cultivated.

THE MULTIFARIOUS USES OF LEATHER.

The uses of leather are multifarious. The demand is constantly increasing, the supply comparatively diminishing.

The fact is art and utility alike constantly call for its assistance.

On the farm not only the boot and shoe but the horse boot, the bridle, the saddle, the harness, the lines, the straps, the whip, the saddlebags, the pouches, appeal to leather. As civilization advances, they will appeal the more and more, and where will the leather come from?

The "Leather-smith" has a catalogue of his sculptured wares. Leather draperies, leather screens, and leather chairs with their embossments adorn the great halls, drawing rooms, parlors, and dining rooms. Mural panels and wall coverings also adorn them.

In the offices of professional men, as well as in the homes, are books covered with leather; and the sofas, divans, and office and dining chairs are also so covered.

Leather, indeed, pervades the camp, the field, the grove, the home, and the office.

Everything on wheels is helped by leather—the carriage, the buggy, the wagon, railway car, and street car, automobiles, bicycles, and the small vehicles of children.

Among the articles made out of leather may be mentioned carriage and buggy tops, cushions and curtains, seats of dining, smoking, and street cars, and various minor trimmings. The traveler's heavy trunk, suit case, traveling bag, the dressing case, the writing case, the flask, the medicine case, the razor strop, the jewel case, the handbag, steamer rugs, shawl straps, the pocketbook, and the cigar case all make drafts on leather. Surgical-instrument cases and medicine bags, brief bags, and specie bags, walking canes and umbrellas, leggins and hat bands, sword slings, gun slings, sheaths, scabbards, pistol hostlers, field-glass and opera-glass cases, dog collars, and the whole family of belts that are used in heavy machinery or around the waist, golf bags, fishing-tackle bags, and other things too numerous to mention.

WHAT IS THE PREDICATE OF A TAX ON HIDES?

Let me ask, Mr. President, what is the predicate of a tax on hides? Foreign cattle in general are under tariff taxes laid by the act of the Congress of the United States. They realize revenue out of all importers who bring into this country the animals such as the American farmers raise and may operate in more or less degree in a protective sense. The Mexican cattle may look across the Rio Grande and may low for the broad plains of Texas, but they can not get across the river until the owner has paid the tariff duty into the Treasury of the United States. Such is also the case with cattle importations from Canada or elsewhere.

I shall presently show the varied forms which embrace every specimen of the bovine tribe, old and young, and put around it such taxation as may possibly increase the cost of living, and certainly increases the cost of getting it into this country or of dealing with it.

THE HIDE TAX IS NOT WORTH THE CANDLE.

John Philpot Curran was once asked what a doldrum was. The great wit, orator, and lawyer replied:

> A doldrum is a contingent remainder without any particular estate to support it.

That is the hide tax in this tariff bill.

I admit it yields considerable revenue. But a large portion of that revenue returns in drawback. Instead of having great anxiety about that revenue now, we know from a reasonable conjecture that the deficit will be otherwise provided for.

This hide tax is not worth to the United States all it puts into the Treasury, for the reason that it increases the cost of everything that the people need that is made of leather.

THE FIRST IMPLEMENT OF AGRICULTURE IS THE FARMER'S SHOE.

The first implement of agriculture in this country is, ahead of the reaper and the mower, ahead of the plow, or the hoe, or the spade—ahead of all that long list of things which my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] grouped together and tried to get the Senate to pass in a lump—is the farmer's shoes. The farmer is an outdoor man. The shoe is his first necessity——

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. DANIEL. For any enlightenment I will yield, but I did not interrupt the Senator, although I had given notice to speak.

Mr. McLAURIN. I should like to ask the Senator if he is willing to vote for free leather and free shoes and free hides?

Mr. DANIEL. I will come to that in time, and I prefer not to be interrupted in my time. Thanks to the courtesy of the Senator. Yes; I will surely vote for substantial reductions on the products of leather. I am in somewhat the same mood about that that the Senator from Mississippi is, but I hope not to be interrupted when I am trying to develop in some orderly array the ideas which control my judgment. It breaks the thread of one's remarks.

I was saying, Mr. President, that the sovereign implement that the farmer of this country wants and needs is the shoe under his foot. Without that shoe he is in a rocky and thorny wilderness. With it, he is on carpet. He rises with the sun. He does not cease his labor until the going down thereof. In whatever climate, whether upon the plain or upon the mountain, whether in the rough field or road or among forest thorns and other impediments, the farmer needs that shoe as the primary part of his equipment. If you will sum up the necessaries of life, things without which life and utility can not be rightly sustained, the cheap shoe is the very next thing to food, and is the most helpful thing wherewithal to get food, whether for the huntsman, the laborer, or the agriculturist.

FREE HIDES A PERVASIVE NATIONAL ITEM.

This is the most national item of this bill. It will be for the benefit of every man, woman, and child in every State, county, city, and countryside of the whole United States, as well as for those on the hard streets of all the cities. It applies to all races and all conditions and all ranks of the human race. The king as well as the peasant, the serving man as well as the employer, the soldier who marches to battle, the sailor who stands upon the quarterdeck, every man, no matter who he is, what he is, or where he is, wants a cheap shoe. It is the outspring of universal benevolence to help him to get it.

ALL THE NATIONS AND ALL PEOPLES FROM THE DAWN OF HISTORY HAVE NEEDED SHOES.

Every great nation of this earth and the people of all times from the dawn of human history have appreciated this fact, and it is the fundamental, progressive, widespread, pervasive, and ought to be the conquering fact in this case.

The great nations of Europe make hides free of tariff burdens. Such, at least, is the case with Great Britain and Ireland, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark. So does our neighbor Canada. Shall we handicap the United States as their competitor and give them the vantage ground?

If the foot of man had ended in a hoof, and if that masterpiece of the Creator for the work of man of mechanical ingenuity—the human hand—had ended in another hoof or a claw, humanity in its long progress of civilization, of refinement and skill would still be kicking and scratching itself to death. The dreams of art and science, of progress, and of general development would have been vain and iridescent.

NOTHING LIKE LEATHER.

The shoemaker has studied out this problem with his last and knife near by. He says, "There is nothing like leather."

We are all prone to exalt our own vocations, but the shoemaker was as near right as any other of his competitive brothers.

When the farmer has equipped himself with a shoe he is only the companion of everybody else. Nobody is dressed for the day's work until he has put on his shoes. So let us reflect this hoary tribute of wisdom and carry it in our minds, that the shoe which we are trying to make cheap is the prime necessity of all mankind.

UNIVERSAL SHORTAGE OF HIDES AND LEATHER.

A second fact, Mr. President, which fixes itself in our minds is this: Our own country as well as the world of to-day has a shortage of leather. Third, the world of to-morrow, if we may approach its course of evolution, is going to progress in shortage and not in abundance of leather.

There are over eighty millions of human creatures in this land. There are 28,000,000 horses and mules in this country also. To supply these 80,000,000 men, women, and children with shoes is a great job, a tremendous proposition that comes home to everybody. It takes 160,000,000 shoes to equip the feet of the people of this country; and all draft animals swell the account for harness and other trappings.

THE WORKINGMAN NEEDS SHOES FOR HIMSELF AND HIS FAMILY.

He is in exactly the same predicament as the farmer. He can not go to his work until he has put on his shoes. As a rule, he has to stand in his shoes all day, or to scuffle around, whatever may be the calling of his duty, with those shoes on.

The Indian had first to get his moccasin. The man of the desert had to get his sandals. It has been the problem of life

from the year one, which presents itself to the man of a family and to the family itself, *first*, how to get bread; *second*, how to get shod that he may get bread. So the two are of equal and companionable dignity. The little tot that stands alone dreams of the shoe until it gets it and has it, and the old man and the woman and the child follow the example. From the cavalry boot to my lady's slipper, the shoe, the shoe, is the constant theme of meditation and of progress.

CATTLE DIMINISHING AS COMPARED TO POPULATION.

The gap between demand and supply constantly widens.

Now, Mr. President, the cattle of the world that supply the shoes are, comparatively with demand, a diminishing quantity. The people who need shoes are a daily and hourly and momentarily increasing number. The gap between the inevitable desire to get the shoe and the capacity to get it is a constant widening breach between man and his necessities. The man who now widens that breach is in a late day of civilization of the earth to attempt it. The man who helps to close that breach is the friend of the human race, and most of all the friend of the poor, who have the smallest margins upon which to acquire what they need.

CATTLE IN VIRGINIA DECREASED FOR THREE SUCCESSIVE DECADES.

In Virginia, according to the census of 1900, there were 663,459 neat cattle, compared to 747,334 in 1890, and 686,184 in 1880, showing a decline in two successive decades.

In these same three decades Virginia had, in 1900, 1,854,184 people; in 1890, 1,655,980; and in 1880, 1,512,565. So it appears that during three decades the population was increasing and the cattle decreasing.

DISCREPANCY IN THE WORLD AT LARGE MUCH GREATER.

The population of the world is more than three persons to one of cattle. The report of our experts is to the effect that while the shortage between persons and cattle is in the proportion of about seventy to eighty millions, or about seven-eighths of a farm animal to the person in the United States, in the world at large there is a much greater discrepancy—that is, today it is about one of cattle to three of people.

Year.	Country.	Total cattle.	Dairy cows.	Population.
1908	United States, except Philippines	73,246,573	22,244,446	85,216,000
1906	Canada	7,187,033	2,635,369	6,441,000
1906	Central America and West Indies	9,963,429		24,915,000
1906	South America	72,334,623		29,518,000
1906	Europe	127,423,308		458,503,000
1906	Asia	109,189,770		891,381,000
1906	Africa	9,897,211		63,795,000
1906	Australia and Oceania	11,310,234		4,048,000
	Total	420,552,211		1,563,817,000

Cattle in United States, Statistical Abstract of the United States, page 112.
Cattle in other countries, Yearbook, Department of Agriculture, 1907, pages 698-699.
Population, Statistical Abstract of the United States, pages 732-733.
Asia, Africa, and Brazil are estimated.

World's population	1,563,817,000
World's cattle	420,552,211
	1,143,264,789

The cattle of the world is less than the persons.

DEMOCRACY FOR CHEAP NECESSARIES OF LIFE.

It is historic to the Democratic party that from its birth until to-day it has stood in the market place and preached to the people the smallest possible charge on the necessaries of life, the largest charge upon its luxuries for revenue.

Shall we Democrats stand and refuse to grant to the widespread and constant voice of the American people the freest shoe that the law can help to make it possible for the American citizen to get? Shall we go against and deny the faith which has given to the Democratic party that prolongation of its longevity, which nothing else would have imparted to it?

NOT ONE OF THE BOVINE RACE FOR EACH ONE OF THE HUMAN RACE IN THIS COUNTRY.

As I have said, there are some 80,000,000 of folk in this country, and there is not one representative of the bovine race for each of them; only seventy-odd million cattle of all kinds for 80,000,000 people. Only a fraction of the cattle can help to supply shoes. All the people need them. Which had we best serve? Which do we think of most? We should be for the man, for the woman, and for the child.

Mr. President, it may almost be a proverb of politics that no man likes a tax which he himself has to pay. It is almost an inevitable and invariable correlative that every man likes a tax that he can foist off on some one else to pay, he gathering some advantage in the shadow of the other man's burden. No man in this country that I know of wants a tax on hides, unless he perceives advantage to his community, State, or country.

REASONS WHY FARMERS GET LESS FROM GOVERNMENT THAN OTHER CLASSES.

It is also true that the farmers are, as a rule, a class which do not get out of the Government as much as they put into it. They do not put into the urn of patriotism a shilling and get a dollar out; they put into that urn a dollar, and they are very fortunate if they get a shilling out.

But, Mr. President, the farmers in the administrations of our modern governments are not altogether lost sight of. If by some neglected, they are by many not forgotten.

FARMERS' PRODUCTS LITTLE REACHED BY TARIFF.

A conspicuous reason to-day why the farmers get less benefit from government than others lies, first, in the fact that their vast products which go abroad can not be reached by tariff taxes, which only apply to articles coming into our ports.

FARMERS PAY FOR ENHANCED PRICES FOR TARIFF-PROTECTED ARTICLES.

The second reason is because the vast number of articles which the farmers have to buy for their family consumption and for their agricultural use, as a rule, consist of things which they do not produce and must be purchased by the enhanced prices which our tariff laws impose.

FARMERS A SCATTERED PEOPLE.

A third reason may be found in the fact that the farmers are isolated. They are a scattered people. They can not concentrate their efforts and exert them organically and readily, as the compact populations can.

It is also true, and our laws now reflect the fact, whether they emanate from Republican or Democratic sources, that the farmer is getting more consideration from government, at least in name, than formerly. Much of this consideration is more specious than solid and more showy than substantial.

TAXATION ON FARM ANIMALS COMING IN FROM ABROAD.

The farmer is surrounded by taxes provided to ward off his competitors of the Old World and the New.

A tariff, ranging from $2 to $3.75 a head, or an ad valorem tax of 27½ per cent, is fixed on the entry of foreign cattle. Horses and mules come next, and those valued at $150 *or less* per head must pay $30 tariff tax per head.

Swine are taxed $1.50 per head.

Horses and mules, valued at $150 or less per head, must pay $30 per head on importation; if valued at over $150, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Sheep 1 year old or older, $1.50 per head; less than 1 year old, 75 cents per head.

Every kind of an animal that is imported from anywhere, whether for domestic use or as a curiosity, has a burden of 25 per cent tariff tax attached the moment it arrives.

All other live animals, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

THE WOOL TAX.

General Grant in his time recommended making wool free.

Cleveland came along and urged many free raw materials, including wool. Free wool was enacted, but with the defeat of Cleveland the duty on wool was put back and the tax on its products increased.

The wool tax has become a terrific burden. Those who have put so much tax on wool are now getting that tax all over themselves, whether in sleeping or waking, for their clothes and blankets are heavily charged with high duties.

The North pays more wool tax than the South proportionately, for the simple reason that the northern climate is severer than the southern and requires greater protection to the citizen from the cold.

The South can get along more easily with cotton, while the North must get along with greater difficulty without wool.

If the people wish to saddle themselves with these high and scarce interpretable wool and cotton taxes, they, nevertheless, bear heavier on those north of Virginia than on those south of it.

The North is able to pay for them, and if they enjoy the luxury, the South can reflect that its people impose the burden upon themselves, and the burden falls in less degree, from the nature of the case, than their more southern fellow-citizens.

OTHER TARIFF RATES ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS.

In an ocean of icebergs of heavily protected articles he must buy, the farmer has many taxes on articles he produces. Many of them are for the show case rather than the counter. A few help the prices of his products. The articles are in section 227 of the tariff bill.

227. Barley, thirty cents per bushel of forty-eight pounds. 228. Barley malt, forty-five cents per bushel of thirty-four pounds. 229. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, two cents per pound. 229½. Broom corn, three dollars per ton. 230. Buckwheat, fifteen cents per bushel of forty-eight pounds; buckwheat flour, twenty-five per centum ad valorem. 231. Corn or maize, fifteen cents per bushel of fifty-six pounds. 232. Corn meal, forty cents per one hundred pounds. 233. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, one and one-half cents per pound. 234. Oats, twenty cents per bushel. 235. Oatmeal and rolled oats, one cent per pound; oat hulls, ten cents per hundred pounds. 236. Rice, cleaned, two cents per pound; uncleaned rice, or rice free of the outer hull and still having the inner cuticle on, one and one-fourth cents per pound; rice flour, and rice meal, and rice broken which will pass through a number twelve wire sieve of a kind prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, one-fourth of one cent per pound; paddy, or rice having the outer hull on, three-fourths of one cent per pound. 237. Rye, twenty cents per bushel; rye flour, one-half of one cent per pound. 238. Wheat, thirty cents per bushel. 239. Wheat flour and semolina, twenty-five per centum ad valorem. 240. Biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles, not sweetened and not specially provided for in this section, twenty per centum ad valorem; biscuits, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, by whatever name known, composed of eggs, flour, or meal of any kind, or other material, when sweetened with sugar, honey, molasses, or other material, or combined with chocolate, nuts, fruit, or confectionery of any kind, or both so sweetened and combined, and without regard to the component material of chief value, fifty per centum ad valorem. 241. Butter, and substitutes therefor, six cents per pound. 242. Cheese, and substitutes therefor, six cents per pound. 243. Milk, fresh, two cents per gallon; cream, five cents per gallon. 244. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, two cents per pound; sugar of milk, five cents per pound. 245. Beans, forty-five cents per bushel of sixty pounds. 246. Beets, twenty-five per centum ad valorem; sugar beets, ten per centum ad valorem. 247. Beans, pease, mushrooms, and truffles, prepared or preserved, or contained in tins, jars, bottles, or similar packages, two and one-half cents per pound, including the weight of immediate coverings; mushrooms, cut, sliced, or dried, in undivided packages containing not less than five pounds, two and one-half cents per pound. 248. Vegetables, if cut, sliced, or otherwise reduced in size, or if parched or roasted, or if pickled, or packed in salt, brine, oil, or prepared in any way; any of the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, and bean stick or bean cake, miso, and similar products, forty per centum ad valorem. 249. Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, not specially provided for in this section, and fish paste or sauce, forty per centum ad valorem. 250. Cabbages, three cents each. 251. Cider, five cents per gallon. 252. Eggs, not specially provided for in this section, five cents per dozen. 253. Eggs, dried, fifteen cents per pound; eggs, yolk of, twenty-five per centum ad valorem; albumen, egg or blood, three cents per pound; dried blood, when soluble, one and one-half cents per pound. 254. Hay, four dollars per ton. 255. Honey, twenty cents per gallon. 256. Hops, twenty cents per pound; hop extract and lupulin, fifty per centum ad valorem. 257. Onions, forty cents per bushel of fifty-seven pounds; garlic, one cent per pound. 258. Pease, green, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, twenty-five cents per bushel of sixty pounds; seed pease, forty cents per bushel of sixty pounds; pease, dried, not specially provided for in this section, twenty-five cents per bushel; split pease, forty-five cents per bushel of sixty pounds; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, one cent per pound. 259. Orchids, palms, azaleas, and all other decorative or greenhouse plants and cut flowers, preserved or fresh, twenty-five per centum ad valorem; lily of the valley pips, tulip, narcissus, begonia, and gloxinia bulbs, one dollar per thousand; hyacinth, astilbe, dielytra, and lily of the valley clumps, two dollars and fifty cents per thousand; lily bulbs and calla bulbs, five dollars per thousand; peony, Iris Kaempferii or Germanica, canna, dahlia, and amaryllis bulbs, ten dollars per thousand; all other bulbs, bulbous roots or corms which are cultivated for their flowers or foliage, fifty cents per thousand.

These losses in section 227 of the tariff bill are often illusive.

WHAT IS A HIDE?

Mr. President, what is a hide? My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] has been going over the tariff. I fear the effect of his propositions would be not only to keep the tax on the shoes of the farmers and the workingmen of the country, but to keep out the finer skins that are already free.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I must ask the Senator to let me correct that statement, because I have expressly stated that I was in favor of free shoes, free leather, and free hides; but if we are going to have a tariff on shoes and leather, then I am in favor of a tariff on hides. I have tried to make myself understood.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not believe in taking two bites at a cherry, neither do I believe in taking three bites out of the middle of a tariff bill when you have not made the first step toward getting there, but merely have spoken against it. When I have proved the faith that is in me in voting for free hides, I shall do my best to persuade my colleagues to come down on things that have their base, as they think, in hides, and shall vote that way myself.

Mr. McLAURIN. I must again be permitted to say that I have not spoken against it.

Mr. DANIEL. You have spoken on a tariff on hides.

Mr. McLAURIN. I spoke for a tariff on hides if we are going to have a tariff on leather and shoes; and if the Senator has stated whether he is in favor of a tariff on shoes and leather I have not heard of it.

Mr. DANIEL. I have not, but I have indicated it. I can not say everything in one sentence. I propose to come to that. I have stated here on the floor, as a prelude, my favorable views in that direction.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have not heard it, Mr. President.

Mr. DANIEL. That may be true, because perhaps of our frequent calls to the reception room and the committee rooms, or to our own office with a crowd of visitors on business all the time.

Mr. McLAURIN. I presume I stay here a great deal more than the Senator from Virginia does.

Mr. DANIEL. You certainly stay here a good deal more than I should like to if I could help myself, but I have been steadily in attendance, either in this Chamber or in the office near by. When you can get the ground sills out from under a house, you have the best chance to have that house come down. But if you go to renew or to fortify the sills or the superstructure you strengthen the whole house. I am going to vote to have this shoe and leather house come down.

I have already read to the Senate and interpolated into the remarks of another Senator the declaration of Governor Douglas, of Massachusetts, distinguished as a shoe manufacturer, that he would be glad to see all the tariff taken off of shoes. I have not heard the Senator quote anything like that. I have contributed something in that direction, and some of the tariff is already off in this very amended proposition. Nobody can give assurance that free hides will surely bring about cheaper shoes or other things, but that is their tendency, and from some quarters the promise.

MANUFACTURERS WHO WANT NO PROTECTION ON FINISHED PRODUCTS.

There was a colloquy between the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and myself, which is in the RECORD of June 19, the day of the discussion, pages 3507–3508. In that colloquy Senator CULBERSON quoted a letter from The Wolfe Brothers Shoe Company, of Columbus, Ohio, and I one from Governor Douglas, of Massachusetts, a leading shoe manufacturer. The colloquy was as follows:

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] asked the Senator from Massachusetts if he would vote for free shoes and free hides. I do not know that I caught the answer.

Mr. LODGE. My answer was no, Mr. President.

Mr. CULBERSON. Would the Senator permit me on that subject to read four or five lines from a shoe manufacturer on that subject, which I happen to have preserved?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I have no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is addressed to me. I presume all Senators had one of the same kind, but I happened to preserve this one.

THE WOLFE BROTHERS SHOE COMPANY,
Columbus, Ohio, March 29, 1909.

Senator CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of the largest manufacturers of shoes in the country, we urge you to lend your influence to place shoes on the free list.

The American shoe manufacturer needs no protection. With free hides and cheap raw material the American shoemaker can shoe the world.

Very respectfully, THE WOLFE BROS. SHOE CO.,
R. F. WOLFE, *President.*

I would be glad to have the observations of the Senator from Massachusetts with reference to this reciprocal proposition from Ohio.

Mr. LODGE. That letter was produced in the House of Representatives, and it is entirely familiar to me. There are certain——

Mr. DANIEL. If I do not interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts, I should like to lay before him and the Senate for their consideration another declaration made to the same effect by Governor Douglas, one of the leading shoe men of the country. I refer to William L. Douglas, late governor of Massachusetts. Here is what he says on this subject:

All we ask is a fair field, and no favor either in our own or in foreign markets. Take away the duties that prevent us from obtaining leather at the same prices paid by our foreign competitors and we will not only hold our own market, with or without a duty on shoes, but we will invade foreign markets on an extensive scale. In doing so we will provide additional work and good wages for our boot and shoe workers.

That is from Governor Douglas.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I have the letter here. I think Governor Douglas altered his views a little on that point subsequently, but the fact is that there are certain grades of shoes that require no protective duty at all. There are other grades of shoes which are exposed to competition, and they are not the shoes affected by the dutiable hides. They are the finer grades, chiefly women's and children's shoes. That branch of the manufacture—and it occurs in certain towns in my State—has taken no interest in the free-hide agitation. They prefer to let the duty remain on everything. But from my point of view it is necessary to look at what is the general interest of the entire industry, and it seems to me and has seemed all along that the interests of the industry would be in free hides and much lower duties than are now imposed by the Dingley law.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator permit me again for just a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I have received a bushel or more of mail on this matter, and I have read everything that came; and I notice it is a very frequent expression of the manufacturers that if you will remove the hide-tax impediment, which is a very remote and very small interest of the farmers, they are ready and anxious to make their assault on the world's markets. They are at such a degree of perfection and readiness to work that, if you will not impede them in that work, they can hold themselves in advance of the world on the subject of shoes.

Now my question is this: The Senator is more familiar with the status of affairs than I am. I should like to ask him what reduction in the finished product he is willing to favor? I expect to vote for

free hides, because I think it is a great step in the right direction, but I should like also to go as much further as is possible.

Mr. LODGE. I think the reductions made by the House were sufficient.

WHAT IS A HIDE AS THE APPRAISERS DETERMINE?

Now, what is a hide? I have before me what the general appraisers of the country say a hide is. The general appraisers of the United States have fixed a dividing line between skins and hides. A green hide is fixed as weighing 25 pounds, a dried hide as weighing 12 pounds. A green hide weighing less than 25 pounds and a dried hide weighing less than 12 pounds are held to be free of duty, as are skins.

So you will perceive that there is progress in some lines of freer trade both as to hides and as to skins. I want to take now all the steps that I can get other people to agree with me to take, just as the Senator did; but I do not see why I should throw a bucket of cold water down my colleague's back by meeting him at the threshold and saying "Do not touch these hides."

See the Tariff Notes, which have been furnished to the Senate, at page 792, for what is a hide.

It should be noted that the 15 per cent tax on hides does not apply to any raw hide weighing less than 25 pounds, nor to a dried hide weighing less than 12 pounds.

The majority of the hides of the farmers weigh under these figures. Hence the tariff does not concern them. Such hides now come in free from abroad, and the tariff proposed does not affect their value or in anywise benefit the farmer, even if on the larger hides it did.

THE MEAT TARIFF.

The next item that moves toward the building up of the value of the American cattle is the meat tariff. The tariff having caught the foreign live animal at the border, puts $2 to $3.75 of taxation on him. Now it proceeds to utilize him. The bill puts a tariff on his meat; that is the most valuable part of him. A fine steak sells for much more per pound than a hide, though it does not last so long.

Then there is a tariff on beef, at 5 cents per pound less 20 per cent; on veal, at 2 cents per pound, and so on; on mutton, pork, venison, and game, except birds; on bacon, 5 cents a pound; meats of all kinds; and bologna sausage. On the extract of meat, on lard, on poultry, on tallow, on wool, on grease is put a tariff. So that the tariff takes the beef and other farm animals apart. It salts the carcass in tariff in all of its parts, as well as in the whole, to start with. And yet you are not done. I desire to insert this as one of the tables that I wish, sir, placed in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be inserted.

The table referred to is as follows:

Schedule G—Agricultural products and provisions.

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Classsification of present law (act of 1897). Italics indicate H. R. 1438, as reported by Committee on Finance to the United States Senate.	Imports for consumption, year ending June 30, 1907.			Exports, year ending June 30, 1907 (value).	Census of manufactures, calendar year 1904.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Average value.		Wages.	Value of products.
	Meat products:						
280	Bacon and hams ....lbs..	475,426.85	$102,101.19	$0.215	$50,169,179		$132,210,611
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	99.00	33.00	.333			
281	Beef ....lbs..	378,321.50	41,609.85	.11	26,367,287		247,096,724
	Veal ....lbs..	59,405.00	7,179.00	.121			12,856,369
	Mutton ....lbs..	368,452.00	31,337.78	.085	83,874		36,880,455
	Pork ....lbs..	196,300.00	28,857.41	.147	1,143,886		91,749,323
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	50.00	5.00	.10			
	(L) Venison ....lbs..	102,310.00	14,242.30	.139			
	(L) Game, except birds, *2 cents per pound.*						
282	Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for		408,172.39		25,298,250		174,028,562
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)		264.00				
	Bologna sausage ....lbs..	450,762.00	121,124.20	.269			
283	Extract of meat—						
	Fluid ....lbs..	19,772.50	13,702.00	.693			
	All other, n. s. p. f. ....lbs..	107,924.00	201,869.00	1.87			
284	Lard ....lbs..	4,011.00	395.35	.099	63,664,890		88,669,565
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	10.00	1.00	.10			
285	Poultry—						
	Live ....lbs..	565,826.95	65,440.92	.116	1,086,618		9,579,718
	Dressed (dead) ....lbs..	134,706.20	29,104.87	.216			
286	Tallow ....lbs..	421,305.50	29,733.00	.071	7,182,688		
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	3,570.00	192.00	.054			
	Wool grease, including degras, or brown wool grease ....lbs..	14,027,242.00	266,749.05	.018			

Paragraph of Senate bill.	Classification of present law (act of 1897). Italics indicate H. R. 1438, as reported by Committee on Finance to the United States Senate.	Rates of duty under—			Revenue under—		Equivalent ad valorems.	
		Present law (Dingley Act).	House bill (Payne).	Senate bill (Aldrich).	Present law.	Senate bill.	Present law.	Senate bill.
	Meat products:						*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*
280	Bacon and hams ....lbs..	5 cents per pound	4 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	$23,771.36	$23,771.36	23.28	23.28
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	5 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	4 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	5 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	3.96	3.96	12.00	12.00
281	Beef ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	7,566.43	7,566.43	18.19	18.19
	Veal ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	1,188.10	1,188.10	16.55	16.55
	Mutton ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	7,369.04	7,369.04	23.51	23.51
	Pork ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	3,926.00	3,926.00	13.61	13.61
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	2 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	1½ cents per pound less 20 per cent.	2 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	.80	.80	16.00	16.00
	(L) Venison ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	2,046.20	2,046.20	14.37	14.37
	(L) Game, except birds, *2 cents per pound.*							
282	Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for.	25 per cent	25 per cent	25 per cent	102,043.11	102,043.11	25.00	25.00
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba)	25 per cent less 20 per cent.	25 per cent less 20 per cent.	25 per cent less 20 per cent.	52.80	52.80	20.00	20.00
	Bologna sausage ....lbs..	Free	Free	25 per cent	....	30,281.05	Free.	25.00
283	Extract of meat—							
	Fluid ....lbs..	15 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	2,965.88	2,965.88	21.65	21.65
	All other, n. s. p. f. ....lbs..	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	35 cents per pound	37,773.46	37,773.46	18.71	18.71
284	Lard ....lbs..	2 cents per pound	1½ cents per pound	2 cents per pound	80.22	80.22	20.29	20.29
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	2 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	1½ cents per pound less 20 per cent.	2 cents per pound less 20 per cent.	.16	.16	16.00	16.00
285	Poultry—							
	Live ....lbs..	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	3 cents per pound	16,974.84	16,974.84	25.94	25.94
	Dressed (dead) ....lbs..	5 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	5 cents per pound	6,735.30	6,735.40	23.14	23.14
286	Tallow ....lbs..	¾ cent per pound	Free of duty	½ cent per pound	3,159.82	2,106.53	10.63	7.08
	Do. (reciprocity with Cuba) ....lbs..	¾ cent per pound less 20 per cent.	Free of duty	½ cent per pound less 20 per cent.	21.42	14.30	11.16	7.45
	Wool grease, including degras, or brown wool grease, lbs.	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	70,136.21	70,136.21	26.29	26.29
	Crude and not refined	....	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	....	....	....	....
	Refined, n. s. p. f	....	½ cent per pound	½ cent per pound	....	....	....	....

MEAT INSPECTION.

Mr. DANIEL. Then, Mr. President, in order that the farmers and the people of this country may not be imposed upon there is a meat inspection. The officers of the United States—experts, practiced, at high salaries—go to "the jungle" where the beef cattle are slaughtered, and before the meat goes out, and in order that we may not have bad meat competition with good meat, the inspection is provided. It is a just protection, not of tariff but of police regulation. Like other Democrats, and Republicans alike, I have supported it for the benefit of all the people, and the sake of that popularity for our products which helps them both at home and abroad.

Cleanliness and sanitation and market prices are all subserved. "Cleanliness," said John Wesley, "is next to godliness;" we get next to it by these processes. It is true we must pay a good price, but they are worth it; and commerce is not like religion, without money and without price. We must pay heavily in the thousands and tens of thousands of dollars for the farmer's cattle and for the citizen's appetite. To guard them both, there is a pure-food law. Next comes a great medical and scientific establishment of this Government—the quarantine—under the same guardianship which refined and philosophic people put over sick children. We examine the Texas steer, if there is any danger of his being diseased, before he crosses the line into Louisiana, North Carolina, or Virginia. If he has tuberculosis or any of the diseases and afflictions that bovine life is heir to, the Government holds him up, and, if necessary, kills him and exterminates him in order that he may not infect.

Look at the medical establishments; look at our surgeons; look at the quarantine officers; go out to the prairies; remember the difficulties we have had out there about fences. Why, Mr. President, many of the western cattle have been feeding on government lands from the time they were put out upon the broad prairies. I have known some of the officers who were sent out there to put up the fences; and I have discovered that some of them, who were known to be men of stern and honest character and were attending to their business, found little applause in the political galleries for these attentions. I know such a case, but I do not care to refer to it specifically. But all of the great and mighty and almost boundless West has been a cattle pasture from early times, and these cattle have fed upon the United States public lands or on the public lands that belong to States. I am not seeking to cast blame or reproach; I am stating the fact. In Texas, Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, and everywhere else, they have fed and continue in some places to feed——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. And they have had more tariff thrust at them than ever was offered to other subjects.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I do.

Mr. WARREN. I want to suggest to the Senator that it has been a very long time since Uncle Sam had any interest in Texas pasture lands——

Mr. DANIEL. Well, that may be now; but they were still up in Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Probably not in your lifetime or in mine.

Mr. DANIEL. How about Wyoming?

Mr. WARREN. So far as Wyoming is concerned there was a time, many years ago, when there was public domain, and the cattle roamed over it, as the Senator has so well expressed it; but that day has long since gone by, and there are very few free pastures now.

Mr. DANIEL. One trouble about the matter is this item of tariff, that has not got the labor of production behind it; and the great foundation of many tariffs, almost the sole foundation, is the difference between what we pay labor in this country and what it is paid in other countries less fortunate in their volumes of money and in their economic systems.

NO MAN EMPLOYED TO RAISE HIDES.

But no man living ever was employed to raise a hide. The tax is no stimulus to more cattle or better cattle. If all the philosophers and scientists, if all the inventors of the world, were to start to work to see if they could make a hide they would come back with the hide not made. You will not increase the number of cattle in this country one iota, in my opinion, you will not stimulate better cattle or more cattle anywhere, by putting any sort of a tariff on hides. It does not reach the hide until the hide has parted with the cattle.

Mr. President, cattle is a fading quantity of the world's economy, and becoming so in our own country. As our public lands are taken up, as population increases and moves westward, and as the demand for their meat increases they are becoming fewer and fewer everywhere in proportion. But from the roving steer, who is seeking to get over the border, to the tariff on meat; from the tariff on meat to meat inspection; from the inspection to the quarantine there will be found either tariff, or public expense and tax. And now, having rubbed tariff and tax all over the parts of the beef, all around the environment of the beef, all around the hospitals of the beef, all around the slaughter pens of the beef, satisfaction is not reached, for the voices say, "Oh, give us a tariff on his hide!" [Laughter.]

"FREE RAW MATERIAL" AS A CREED ADVOCATED BY ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

Mr. President, I will now revert to raw materials and to their status as a political creed and practice in this country. Free raw materials never have been and are not now the creed and platform declaration of any political party in the United States. I challenge the production of any plank that refutes my statement. So far as the great Democrat, Robert J. Walker, was concerned, he disowned it. Though I do not pretend to have been by any means an exhaustive student, the first notable place in which I find the declaration of "free raw material" is in the report of Alexander Hamilton on "Manufacturing."

Alexander Hamilton was a great man, one of the bravest of our Revolutionary soldiers; the aid-de-camp and right-hand man of Washington, and afterwards Secretary of the Treasury in his Cabinet. The highest aspiration that he had upon the battlefield was to be chosen as the man to lead those who went into a forlorn undertaking. He sought the welfare of his country, and he would have gladly laid down his life for it at any time. I admire him greatly, but I do not think that Alexander Hamilton was right when he predicated the protective system of this country upon free raw materials.

"IT IS AN ORIGINAL DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE."

Some Democrats claim it is an original Democratic doctrine. I do not find it so. It can not be proved to be so. It belongs more, by the very nature of the case, to the protective system than it does to what you call the low-tariff system, which diffuses the tariff. Henry Clay was, like Hamilton, for free raw materials. The writings of our late distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator Justin Morrill, show that "free raw materials" is a vein that runs through them. The same may be said of the chairman of the Finance Committee, Mr. ALDRICH of Rhode Island, and of Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania, often called "Pig Iron Kelley." They have all preached, with such variations as fitted their own views, the doctrine of Alexander Hamilton. Wherever you find the high protectionist you are apt to find an advocate of free raw materials.

I come now to a later period; and I see in a New York paper occasionally that "free raw material" is a Democratic doctrine. It is the supposed Democratic doctrine of the man that is writing that particular editorial, but it never has been either the creed or the practice of the Democratic party. The Democratic teachings are historic teachings. They are cohesive. The broad faith of the Democracy is the pervasiveness of small tariffs over multitudes of articles.

NO GENERAL PRINCIPLE REGULATES EITHER RAW MATERIALS OF ALL KINDS OR FINISHED PRODUCTS AS TO WHETHER OR NO THEY BE TAXED.

No general principle can regulate a tariff on raw materials any more than a general principle can be laid down as a rule on finished products. The subject-matter is a matter of trade and exchange, no matter how raw it is and no matter how finished it is; it is the property of a citizen of this country, and all men know that the American principle is to classify our people as little as possible; to keep in the heart of every man the idea that he is as much considered by his Government as any other man, and has a right to be considered as much as every other man.

But, Mr. President, there is also this overreaching principle that should apply to all tariffs. If it is best for the whole country upon a general survey of the whole situation, and especially if it appears to be best for every man, woman, and child in that country with some tentative, some real benefit, to be fairly found, it is best to put on or to take off the tariff tax as the case may be. This is a humanitarian, patriotic equity that walks across every man's threshold and shakes hands with him. That is what the taking of this tax off of hides portends to do—the most humanitarian and equitable thing—which would do much good and no injustice.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

Now I will refer to some Democratic platforms for the purpose of showing some material Democratic history on the subject of the party regard for labor, its opposition to free raw materials as a distinctive principle, and its action in my own State and in the country at large. In our recent discussion

reference has been made to the Denver Democratic platform of 1908 and to the votes of Democrats in the Senate and House against the abolition of revenue taxes on certain raw materials.

I will begin with the declaration of the Democratic leader of 1908. I have no disposition to criticise him here, nor to say aught against him. But he is like the rest of us. He can make mistakes. None of us can follow anybody else altogether. Republicans differ with President Taft about many things. None of us can follow anybody blankly or blindly. If George Washington were President to-day—and there is none whom we all so much reverence—he would be capable of making a mistake. He did make mistakes; he was human. Andrew Jackson did not hesitate to vote against him when he thought his duty required him to do it. Thomas Jefferson was of the same pattern, opposing opinions of Washington.

BRYAN'S OPPOSITION IN 1894 TO PLANK IN DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan was a Member of the House of Representatives, being elected the first time when Cleveland was elected to his second term in 1892.

The Democratic platform of that year demanded the repeal of war taxes, including the 10 per cent prohibitive tax on the issues of state banks.

He was a member of the party that had come into power upon the platform on which Cleveland was elected, but he exonerated himself from any obligation to support the repeal of the bank-issue tax, even though it was only intended to destroy and produced no revenue whatsoever. Prohibitive and destructive taxes never had a place amongst Democratic principles.

In the course of his remarks to the House on June 5, 1894, Fifty-third Congress, second session, page 5809, he said:

IT HAS BEEN STATED THAT EVERY DEMOCRAT IS IN DUTY BOUND TO VOTE FOR THE REPEAL OF THE STATE-BANK TAX, BECAUSE OF THE PLANK RELATING TO THAT SUBJECT ADOPTED BY THE LAST DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION AND OTHERS.

A PLATFORM CAN ONLY BIND THOSE WHO RUN UPON IT.

IN THE FIFTY-SECOND CONGRESS I VOTED AGAINST REPEALING THIS TAX, AND, AS A CANDIDATE FOR REELECTION, PROMISED MY CONSTITUENTS THAT I WOULD VOTE AGAINST IT AGAIN IF THE QUESTION CAME BEFORE THE FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

He further said:

President Cleveland is, of course, pledged to the repeal of the tax, because he accepted a nomination and an election upon the national Democratic platform of 1892. Those also are pledged to repeal whose nominating conventions indorsed the national platform, and those are perhaps bound also who ran as Democrats without expressly repudiating that part of the national platform. *In my own case, I was not only nominated before the adoption of the national platform by the Chicago convention, but I expressly repudiated in my canvass the plank which declared in favor of repealing the state-bank tax.* (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 5, 1894, p. 5809.)

Thus it will be seen that the pleas of Mr. Bryan are:

First. That he did not run upon the national Democratic platform in 1894. If only those who run on a platform supported a national ticket it would be lonesome at the polls.

Second. That he repudiated the repeal of the state-bank tax in his candidacy.

Third. That he promised his constituents to vote against it.

There are many Democrats who are in the same or a similar category as Mr. Bryan was with respect to the Denver platform in their view to the exceptional plank that concerns the few articles of raw material which it called for on the free list. They also have constituents with the same right to regard them as he had.

"Equal rights to all and special privileges to none" is a Democratic principle, and other Democrats must necessarily possess the same privilege of pursuing the dictates of their conscience that he did.

I am not seeking to arraign him, but it is not his right or any other man's right to repudiate a part of a platform to which he disagrees and criticise or denounce those who apply the same rule as to the plank of another platform to which they disagree.

THE COHESIVE AND LASTING PRINCIPLES OF PARTY.

The cohesive principles of a party are those general principles which keep its members together from year to year in companionable unity.

The principles of Democracy which have united it are bedrock principles, which have preserved it throughout the nineteenth century and find it still a formidable force in the twentieth century.

The exceptional doctrines that captivate for a single campaign have never been regarded and can never be made the test of party loyalty or party thought. If this were done, it would soon precipitate irreconcilable factions, if not dissolution.

The things that are fit for and which count in political campaigns are the great general principles which control the party that make it.

The details of schedules and the novelties of difference have more harm than good in them, and can not be satisfactorily arranged by a national convention in the swift and moving scenes which are the universal concomitance of such proceedings.

We can not follow everything that even our eminent leaders from Jefferson to his successors said and did, but we can follow, in the main, the fundamental principles of good government which they stood for. In them is our lasting bond.

THE WALKER TARIFF ACT TAXED RAW MATERIALS FREELY, INCLUDING COAL, IRON, LUMBER, SUGAR, TAN BARK, AND TANNING EXTRACTS.

The great Democratic model tariff of 1846, with which Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury under James K. Polk, was notably connected, contained tariff taxes on coal, lumber, iron, sugar, tan bark, tanning extracts, and over a hundred raw materials.

Amongst its enumerated principles was the declaration that taxes should operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

In 1896 and again in 1904 the Democratic platforms declared against discriminations between class, industries, and sections.

If the Democratic party ever declared in a national convention for free raw materials, I have nowhere seen the declaration.

The same may be said of the Republican party, though many of its leading men have expressed themselves at different seasons and now again for free raw materials.

The Democrats have been time and again and notably criticised for not voting at this session for free raw materials. The criticisms originated with Republican correspondents, and were taken up and repeated by Democratic newspapers who had so mixed things up as to mistake those Republican teachings for those of their own party, of whose history they were unfamiliar.

Undoubtedly unfair and discriminating items will be found throughout the Payne bill, and also throughout the proposed Senate amendments. Some of them are very gross, but it will be impossible to frame a protective-tariff bill without discriminations and inequalities. It is for the purpose of making discriminations and producing inequalities that protective and prohibitive tariff bills are framed. That furnishes the reason of their being, and the more refinements of protection necessary there are the more refinements of injustice. War and national defense reverse all rules. Hence the old Democratic maxim, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

PARTIES NEVER ADOPT THE SAME PLATFORM TWICE.

No party in this country has ever twice adopted the same platform. A new expression of the oracles of party is called for every four years. No party could live, and none has lived, that considered itself bound to proclaim the same opinions any successive four years. The world is one of constant and incessant change. The movements of public life in this rapid age are upon a stage of many actors and of many plays and of shifting scenes, and the best that any man can do about it is to size himself up upon the field of contest upon which he has got to fight, taking his side according to his judgment and his conscience, and making many allowances for the errors and for the aberrations of both sides in his feelings.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM AT DENVER IN 1908.

Now, what was this Democratic platform? I read concerning the tariff:

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties.

That is all right.

Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list.

Does that mean that when a trust enters a field and produces articles that everybody's else competing articles of the like kind, no matter how little or big the trust is, must be made free? I think not. Its sensible meaning is that when a trust is in the saddle, booted and spurred, and has created a monopoly in articles, put them on the free list if you can. I have nothing to say against it. But, like all general rules, it has its limitations and exceptions. For instance, suppose a trust controls tobacco or quebracho that comes from abroad; should we put it on the free list, thus dissipating our needed revenue, and thus also helping the trust?

MATERIAL REDUCTIONS ON NECESSARIES OF LIFE.

Material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life—

This is an historic principle of Democracy; nothing more sound, nothing more advantageous—

ARTICLES SOLD ABROAD MORE CHEAPLY THAN AT HOME.

especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary—

To do what? To restore free trade? No. To produce free trade? No. But—

to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

THE REVENUE BASIS BY "GRADUAL REDUCTIONS" AND THE SENATE DEMOCRATS.

The climax of the Democratic principles in the Denver platform is to reduce the tariff to a revenue basis. That reduction to a revenue basis is not demanded immediately, but as to the method "gradual reductions" are advised.

It is in accordance with this broad general doctrine that the Democrats in the Senate have voted. I have never seen them more united. They are much more united than the Republicans have been, and have had fewer differences and divisions of opinion than in any of the tariff conflicts I have here witnessed. One or two, or three, perhaps, have now and then voted for a protective item. There is no instance where I have voted for other than revenue tariffs; that is, for duties to be collected. (See Appendix and Walker report.) To this I make the exception that I voted for the Wilson-Gorman Act, as did all Democrats in Congress, Mr. Bryan included.

HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON'S TARIFF REPORT—NOT PURGED OF PROTECTION—TEMPERATE REFORM WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF GROWTH.

When the Wilson tariff was enacted, Hon. William L. Wilson proclaimed in his report "that the power of taxation has no lawful or constitutional exercise except for providing revenue for the support of government."

Nevertheless, he was forced—even with his party in the Presidency, in the House, and in the Senate—to give way to the conditions of the country before an opposition which he described as one that "rallies behind it the intolerance of monopoly, the power of concentrated wealth, the inertia of fixed habits, and the honest errors of a generation of false teaching."

He therefore admitted as to the bill he reported that "it did not profess to be purged of all protection any more than to be free of all error in its complex and manifold details," and his expressed conclusion was that "in dealing with the tariff, as with every other long-standing abuse that has interwoven itself with our social or industrial system, the legislator must always remember that in the beginning temperate reform is safest, having in itself 'the principle of growth.'"

He further said:

However we may deny the existence of any legislative pledge or the right of any Congress to make such pledge for the continuance of duties that carry with them more or less acknowledged protection, *we are forced to consider that great interests do exist whose existence and prosperity it is no part of our reform either to imperil or to curtail.*

I took part in the Senate side of that struggle. I witnessed the great difficulties and the force of conditions to control the result of its deliberations.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan was brought to the same conclusion to which Mr. Wilson was brought, and in supporting his bill voted for larger taxes and more protective taxes than the Democrats of the Senate have sustained.

Our difficulties are much greater than they were then, for instead of having all the departments of government at our back, we now have every department of government, including two-thirds majority in the Senate, to combat.

The criticism upon the Democrats of to-day is regardless of history, regardless of conditions, regardless of example, precipitate and reckless in its judgment, and the reversal of all the equities of fair consideration. It was inspired, originated, and sustained by Republicans, and the Democrats who join in the Republican criticism are only playing into their hands.

MORE ABOUT ARTICLES SOLD ABROAD MORE CHEAPLY THAN AT HOME.

About these articles of ours which are made here under the protection and the guidance of our laws, not only under tariff protection, but under the protection of our soldiery, under the protection of our militia, under the protection of our policemen, these industries which are set up, patronized, fostered, carried, defended by the blood of the American people, do they owe us anything? If they owe us anything, what is it they owe? They owe us the deference and the loyalty of an American citizen who considers his country first.

Yet, Mr. President, there are iron works in the United States that will sell a railway engine to go to Finland, to Mexico, or to Canada much cheaper than they would sell that engine to a domestic concern if we were going to build a railroad between here and Richmond, a neighboring city. Is that reciprocity? Is that patriotism? Is that the right conception of an American of his duty to his country? I think not. Just the same may be said of steel rails and multitudes of other things.

Our protected factories sell nails in Cuba cheaper than they will sell them in New York, Baltimore, Washington, or any other American city.

They sell plows and agricultural machinery cheaper in South Africa and South America than they will sell them in the North, South, East, or West.

They supply homes in all lands with cheaper articles of comfort or necessity than they will any American who is living and working under our flag, and they are seeking these American votes by the falsest cry of protection that ever deluded a people.

RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY.

On the 6th of January, 1909, three months before the bill was reported, I began an effort to get at the volume of the business of this country which was dumped into Europe by American manufacturers who would not let the American buy their products as cheaply as they would sell to any kind of a foreigner. I asked for a resolution of inquiry to be adopted. It was adopted and sent to Secretary Straus, of the Department of Commerce and Labor. I will insert it in my remarks, with permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS EXPORTED TO BE SOLD IN FOREIGN MARKETS AT LOWER RATES THAN IN AMERICAN MARKETS, ETC.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 6, 1909.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the following resolution of the Senate:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to have prepared for the use of the Senate a statement of all manufactured products of the United States which are sold, or exported to be sold, in foreign markets at lower rates than in American markets, with all such pertinent information on the subject as he may deem fitting, including the domestic and foreign prices of sale."

In accordance with the direction of the President I have the honor to advise you that the Department of Commerce and Labor possesses no data which would enable me to prepare a statement of all manufactured products of the United States sold, or exported to be sold, in foreign markets at lower rates than like articles are sold in American markets. It is, however, a matter of common belief that quite a number of manufactured products of the United States are sold in foreign markets at lower rates than similar products are sold in American markets.

Reference has been occasionally made in reports from special agents of this department and from consular officers to this general subject. The information, however, has not been sufficiently in detail or specific as to the articles in question.

I respectfully suggest that in order to obtain such data it would be advisable to make a specific inquiry to ascertain the facts, and that the department be furnished the means to conduct an inquiry through one or more special agents known to be thoroughly equipped to perform this class of service. In the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year, which was passed by the House December 11, 1908, provision is made on page 146 for the investigation of trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, and the sum of $40,000 is appropriated for that purpose. I respectfully suggest that the amount named be increased to $50,000, of which not more than $10,000 shall be expended to ascertain whether products of the United States are sold, or exported to be sold, in foreign markets at lower rates than in American markets, as contemplated in the resolution of the Senate.

Respectfully,

OSCAR S. STRAUS, *Secretary.*

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

REPUBLICANS REFUSE AN APPROPRIATION TO GET INFORMATION.

Mr. DANIEL. A message came back from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that he was not provided with the means of collecting that information. I started again, and when an appropriation bill came along here, at the suggestion of the honorable Secretary I offered and helped to get adopted in the Senate an appropriation of $10,000 to enable us to obtain a suitable report on that subject. It died. It died the death between committees.

I returned again the third time with a resolution of April 5, 1909, to the imminent deadly breach, and I found it equally imminent and just as deadly, although, through the assistance of the present Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor, politely afforded, we were sent a few scraps, with the regret that no better could be done.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that some of the manufacturers of this country who are the most pressing and eager for tariff, tariff, tariff, and more tariff, are protecting the pauper labor of the whole earth to-day at the expense of the American people and of their workingmen.

From South Africa to Cuba, from Finland to Mexico, from South America to everywhere else, we are supplying the foreign farmers with the best machines that Americans make. We are taking away work from our poor sewing women to send it to cheap sewing machines in the worst centers, as well as to the more remote and backward tribes of men, to get their cheap labor, and take its reward out of the mouths of American men, women, and children, who are treated by some Republicans as the special objects of their ceaseless care.

It is a shame. It is fundamentally wrong. We should cease to furnish stipends upon and to stimulate the men who pursue Congress for benefactions, and scatter them to the winds of the earth, to people who, in fact, turn their own batteries against us as soon as they can lay their hands upon them. They

produce by American machinery cheaper bread and cheaper meat for those who would buy your bread and meat abroad, producing cheaper clothes for those rivals from abroad, while we tax our own folks with such wool and cotton tariffs as place heavy burdens here at home. Our own protected factories sell nails in Cuba cheaper than they will let a man in Richmond get nails to build a house; plows cheaper in South Africa, watches cheaper in London, engines cheaper in India, steel rails cheaper in Europe or Mexico than in Washington, selling saws and hammers, selling every kind of a machine that the American working man and woman is sighing for at cheaper rates, and all being done under the falsest cry of protection that was ever made to a people aroused by denunciation.

THE SUCCESSFUL GALLINGER RESOLUTION.

My distinguished friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] knows something of the futile efforts which I made to get official data on this subject. He also knows something of a very successful and very rapid effort which he made himself, very properly. I have not a word to say against that gentleman, whose faithful services I have witnessed for nearly a quarter of a century. That I differ with him is my right, but we each hold the same right under the same title of American liberty. I honor the man who follows his conviction. I regret that I was not so fortunate in getting official data as he was.

There went to the Secretary of State the resolution of Senator GALLINGER asking him to send here all the cases they had information about in which the foreigners were selling goods cheaper in the United States than to their fellow-citizens abroad. That object was readily accomplished, and the State Department furnished the information.

Exiled by the autocrats from both the Finance Committee of the Senate and from the conference committee of the two Houses, which has been at work for weeks, the Democrats of this Congress have been denied the opportunities of hearing and of consideration with their colleagues of the pending measure.

The majority in the Senate pay no respect to the provision of the Constitution that each State shall have two Senators and each Senator one vote, and allow no vote in the determination of the measures reported.

We were like the man that Swinburne tells of in his book on wills. He said that there was once a man who was poor and hungry, and there was a rich man who feasted finely every day. The poor man used to get a cracker and a small piece of cheese and go and sit where his olfactories would catch the sweet savors and odors that played out upon the democratic breeze from the kitchen of the rich man, and there he would sit down, and while his mouth watered and his sense of smell brought him the pleasure of suggesting the dainties, he partook of his cracker and cheese and then went his way. It became so much his habit that the rich man noticed it, and resented his intrusion upon the savors of his dainties. So he had the poor man arrested and sought to have him fined.

The judge came to decide and found a purse in the poor man's pocket. He said: "My sentence is that you shall not pay this rich man, but you shall take out your money and shake it in his ear as long as you have enjoyed the scent of his table; and he shall submit to it." So they tied the rich man down and the poor man drew out his change, and hour after hour he shook it in the rich man's ear. That is equity. Would that the things of life would always go on such an equitable basis.

We did not get our information and have not got it, but the general public and such helps as we have supply us with enough facts to give you a subject of pondering, and to give you a task, in justice to your fellow Americans, to see to it that they shall not be invaded in their own faculties and under their own roofs by the subtle practices of the speculators in the tariff game.

The time may come when the powerful of to-day will hear the roar at the polls of votes annulling the decrees here made against the consumers.

EXTRACTS FROM SOME DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

Some of us have had hard words applied because of certain quoted doctrines respecting the differences in cost of foreign and American labor. I have on another occasion discussed that matter and shown by reports of the late Secretary Evarts of the State Department and others that American artisans were more skilled and effective than those of foreign lands and did more and better work in a given time. The doctrines I stated were from the Democratic platforms of the Democracy of Virginia, and of the United States also, which have become proverbial.

PLATFORM OF VIRGINIA DEMOCRATS IN 1883.

In 1883 the Democratic party of Virginia, after several years of turmoil and defeat, reorganized itself, and amongst other utterances of its platform were these:

We favor a tariff for revenue limited to the necessities of government economically administered, and so adjusted in its applications as to prevent unequal burdens, encourage productive interests at home, *and afford just compensation to labor,* but not to create or foster monopolies.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1884.

The Democratic party is pledged to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests. But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that *any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved.* The process of the reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictation of justice—all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. *The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.* Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government economically administered, including pensions, interest and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, bearing heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity.

PLATFORM OF 1885.

In 1885 the declaration of the Virginia Democratic convention on the tariff was:

We reaffirm the declaration of the national Democratic party at its last convention on the subject of the tariff, and especially *do we maintain that the necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages existing in this country.* Also, we favor, as in 1883 and in 1884, a tariff for revenue, limited to the necessities of government economically administered and so adjusted in its application as to prevent unequal burdens, encourage productive industries at home, and afford just compensation to labor, but not to create or foster monopolies. In the necessary reforms to remedy the abuses of the existing tariff, the schedule rates should bear heaviest on articles of luxury and lightest on articles of necessity.

The platform of the national Democratic party in 1888 said this:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by a reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws *with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor,* must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurances of an extended market and steady and continuous operation.

In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party *should promote the advantage of our labor by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman, and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment.*

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1892, WHEN CLEVELAND WAS PRESIDENT.

Hon. William M. Springer was the Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and reported bills putting certain articles on the free list. It was to these measures that the Democratic platform of the Chicago convention of 1892 had reference when it stated:

We indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its—

Referring to the McKinley tariff law—

most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption.

These gentlemen of the Fifty-second Congress only turned their faces in the direction of free raw materials and are therefore commended. Let us see what the propositions were:

First. To put wool on the free list, with a reduction of the tariff on woolen goods.

No matter what we should put now on the free list, there is neither promise nor assurance of reduced tariff on the finished goods.

This was the only raw material that the Springer proposition referred to.

The wool tariff is not a very agreeable subject to me. I voted for it in the Wilson bill, and thought that Grant and Cleveland were in that item in the right path; but the American people would not have it so.

What were the other propositions?

The second was to admit free cotton bagging (finished product).

Third. The machinery for manufacturing bagging (finished product).

Fourth. Cotton ties (finished product).

Fifth. Cotton gins (finished product).

Sixth. Binding twine (finished product).

Seventh. Reduction of the tariff on tin plate (finished product), but to go on the free list after October 1, 1894.

Of the seven articles thus proposed for the free list by the Springer propositions, six of them were finished products; and it was to this list of articles that the Democratic platform of 1892 referred as turning in the direction of free raw materials.

Anybody that cites this collection in support of the desirability of free raw materials is far away from his reckonings.

SOME VIRGINIA PROTESTS IN 1894 AGAINST FREE RAW MATERIALS.

In 1894 in the congressional strife about free raw materials there were many protests from Virginia against President Cleveland's ideas on this subject.

I cite from two of them the views of the Richmond (Va.) Times of July 12, 1894, and September 7, 1894.

That journal regarded the idea as a "fundamental Republican idea" and not a "fundamental Democratic idea," and called it "the veriest nonsense that ever befogged clouded minds."

Again, it portrayed President Cleveland as not representing the true Democratic idea of tariff reform, and called the raw material "a proposition to let one man bring in his imports free of taxes, while another man is required to pay taxes on his."

FREE RAW MATERIALS CALLED "FUNDAMENTAL REPUBLICAN IDEA."

[From the Richmond Times, July 12, 1894.]

To our mind, talk about "raw materials" and "finished product" is the veriest nonsense that ever befogged clouded minds. It is hard to say what is a "finished product," as manufactured articles in all States may be looked upon as "raw material" for something else. Now, ore at the ore beds is "raw material" for pig iron at the furnace. As soon as it is converted by the furnace into pig iron that pig iron is "finished product," as far as the furnace is concerned, but is "raw material" for the foundry to work into structural iron. Bessemer pig is "raw material" also for the steel-railway mill, and steel rails are one of its "finished products." But the steel rails are only "raw material" to the builders of a railroad, and his "finished product" is not seen until the railroad is completed.

Wheat is "raw material" for the miller, and flour is his "finished product." But flour is only "raw material" to the cook, and bread is her "finished product." Nevertheless bread is only "raw material" to the pudding maker; and so it goes on. All things are "raw materials" for whatever they may be converted into.

When, therefore, Mr. Wilson undertakes to say that he will lay all duties on "finished product" only, and will exempt all "raw materials," he is putting himself out of court. If he exempts all "raw materials," he will have but little on which to lay duties. If, however, he exempts certain articles, because he chooses arbitrarily to say that they are the only "raw materials" which ought properly to be considered as "raw materials," he is then discriminating between the industries of the people, and placing burdens according to whims and not according to principle.

Mr. Wilson may think this a "fundamental Democratic idea." But if it is not essentially an idea in the school which believes in governmental favoritisms and privileges to some, we are unable to judge in such a case. It is a "fundamental Republican idea" and not a "fundamental Democratic idea."

NO THIRD TERM—GENUINE DEMOCRACY.

[From the Richmond Times, September 7, 1894.]

The Hon. CHAUNCEY DEPEW informs the American people that Mr. Cleveland will be the nominee of the Democratic party in 1896. There are no longer prophets, and therefore the prediction of one is entitled to as much consideration as that of another. We can gently tell the Hon. CHAUNCEY DEPEW that Mr. Cleveland will not be the nominee of the Democratic party in 1896. One of these predictions may therefore be considered as offsetting the other, so that the case may now be looked at on its merits, and with no regard for predictions at all.

The Democratic party has got too much sense to depart from its time-honored principle that no man shall be President of the United States more than twice. A third term passes the line which we have drawn as separating republican from institutions dependent upon any one individual, and we are not going to allow that line to be crossed, never mind what the temptation may be.

But, in the second place, it is now ascertained and made known of all men (what was not appreciated before) that Mr. Cleveland does not represent the true Democratic idea of tariff reform. We know now that his idea of tariff reform is that what he calls "raw materials" are to be admitted free of duty and the genuine Democrat says that that is McKinleyism at the other end of the line. It is a proposition to let one man bring in his imports free of taxes, while another man is required to pay taxes on his. The genuine Democrat says he will never agree to this, because it violates that equality of all men before the laws, to secure which he understands his party to exist. Mr. Cleveland, therefore, would be very far from having a united party at his back if he were again the nominee.

What is involved in "free raw materials" was not understood in 1892, but it is perfectly understood now, and the backbone of the Democratic party will never consent to it.

The Richmond State referred to Mr. Cleveland's letter of acceptance in favor of "freer raw materials," in which he said:

We believe that the advantages of freer raw material should be accorded our manufacturers, and we contemplate a fair and careful distribution of necessary tariff burdens rather than the precipitation of free trade.

And thus commented:

If Mr. Cleveland had meant to commit the party absolutely to free raw materials, he would have used that expression instead of "freer raw materials," the language of his letter.

IRON ORE AND COAL.

The McKinley tariff act put 75 cents on the ton of ore, as the act of 1883 had done before; the Wilson-Gorman law reduced it to 40 cents; the Dingley law preserved it at 40; and the present Congress, with Democratic support, reduced it still further, to 25 cents per ton, and to that reduction there is, by treaty, a discount of 20 per cent in favor of imports from Cuba.

At the time the small iron-ore tax was discussed at this session, in the Senate much bruit was made to the effect that the trusts owned and controlled the great body of ore land in this country. Before that time some influential gentlemen of standing in Virginia urged me to support a much larger tax, leaving arguments with me of that tenor. Ere long their interests, with others, changed hands to free-ore advocates, and by repute they became free-ore advocates also.

Since the debate the Senate has been familiarized with statements of the investments of the Bethlehem Steel Company and the Pennsylvania Steel Company in the Cuban ore lands, and with the fact that the Pennsylvania Steel Company is under contract with the bondholders of the Spanish-American Iron Company to import not less than a million tons of Cuban ore annually into this country. These and cumulative facts in the same direction were well stated by Senator PAYNTER, of Kentucky, in the RECORD of June 16. Neither he nor the great body of Democratic Senators were deluded by the cry of "Wolf!" but showed their just apprehension of facts now generally known. (See RECORD of June 16, 1909, p. 3340.)

Eighteen Democratic Senators who voted for reduction were said to have voted for "protecting" iron ore, although it was a low-revenue tax. It was said also that they were not Democratic, although the general principle of the Democratic party is "gradual reduction."

COAL.

It was said, too, that they lined up with Republicans. What of it? Should we not all be glad to line up with Republicans when the Republicans were themselves lining up with us for the lowest tax ever levied on the subject for over a century, and lined up with the public spirit of our times?

This table speaks for itself:

Coal tariffs for over one hundred years.

Year.	Tariff.	Duty per ton.
1789	2 cents per bushel	$0.56
1790-1792	3 cents per bushel	.84
1792-1794	4½ cents per bushel	1.26
1794-1812	5 cents per bushel	1.40
1812-1816	10 cents per bushel	2.80
1816-1824	5 cents per bushel	1.40
1824-1842	6 cents per bushel	1.68
1842-1846		1.75
1846-1857	30 per cent ad valorem	$0.65- .75
1857-1861	24 per cent ad valorem	.55- .65
1861-1862		1.00
1862-1864		1.10
1864-1872		1.25
1872-1893		.75

The tariff on coal is now 67 cents per ton. The Senate has reduced this by 10.45 per cent, and it may be lower than this before Congress adjourns. Transportation is the largest consideration now about coal, and the people in towns who complain of its cost would do well to look into and compare the cost of coal to them with that to more distant places.

LUMBER.

The majority of Democrats have voted, and I with them, for a 5 to 6 per cent tax on lumber—to speak precisely, $5.88 per thousand—in effect by voting against striking out the $1 tax in the House bill; and again, in supporting what afterwards came along, the $1.50 tax, which amounts to 8 to 9 per cent—to speak precisely, 8.82 per cent.

It has been well said by Hon. MARTIN DIES, of Texas, that:

Lumber is as much a legitimate subject of taxation as food, clothing, and the various other articles that enter into the necessities of the people. A man does not build many homes in a lifetime, but he eats food and wears clothing every day. A great many people do not own houses, but they must still buy knives and forks, plows and harness, all of which are more highly taxed than lumber ever was. The lumber tax is less burdensome to the poor than almost any tax in the entire list.

It is further obvious that the inspiration to take the tax off of lumber is a sectional one, for it is not only admitted, but it is claimed that it would not affect the South or southern lumber, but would help those people of the treeless States who have largely cut away their lumber. Some of these States have all manner of protective taxes now adding to their values by their discriminations, and for them to rail at the small taxes that are applied to southern raw materials is simply straining at motes and swallowing camels.

SUMMARY OF MR. Z. W. WHITEHEAD, OF NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. Z. W. Whitehead, of Norfolk, Va., has made a summary showing that lumber is in volume and importance the greatest industry in the State; there being 1,352 sawmills, employing 55,000 operatives, whose income at the minimum figure of $2 a day amounts on an average to $3,330,000 per month.

I could not condense that summary without mutilation. It has been printed in Senate Document No. 111 of this session:

Canada imported into the United States last year 892,789,000 feet of lumber, valued at $14,989,179, while American exports of lumber to Canada, or British North America, during the same time were only 149,884,000 feet, and valued at $4,269,179. In other words, Canada shipped into the United States practically six times as much lumber as the United States exported to Canada.

Forty-eight per cent of all the lumber manufactured in the United States, annually, is produced in the South, and the lumber industry furnishes employment to a greater number of operatives than any other single industry in the South. Combined, the lumber interests of the South has a greater capital stock than any other industry in our midst.

The total production of lumber in the United States last year, or rather in 1907, was 40,000,000,000 feet, and valued at approximately $600,000,000.

The lumber industry alone brings into the South an average of $1,000,000 for every working day in the year. It furnishes a greater volume of tonnage to southern railroads and transportation companies than any other commodity known or going.

In Virginia there are 1,352 sawmills, employing practically 55,000 operatives, whose income, at the minimum figures of $2 per day on an average, would amount to $111,000, or $3,330,000 per month. No other single industry in the State pays out so much money monthly or annually for labor. As a matter of fact, in Virginia, lumber leads in volume and importance that of all other industries in the State.

The total production of lumber in Virginia, annually, is 1,450,000,000 feet. The percentage of local consumption in Virginia is about 4 per cent of the cut.

There are 28,856 sawmills in the United States, employing about 800,000 men. Only about 7 per cent of all the lumber manufactured in the South is consumed in this territory. About 80 per cent of the cost price of lumber is for labor in various ways that enter into its manufacture, from the raw material on the stump to the finished article at the point of consumption.

The present tariff of $2 per 1,000 on rough lumber amounts to an ad valorem duty of about 11 per cent, while iron and steel, cement and building stone are protected with a tariff of from 32 to 48 per cent, all of which compete heavily with lumber for heavy construction purposes. The duty on iron and steel, if cut 50 per cent, would still be prohibitive, while the present duty on lumber is already on the basis of a tariff for revenue only, importations last year amounting to over 900,000,000 feet from Canada alone.

The lumber interests of the country are the largest of all other purchasers of farm products, such as hay, corn, oats, and live stock.

The cost of stumpage and lumber in Canada are so much less than in the United States that the cost price of lumber production in that country is anywhere from 20 to 33⅓ per cent less than in the United States. This is illustrated by the fact that in Canada the manufacturers employ largely Hindoo, Chinese, and Japanese labor, and buy their stumpage on an average of $1.40 per 1,000, whereas in the United States the average price of stumpage ranges from $2.50 to $4 per 1,000 feet. Labor that costs 80 cents to $1.25 in Canada costs $1.50 to $2.25 in this country.

LUMBER EXPORTS TO CANADA.

One of the Republican Senators, Hon. C. I. CRAWFORD, of South Dakota, has shown in this debate that—

Our exports of lumber into Canada are nearly half as much as the exports of lumber from Canada into this country, and cases have been given in these debates where the American lumberman has been able to undersell the Canadian in his own territory—

And that—

During the last fiscal year we exported nearly $10,000,000 worth of lumber and other wood, and of forest products we exported more than $126,000,000, and a large part of this is in successful competition with Canadian forest products.

Our Virginia lumber does not reach Canada, but does reach the great Middle States and some farther north. It has waterway connections.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF, AND AGAIN COME PROTESTS FROM THE LIKE DIRECTIONS AS IN 1894.

North Carolina and Virginia have very large interests in lumber scattered about in different sections, with much capital invested and with many hands employed in their work.

It is admitted that they are beyond the range of northwestern or Canadian trade, for transportation charges are too great.

There was such a threatened uprising in the Democratic party of North Carolina against such discriminatory legislation that the good faith of the party and its managers had to be pledged, over the signature of Chairman Eller, of the State Democratic executive committee, to avert an open revolt in the ranks of the party. As it was, the Republicans elected three Members of Congress in that State, largely on this issue, and others would have been elected had the Democratic candidates not openly in their campaign speeches repudiated this plank. Even then the Democratic majorities in every district were reduced, save and except one.

HON F. M. SIMMONS.

Our colleague, Hon. F. M. SIMMONS, of North Carolina, has related the strong sense of antagonism in his State against the free-lumber clause of the Democratic platform.

It seems singular that this product of the South should be picked out for invidious treatment when there was not a word in the Denver platform about any other raw materials whatsoever.

The observations of Senator SIMMONS are worthy of attention from those who do not hesitate to vote heavy taxes on everything the people have to buy, and yet make a great noise if they do not rush to dispense with the moderate revenue taxes which may incidentally assist them in paying.

Senator SIMMONS said, as to the free-lumber proposition, in the Senate:

This plank of our platform met with general disapproval in my State. I do not remember, and I took part in that campaign, a single Democratic speaker who gave it unqualified indorsement upon the stump. I do not believe there was a single Democratic candidate for Congress in that State who so supported it in his campaign.

I do not recall a single Democratic newspaper published in North Carolina which openly and warmly advocated it during that campaign. On the contrary, I am advised that some of our Democratic candidates gave assurance, if not in public, in private, that they were not in sympathy with it, and I am told that one Democratic candidate for Congress in a public speech openly repudiated it.

The feeling against this plank was so strong in the State that the Democratic executive committee of the State felt impelled to take action in regard to it. I hold in my hand a statement made under his own signature by a gentleman who was associated at party headquarters with the chairman of our state executive committee, stating that what I am going to read was put in circular form and in the form of supplements to newspapers and 200,000 copies of the document were circulated throughout the State during that campaign. It was published in many newspapers of the State. It was circulated in every hamlet of the State and accepted by the people as an assurance given by the executive committee of the party in the State. Here is what he says:

"In the effort to meet the dissatisfaction which the injustice of this plank in the platform produced in North Carolina," referring to the lumber plank, "there was published and sent out from Democratic state headquarters 200,000 copies of an article from which the following are extracts:

"'The manufacture of lumber is one of the great industries of the South, and one which would for this reason appeal with especial force to the best wishes and protection of the Democratic party.'"

And further:

"They may rest assured that the Democrats would not put lumber on the free list, it being a southern product, unless there should be coupled with it the placing upon the free list of all articles entering into competition with trust-controlled articles, as their platform demands, and which would tend to largely cheapen the expenses of the manufacture of lumber.

"That assurance," says the writer, "was scattered broadcast over the State, and if any Democrat or Democratic paper criticised it I never heard of it."

In the light of these facts, I submit if Mr. Bryan was justified by the reasons he gave in 1894 in voting against a plank in the Democratic platform of 1892, so are the Senators and Representatives from North Carolina for their vote upon lumber, which he now criticises on account of the plank on that subject in the platform of 1908.

I do not, Mr. President, wish to be understood as justifying my vote solely upon that ground. I contend that my vote is consistent with that declaration. I say that the declaration in the Democratic platform was predicated upon certain conditions, and that those conditions do not exist. If those conditions existed, I would vote for free lumber; but the conditions do not exist, and I have cast my vote against free lumber and shall cast it for a duty upon lumber when I have an opportunity to do it. I am satisfied with that vote, and I do not concern myself about the criticism of those who seek to impugn my Democracy or my motives; but I do not intend that the facts shall be perverted or misrepresented.

HON. CARTER GLASS.

Hon. CARTER GLASS, of Lynchburg, Va., who represents the sixth district of that State in Congress, wrote a letter on this subject which is so full of pith that in making some remarks here I had it put into the RECORD of June 18, 1909, page 3450. I concur in his sentiments and applaud his course.

I quote the following:

NOT DEALING WITH A THEORY.

We were not dealing with a theory. We were confronted with the plain certainty of tariff legislation by the Republican party in Congress on strictly protection lines; and, this being the case, I did not consider it my duty to join with a score of Canadian-border and Middle West Republicans to put certain products of Virginia and the South on the free list for the peculiar advantage of their constituents, only to see these same Republicans a moment later unite again with the rest of their party and tax the people of my State and section beyond endurance on the products of the North and the Middle West.

The suggestion that the Denver platform bound me to thus immolate my State and section is all moonshine. I was nominated for Congress before the Denver convention met; and in nearly every speech I made in the campaign for reelection I emphasized the sectional phases of Republican tariff legislation, and, from the hustings, as I have done for years through the columns of my newspaper, protested against the policy that would compel Virginia and the South to sell their raw materials to northern manufacturers in competition with the world, and at the same time force our people to purchase the products of these northern manufacturers from the shelter of a high protective tariff.

IS A TARIFF FOR REVENUE DEMOCRAT.

I am a "tariff for revenue" Democrat. I stand for equalizing duties; but I distinctly reject the Utopian idea of yielding every advantage that incidental protection affords the products of the South in order to give the industries of another section the double advantage of our materials free at one end of the proposition and high protection for their products at the other end.

PUTTING LUMBER ON FREE LIST NOT "HISTORIC DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE."

The talk about "free lumber" being "historic Democratic doctrine," and about the Denver convention having declared for putting this "prime necessity of life on the free list," and about the failure of five Virginia Congressmen to heed the demand for "cheaper building material," is utterly at variance with the facts. Not one of the three contentions can be maintained. Putting lumber on the free list is not "historic Democratic doctrine." A "tariff for revenue" is the historic Democratic doctrine. * * *

The general declaration of the Denver platform on the tariff question was for a "gradual reduction of duties" to a "revenue basis." Nobody will deny this. Then, distinctly and notoriously, in response to the outcry of the American press, Republican as well as Democratic, against the exactions of the print-paper trust, and the demand that it be punished by putting on the free list everything entering into or affecting the production of print paper, the convention made this separate declaration, not of "historic party doctrine," but of immediate public policy:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

"Existing duties have given to the manufacturers of paper a shelter behind which they have organized combinations to raise the price

of paper, thus imposing a tax upon the spread of knowledge. We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, logs, and that these articles be placed on the free list."

No candid disputant would contend that this was a demand to put lumber distinctively on the free list. It was a specific statement of a condition that prevailed in the paper trade, involving a tax on the spread of knowledge, and a comprehensive demand that this particular evil be corrected by putting on the free list all articles affecting the production of print paper; and the declaration enumerates the articles. Obviously lumber was included only because the tariff on lumber affected the price of Canadian logs, and because the law could readily be evaded by an inexpensive process had the terms "lumber" and "timber" been omitted.

Now, what was the response of the Payne bill to this demand? It in reality put none of these things on the free list. It made a pretense of putting wood pulp on the free list, but saved it by a "joker." It made a pretense of reducing the duty on print paper, but shrewdly tacked on a countervailing condition. It did not pretend to put lumber on the free list, but reduced the duty from $2 to $1 per thousand feet. And then what? By rule, the Republican majority denied the House the right to vote on the question of unconditional free pulp and unconditional free print paper, because 95 per cent of these things are made in Republican States at the North.

It gave the House the right to vote for free lumber, because it is a great industry of the South; so that, under this Republican rule, the comprehensive demand of the Denver platform to have the tariff taken off everything affecting the production of print paper was disregarded as to those things produced in New England and the Lake States, but the great southern product of lumber, which is chiefly sold in these States, was put up as a target for those Republicans in Congress who believe in protection for everything they sell to us and free trade in everything they buy from us. And southern Congressmen are criticised for declining to sanction any such wretched discrimination.

SMALL DUTY ON LUMBER NOT A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

As to the nature of the small duty on lumber, it is not a protective tariff in the sense that it adds one thrip to the price of rough lumber to the general consumer. Nobody in Congress or out who knows anything about the subject and has any regard for his intellectual integrity would pretend to say to the contrary. The duty does not increase the cost of lumber one farthing to a single consumer in Virginia or the South or to any resident of the United States, outside a narrow zone of competition on the Canadian border. It is distinctly within the Democratic doctrine of a tariff for revenue, yielding, as I recall the figures, $1,600,000 to the Federal Treasury. It incidentally preserves to Virginia and the South the lumber markets for New England and other Northern States easily reached by Canadian lumber. One will search the tariff speeches in vain to find any serious contention that the dollar duty on lumber could increase the price one cent to a single inhabitant of the United States outside a very limited territory, whose people for half a century have grown rich by collecting tariff tribute from the balance of the country, and whose Congressmen stood out in the House recently for the highest degree of protection for their own products and free trade in the products of other sections.

To the extent that the House of Representatives was permitted by the Republican rule to participate in the work of making a tariff law, I voted my best judgment and my clearest conception of sound Democratic doctrine.

Knowing, as everybody did know, that it must be a protective-tariff law, I unhesitatingly declined to yield every advantage that Virginia and the South have under the revenue features of the existing law, while every product of northern mills and factories was being highly protected.

REFUSED TO SURRENDER PALTRY TRIBUTE NORTHERN MANUFACTURERS PAY TO THE SOUTH.

I refused to surrender the paltry tribute which a few northern manufacturers of lumber pay to the South, while their Congressmen were intent on exacting greater tribute from all the people of my State and section.

SOME IMPORTANT FACTS ABOUT HIDES AND LEATHER.

The cost of sole leather in the cheap, heavy shoes used by the working classes is larger in proportion than it is in the expensive and highly finished shoes.

Agricultural communities are the largest consumers of leather. The farmers, therefore, have the largest interest in the freedom and cheapness of hide products.

The demand for leather has outstripped the demand for beef. Our sole-leather exports have decreased from 38,384,314 pounds in 1897, when the 15 per cent hide tax was adopted, to 31,189,897 pounds in 1908.

It is much more to the interest of the farmer to keep down the price of shoes, harness, and other articles made of leather than it is to put up or keep up the price on hides.

No protection of cattle importation from foreign countries and no tax on hides has fostered, increased, or in any way helped cattle raising.

In looking at the price list of native steers on the hoof, of heavy native steer hides and of sole leather in Chicago, it will be seen:

1. That prices of steers on the hoof are variable, sometimes an ascending and sometimes a lowering figure.

2. The price of hides ascend at a greater ratio than does the price of steers.

3. The price of sole leather per pound maintains a steadier and a higher line of values.

It is stated on high authority upon statistical examination that the price of steers and their hides showed no proportionate connection. Governor Douglas says:

Thus while the price of hides is now 15½ cents per pound, they were about 9 cents in 1897, and prices of steers have varied, except in 1902, but little, perhaps 15 cents higher than before.

THE ENORMOUS PACKER TRUST AND MYRIAD OF REMONSTRANCES.

I have had, as presumably other Senators have, hundreds of communications on this subject.

From some of the many I cite the following extracts:

There are four or five packers to-day controlling the raw-hide business of the country, also the tanning and part of the shoe business. Why are such privileges granted to the few? What chance has the young man of ever starting in business, as we and our forefathers had, when different trades are controlled by a few trusts or corporations?

When the combination came down to Chicago from Milwaukee, what chance would they have if they had to compete with a trust or large corporation? As it was, they would have none only for the Dingley bill giving them 15 per cent on the raw hide eleven years ago. Take off 15 per cent on the hide. The hide costs them on the hoof only $4.85 to $5 per hundred and nets them from $15 to $14 per hide when taken off the animal, besides their other profits on the carcass, and now controlling the tanning industry of the country.

FOREIGN MARKET CLOSED TO THE TANNERS.

[G. F. Dittman Boot and Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo., April 14, 1909.]

A duty of 15 per cent on "packer" hides effectually closes the foreign market to the tanners.

In recent years the large meat packers, who control the output of "packer" hides, have bought up the majority of tanneries and are now in a position to freeze out the remaining independent tanners by reason of their monopoly of the local hide supply.

By the elimination of a duty on packer hides an open market is presented the independent tanner, enabling him to draw upon the world's supply whenever monopoly drives the price out of reason or attempts to close the local market to him.

PRESENT DUTY BENEFITS ONLY THE "BEEF COMBINE."

[S. J. Richey and F. W. Weaver, of Luray, Va.]

The present duty benefits only the "beef combine," and it does not increase the price paid the cattle raiser for his cattle. In addition to controlling the cattle and hide markets of the United States the "beef trust" is now engaged in the tanning business. They propose tanning the hides they take off, in the event they can not get their price for the hides on the market.

THE PACKERS' DOMINATION.

[Free hide mass meeting, Chicago, Ill.]

For some years the packers have been gradually working into the business of buying and selling country hides so that in time they may control the entire supply as they now control the supply of packer hides.

With the packers in complete domination of all the domestic raw material for making leather and a tariff to keep out foreign hides, there can be no hope for expansion of our export trade in shoes, harness, etc., which is the only salvation of our business from the evils of overproduction.

The great packing interests are not only controlling the domestic hide market, but are now tanning from 50 to 60 per cent of their heavy cattle hides. This gives them a commanding position in the tanning of both upper and sole leather. This aggressiveness on the part of the packing monopoly means the ultimate control of the shoe, harness, etc., business.

Representing as we do the manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing interests of the great Central West in leather, in boots and shoes, in leather belting, in saddlery and harness, in trunks, and, in fact, all other articles made of leather produced from dutiable hides, and basing our conclusions on more than eleven years' practical experience with the tariff of 15 per cent on cattle hides, we assert that this tariff is a burden on every one of the eighty-odd million consumers of these articles in this country.

TAXED HIDES THE BASIS OF THE PACKERS' CONTROL.

[Charles N. Prouty, Spencer, Mass.]

It gives a basis for the big packers to control the hide market and enable them to hold their hide product much higher than they otherwise would, whatever the cost is to them. When the "Mr. Swifts" say, as is published in the papers, that so far as their tanning interests are concerned they should favor free hides, but in consideration of benefiting the raiser of beef they favor the tariff, I do not think that is an honest statement. I do not think the raiser of beef begins to get the benefit out of the tariff that the Swifts do. I have always been a Republican and a defender of the protective system. This duty on hides does not materially, to any extent, encourage an industry. No farmer would raise a steer any quicker on account of the duty on hides, and the benefit he gets out of it is slight, but the increased cost of leather products comes back to him. If he does not buy but one or two pairs of shoes a year or one set of harness, he loses a great deal more than he would gain through the duty on hides.

MONOPOLY CREATED FOR THE PACKERS.

[W. H. Heller, president Hide and Leather Association of New York.]

The effect of the duty is, by legislation, to give a monopoly of the tanning of leather to the Chicago packers, to the exclusion of those who have all their lives been engaged in the industry. We therefore ask Congress, in justice to all engaged in the tanning of leather and the manufacture of shoes, and in the common welfare, to place hides upon the free list.

CATTLE GROWERS NOT THE BENEFICIARIES, BUT PACKERS ARE.

[A. B. Goodbar, St. Louis, Mo.]

First. That the farmers and cattle growers are not benefited by the tariff on hides.

Second. That the beef packers are the real and sole beneficiaries of this tariff.

I also stated that the value of the hide is not taken into consideration by the beef packer in fixing the price of beef, and as an evidence of this fact that the prices of beef and hides do not rise and fall together or in the same relative proportion.

FOUR OR FIVE MEN GET BENEFIT AND THE PEOPLE PAY FOR IT.

[Green Brothers Shoe Company, Fredericksburg, Va.]

At the present there are four or five men in the United States who get the benefit of this tariff on hides, and the rest of the country and people pay for it. I refer to the great packers of Chicago.

[The Florsheim Shoe Company, April 26, 1909, Chicago, Ill.]

The packer takes off 95 per cent of all the hides that weigh over 25 pounds. Of course his hides are dutiable; he needed the duty and the extra profit. Many hides weighing under 25 pounds are taken off by the farmer and country butcher; they are not dutiable.

PACKERS MAKE MILLIONS OF DOLLARS; FARMERS AND TANNERS PAY.

[W. B. Smoot, Alexandria, Va.]

You will find that the beef trust will not appear directly in opposition to the removal of this their tax, but will employ farmers to make their fight on the pretense that the farmer gets the benefit of this tax on hides, which is refuted by facts, figures, and market quotations; and it is a well-known fact that the farmers of this country pay a large proportion of this tax in the consumption of leather on the farm, in the shape of shoes, harness, agricultural machinery, etc.

Hides are the packers and butchers' by-product or offal, as no cattle are butchered in this country for their hides, but hides are the tanners' raw material, and many millions of dollars' worth of green-salted hides are brought into the State of Virginia every year to be made into leather by Virginia labor and tanning material, and the tanning business is one of the important industries of this Commonwealth, as you well know.

The packers and their adroit representatives will make a powerful underhand fight against removing this duty of 15 per cent on hides, as it puts millions of dollars in their pockets every year. They feel that they bought and paid for the special privilege of this tax in 1896, and notwithstanding the fact that they have been liberally rewarded ever since, they want the game to go on, as it is a very artful method of taxing the consumer, as it will increase as long as babies are born barefooted and the farmers use harness on their horses and mules.

THE TAX INCREASES COST OF LEATHER.

[Paul C. Edmunds, Lynchburg, Va., April 24, 1909.]

As a leather buyer for my concern, which gives employment to more than a thousand people, I can not see how we can continue to run our factories at anything like their normal volume of business, unless we can secure our raw material for less money. While in my judgment leather now, on account of manipulation of the hides by the packers, is entirely too high, there is not a tanner in the business who does not believe that we will be compelled to pay considerably more for leather, unless the hides can be brought in free and the monopoly that the packers now have is broken.

MONOPOLY IN TANNING AIDED BY TAX.

[Lynchburg Shoe Company, April 20, 1909.]

It appears to us that the packers will soon obtain a practical monopoly of the tanning of sole leather, unless hides are made free of duty.

PACKERS CONTROL OUTPUT OF HIDES—THE TANNERS' POINT OF VIEW.

[W. D. Allen Manufacturing Company, Chicago.]

The situation from this point of view does not interest us at all, except as American citizens. We know it to be a fact that the large packing industries of the country not only control the output of hides now, but they practically control 60 per cent of the sole-leather tanning industry, and the independent tanner will very soon be wiped out if the present tendency is kept up.

A MISTAKE TO BURDEN THE WHOLE PEOPLE FOR BENEFIT OF MONOPOLY.

[Charles N. Prouty, Spencer, Mass.]

Boots and shoes are one of the leading necessities for the public welfare. No one could live in this country creditably without them, and what a mistake to enact a law to make the packer that monopolist and burden the whole people to oblige one class—the farmers—when really they get so very little out of it, and that little is more than lost in their purchase of leather goods, and really no one is benefited but the four or five great monopolists, the packers, who are buying up the tanneries and driving out the independent tanners.

THE TAX ON HIDES UNJUST TO FARMERS, LEATHER CONSUMERS, AND MANUFACTURERS.

[Salem Tannery, Salem, Va.]

We feel that it is not out of place to call your attention briefly to the injustice of the 15 per cent tariff duty on imported hides and to ask your cooperation for its removal. You are doubtless already in touch with the facts in this connection and know that the duty is unjust to the farmer, the leather consumer, and manufacturer, being a benefit only to those few packers who are endeavoring to control the hide and leather industries of the United States.

CONSUMERS OF SHOES AND HARNESS WOULD BE BENEFITED BY FREE HIDES.

[Cincinnati Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.]

There are two questions before the public. One, that all consumers of shoes, harness, and other products of leather will receive a positive benefit from free hides through a lower cost of leather goods. This we know to be true. The other is that the farmer may receive some benefit on the price of his cattle through a duty on hides. This has been proven untrue, as the benefit goes only to the beef packers. But in view of the fact that the tariff on hides has enabled the beef trust to acquire a monopoly on hides, the aforestated questions are at present of secondary consideration to the one great issue now before the people of the country in this fight, namely, the elimination of the monopoly which under the present tariff the beef trust has on cattle and hides. Therefore every Senator and Congressman who agitates or votes against free hides will be agitating or voting for maintaining and increasing the power of one of the largest and most powerful monopolies in the necessities of life.

HIDES SHOULD BE FREE, AND TAX ON LEATHER AND SHOES REDUCED.

[The Florsheim Shoe Company, Chicago, Ill.]

Notwithstanding Mr. Connors's reported denial, it is a fact that Armour & Co. are both in the sole and upper leather tanning business very extensively, operating in their own name as well as through subsidiary companies, which they control, and the same methods have been followed by the other packers. The inclosed advertisement of Armour & Co. in Hide and Leather, of February 27, certainly substantiates this.

They may be or may not be in the shoe manufacturing business. We are not advised as to this, but it is logical to assume that the very reasons that made them go from the hide business to the tanning business will eventually make them go from the leather business to the shoe manufacturing business; and if the same methods that are usually followed by large companies who have special tariff protection are carried out, they will soon retail shoes.

This condition could not exist if the hides of cattle were put on the free list, where they ought to be, and the duty on the finished leather, sole as well as upper, was considerably reduced from the present schedules.

Furthermore, the putting of hides on the free list and reducing the duty on leather as well as on shoes, would, in our opinion, reduce the cost of the shoe to a considerable extent to the consumer.

ANIMALS BOUGHT BY PACKERS ONLY FROM BEEF STANDPOINT.

[Hamilton Brown Shoe Company, St. Louis, Mo.]

The writer of this is largely interested both in the manufacture of shoes in Missouri and in the growing of cattle for beef purposes in Texas. The cattle company of which I am president sells annually from sixty to seventy-five thousand dollars' worth of beeves, and has done so for years. I therefore speak not in any theoretical manner, but by the letter. I know from actual experience that the animals that my cattle company breed and sell to the packers are valued from the beef standpoint entirely, and that the hide is merely a by-product along with the horns, the bones, the hair, and the hoofs. The writer, as a manufacturer of shoes, the largest of any one concern in the world, is therefore in a position to see the operation of this iniquitous tariff on hides from both sides of the line of division, and I say to you, in the light of the knowledge that I have acquired through actual experience, that unless the present 15 per cent duty on hides is abolished, it is but a short time until the independent tanner will be forced out of business, or into clerkships with the packing-tanning interests as they are now constituted.

Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that you are working in the interest of the West when you lend your support to the proposition to place a duty on hides. We of the West do not want this duty. It operates directly against all of the best interest of the West and South and profits absolutely no one but the packers.

THE PACKERS ONLY BENEFIT THEMSELVES.

[P. Rielly & Son, Newark, N. J.]

The packers buy cattle at 4½ to 5 cents per pound, and when the hide is taken off it is worth 15 to 16 cents per pound, without any labor or anything else done to it. This is the cause of enriching them so fast. And has placed them in control of all leather industries by allowing them such an advantage. They are now in the tanning of leather of every description, also the shoe business. They will drive us out of business unless you take off the duty on green hides, and if you do we will then be able to compete with them and the world.

The packers are no benefit to the farmer or anybody else but themselves. They buy their cattle as cheap as they can and sell their product as dear as they can.

Why should they be allowed such an advantage over us. Give us free hides and we will be equal and able to compete with the world.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE LITTLE TANNER IF TAX IS NOT REPEALED?

[Stanton Tanning Company, Richmond, Va.]

We request of you to give us all the assistance you can in having the burden on the trade of 15 per cent duty on hides repealed. In our opinion, if this duty is not repealed, we do not know what will become of the little tanners who are trying to make a livelihood, as we are now almost in the hands of the packers.

The repeal of the 15 per cent duty on hides is very important to the small tanners as well as the users of leather. We have been under the packers for the last twelve years, and if we do not get relieved it will only be a short time before the small tanners will have to be abandoned with.

THE OPPRESSION OF TANNERS BY THE TAX ON HIDES.

[John H. Hanan, Brooklyn, N. Y., president National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association.]

We have many orders on our books for top lifts and other cut stock, which we are unable to fill for the reason that we can not buy heavy hides out of which to tan the heavy leather required. Our only relief seems to be in buying foreign hides. Even this market, to a certain extent on account of the duty, is controlled by the packers. While I do not believe that the removal of the tariff from hides will materially lessen the price, I do believe it will make it more difficult for the trust to control the market, as we would have the markets of the world to compete in instead of the United States.

Before tariff was put on hides this company had a nice business started with London wholesalers. We would undersell English manufacturers and make a good profit.

After the packers got a tariff on hides it added to the cost of leather to such an extent that we could not meet the English competition, and that business was lost. Tariff on hides is a detriment and a great drawback to the shoe business of our State, also to every individual citizen of our State. We know conditions and realize it more than anyone not directly engaged in the business.

FREE HIDES TO PRODUCTS OF LEATHER WHAT SULPHATE OF AMMONIA IS TO PRODUCTS OF AGRICULTURE.

I shall vote for free hides because I regard them as exceptional in their nature and effect. They are a by-product of a food product and are under conditions that should make them free. In the general public policy for the benefit of all the people I think the farmers will partake as beneficiaries of whatever conduces toward cheaper shoes, harness, and other things made of leather. At the same time I think it will assist both the tanners and the shoe manufacturers. In short, it involves the greatest good to the greatest number.

We have put sulphate of ammonia on the free list because it is the greatest fertilizing agent for the benefit of the farmers, and for the second reason that it is a by-product of steel, coke, and gas factories. It will spread good in all directions, without depriving any man of his just rights.

I voted to put zinc on the free list because of shortage in the raw material and the heaviness of freight to this country, which are so much that in themselves they put a heavy charge

upon its introduction. It costs over $6 a ton to get it from Mexico, which is nearly a prohibitory impediment.

We need sulphate of ammonia free; we need zinc free; and we need hides free for kindred reasons which apply in variations. Each case must be judged by itself. It is pleasant to see the rifts in the sky that are not fettered and barred by tariff. There is a long free list in this bill, and there generally is a free list at the end of every tariff bill.

OUT OF THE EATER COMES FORTH MEAT.

"A thing that is a-building," says Carlyle, "is not like unto the thing that is built." The greatest building on the earth is only the scaffolding that this generation has made for something higher, nobler, and better for the generations to come.

Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke this truth:

We rail at trade, and the philosopher and lover of man have much harm to say of it; but the historian of the world will see that trade was the principle of liberty; that trade planted America and destroyed feudalism; that it makes peace and keeps peace.

When the war drum throbs no longer, though it will never be your or my privilege to hear its last beat; when the battle flags are furled, though we shall not behold them, the world will view the consummation while happily exchanging the products of one continent with another in unshackled trade.

Little by little, more and more, to-day and to-morrow, decade by decade, century by century, it is coming in the providence of Him—

Who takes a thousand years to lay his hand on.

Out of the eater comes forth meat; out of darkness light; out of chaos order; and out of war peace.

Out of the congested tariff conditions of the nations, building battle ships and knotting themselves together behind high-protective walls, will come forth conditions that make for closer friendship and for more peaceful relations and for freer trade.

When we have shod all of our people with the best and cheapest shoes that we can aid in providing for them; when every little boy and girl can go wearing them, with the best school-books in the world and with the best teachers, to the best schools, people of their time will look back with satisfaction upon all the steps taken to prepare the way for better things.

APPENDIX.

[Extracts from report of Robert J. Walker, Secretary of the Treasury in the Presidency of James K. Polk.]

Hon. Robert J. Walker, Pennsylvanian by birth, Mississippian by adoption, was Secretary of the Treasury in the Democratic administration of President Polk. He used the following words which, as a part of his report, was laid before the House of Representatives on December 3, 1845 (see S. Doc. No. 14, 61st Cong., 1st sess., p. 2):

In suggesting improvements in the revenue laws the following principles have been adopted:

First. That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Third. That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties, or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from all duty.

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

Fifth. That all minimums and all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

Sixth. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

No horizontal scale of duties is recommended, because such a scale would be a refusal to discriminate for revenue and might sink that revenue below the wants of the Government. Some articles will yield the largest revenue at duties that would be wholly or partially prohibitory in other cases. Luxuries, as a general rule, will bear the highest revenue duties; but even some very costly luxuries, easily smuggled, will bear but a light duty for revenue, whilst other articles, of great bulk and weight, will bear a higher duty for revenue. There is no instance within the knowledge of this department of any horizontal tariff ever having been enacted by any one of the nations of the world. There must be discrimination for revenue or the burden of taxation must be augmented in order to bring the same amount of money into the Treasury. It is difficult, also, to adopt any arbitrary maximum to which an inflexible adherence must be demanded in all cases. Thus, upon brandy and spirits, a specific duty, varying as an equivalent ad valorem from 180 to 261 per cent, yields a large revenue; yet no one would propose either of these rates as a maximum. These duties are too high for revenue, from the encouragement they present for smuggling these baneful luxuries; yet a duty of 20 per cent upon brandy and spirits would be far below the revenue standard, would greatly diminish the income on these imports, require increased burdens upon the necessaries of life, and would revolt the moral sense of the whole community. There are many other luxuries which will bear a much higher duty for revenue than 20 per cent, and the only true maximum is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty. Nor should maximum revenue duties be imposed upon all articles, for this would yield too large an income and would prevent all discrimination within the revenue standard and require necessaries to be taxed as high as luxuries. But, whilst it is impossible to adopt any horizontal scale of duties, or even any arbitrary maximum, experience proves that, as a general rule, a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem will yield the largest revenue. There are, however, a few exceptions above as well as many below this standard. Thus, whilst the lowest revenue duty on most luxuries exceeds 20 per cent, there are many costly articles of small bulk, easily smuggled, which would bring, perhaps, no revenue at a duty as high as 20 per cent; and even at the present rate of 7½ per cent they yield, in most cases, a small revenue; whilst coal, iron, sugar, and molasses—articles of great bulk and weight—yielded last year six millions of revenue, at an average rate of duty exceeding 60 per cent ad valorem. These duties are far too high for revenue upon all these articles and ought to be reduced to the revenue standard; but if Congress desire to obtain the largest revenue from duties on these articles, those duties, at the lowest rate for revenue, would exceed 20 per cent ad valorem.

* * * * * * *

DUTIES ON LUXURIES.

In arranging the details of the tariff, it is believed that the maximum revenue duties should be imposed upon luxuries. It is deemed just that taxation, whether direct or indirect, should be as nearly as practicable in proportion to property. If the whole revenue were raised by a tax upon property, the poor, and especially those who live by the wages of labor, would pay but a very small portion of such tax; whereas by the tariff, the poor, by the consumption of various imports or domestic articles enhanced in price by the duties, pay a much larger share of the taxes than if they were collected by an assessment in proportion to property. To counteract as far as possible this effect of the tariff—to equalize its operation and make it approximate as nearly as may be to a system of taxes in proportion to property—the duties upon luxuries, used almost exclusively by the rich, should be fixed at the highest revenue standard. This would not be discriminating in favor of the poor, however just that might be within the revenue limit; but it would mitigate, as far as practicable, that discrimination against the poor which results from every tariff by compelling them to pay a larger amount of taxes than if assessed and collected on all property in proportion to its value. In accordance with these principles, it is believed that the largest practicable portion of the aggregate revenue should be raised by maximum revenue duties upon luxuries, whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad.

An appeal has been made to the poor by the friends of protection on the ground that it augments the wages of labor. In reply it is contended that the wages of labor have not augmented since the tariff of 1842, and that in some cases they have diminished.

When the number of manufactories is not great, the power of the system to regulate the wages of labor is inconsiderable; but as the profit of capital invested in manufactures is augmented by the protective tariff there is a corresponding increase of power until the control of such capital over the wages of labor becomes irresistible. As this power is exercised from time to time, we find it resisted by combinations among the working classes, by turning out for higher wages or for shorter time, by trades unions, and in some countries, unfortunately, by violence and bloodshed. But the Government, by protective duties, arrays itself on the side of the manufacturing system, and by thus augmenting its wealth and power soon terminates in its favor the struggle between man and money—between capital and labor. When the tariff of 1842 was enacted the maximum duty was 20 per cent. By that act the average of duties on the protected articles was more than double. But the wages of labor did not increase in a corresponding ratio or in any ratio whatever. On the contrary, whilst wages in some cases have diminished, the prices of many articles used by the working classes have greatly appreciated.

A protective tariff is a question regarding the enhancement of the profits of capital. That is its object, and not to augment the wages of labor, which would reduce those profits. It is a question of percentage and is to decide whether money vested in our manufactures shall, by special legislation, yield a profit of 10, 20, or 30 per cent, or whether it shall remain satisfied with a dividend equal to that accruing from the same capital invested in agriculture, commerce, or navigation.

TARIFFS FOR REVENUE TO BE COLLECTED—PROHIBITIVE TARIFFS TO RAISE DOMESTIC PRICES AND PROVIDE NO REVENUE.

The whole power to collect taxes, whether direct or indirect, is conferred by the same clause of the Constitution. The words are, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." A direct tax, or excise, not for revenue, but for protection, clearly would not be within the legitimate object of taxation, and yet it would be as much so as a duty imposed for a similar purpose. The power is "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises." A duty must be laid only that it may be collected, and if it is so imposed that it can not be collected, in whole or in part, it violates the declared object of the granted power. To lay all duties so high that none of them could be collected would be a prohibitory tariff. To lay a duty on any one article so high that it could not be collected would be a prohibitory tariff upon that article. If a duty of 100 per cent were imposed upon all or upon a number of articles, so as to diminish the revenue upon all or any of them, it would operate as a partial prohibition. A partial and a total prohibition are alike in violation of the true object of the taxing power. They only differ in degree and not in principle. If the revenue limit may be exceeded 1 per cent, it may be exceeded 100; if it may be exceeded upon any one article, it may be exceeded on all; and there is no escape from this conclusion but in contending that Congress may lay duties on all articles so high as to collect no revenue and operate as a total prohibition.

The Constitution declares that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." A tariff bill, it is conceded, can only originate in the House, because it is a bill for raising revenue. That is the only proper object of such a bill. A tariff is a bill to "lay and collect taxes." It is a bill for "raising revenue," and whenever it departs from that object, in whole or in part, either by total or partial prohibition, it violates the purpose of the granted power.

TAXES TRANSFERRED TO THE PROTECTED CLASSES.

At least two-thirds of the taxes imposed by the present tariff are paid, not into the Treasury, but to the protected classes. The revenue from imports last year exceeded $27,000,000. This, in itself, is a heavy tax; but the whole tax imposed upon the people by the present tariff is not less than $81,000,000, of which $27,000,000 are paid to the Government upon the imports and $54,000,000 to the protected classes in enhanced prices of similar domestic articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 7 o'clock having arrived, the Senate stands adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 22, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June 21, 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 Thursday, June 17, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 18, 1909.*

SIR: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the governor of Illinois my resignation as a Representative in Congress of the United States from the sixth district of Illinois.

WILLIAM LORIMER.

Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the communication will lie on the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Platt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. R. 33. Joint resolution relating to the provisions of section 10 of the sundry civil act of March 4, 1909.

UNEXPENDED BALANCE, RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 33 and that it be put upon its passage.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let us have it read first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the following Senate joint resolution and pass the same. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate joint resolution 33.

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of section 10 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1909, shall not be construed as applying to the unexpended balance of any river and harbor appropriation the use of which may be essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, for the further maintenance or prosecution of the work to which it pertains as heretofore authorized by Congress.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from New York if he will not allow this to go over until Thursday next. The Secretary of the Treasury has made a report to the House, in response to the resolution passed a couple of weeks ago as to the number of these appropriations and the aggregate amount of them, reporting about $191,000 as "not needed" for the purposes for which the money was appropriated. I think, therefore, the resolution ought to be amended so as to not give the Secretary of War the wide discretionary power he would have under this resolution as it comes to us from the Senate. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York to allow it to go over until the next meeting of the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman will not press that request. Let me explain the matter in a few words.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a request for unanimous consent, and I reserve the right to object.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Well, let me explain.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from New York permit a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. None of these appropriations will be turned into the Treasury prior to June 30?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. No.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think we will have ample time to give the matter that consideration which the House ought to give to it if the gentleman will allow it to go over until the next meeting of the House; and we can then adopt it with an amendment, if the House sees fit to amend it, or, if not, adopt it as it came to the House from the Senate.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. I trust the gentleman will not insist upon that.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is in possession of information from the Treasury Department that shows the necessity for an amendment to the Senate resolution. It appears from the report of the Secretary of War now before me that the appropriations heretofore made for river and harbor improvements that are not now needed amount to over $191,000. Why should they not be turned back into the Treasury? It is because of that fact that I ask the gentleman to allow this to go over until Thursday next, until we can take time to consider the information which the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the House, and which as yet no Member of the House has had an opportunity to examine or consider.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We are not willing to give unlimited power to the Secretary of War—to have no limit placed at all upon his discretion. We have had no time to look into this, and I can not consent to it.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will strike that out and allow us to amend it now I would be satisfied. Why not?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Oh, no; I do not agree to the amendment. We want to pass it now when we have a quorum. There is no reason for delay, and if the gentleman will be patient for a moment I think he will be satisfied.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is far more important to take care of the funds of the United States than to act now simply because we happen to have a quorum.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. We are not squandering the funds of the United States.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes; they have been doing it with a vengeance.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will let his resolution go over. This resolution makes absolutely indefinite the effect of the law. It provides that the law shall not be construed to affect appropriations except in the discretion of some official. Now, the Secretary of the Treasury has transmitted to the House a report, pointing out the appropriations which it is desired shall be eliminated from the effect of section 10 of the sundry civil act, approved March 4, 1909.

It seems to me that all that the War Department can reasonably expect is to have enumerated the items that it wishes to have exempted from the operation of that act. I am unwilling to have a provision passed by unanimous consent that provides that a certain provision of law "shall not be construed as applying to the unexpended balances of any river and harbor appropriations the use of which may be essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, for the further maintenance or prosecution of the work." If laws should have anything, they should have certainty. It would be utterly impossible for anybody by the utmost care and scrutiny to be able to tell whether in the discretion or opinion of the Secretary of War a certain appropriation would be either essential or nonessential.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. If the gentleman will wait until I have had an opportunity to explain the resolution, I think I can satisfy him that no one wants to expend an unexpended balance contrary to the wishes of either the Treasury or War departments. This matter was carefully gone over as early as the 3d of May last. The chairman of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations understood what appropriations were needed. Now, if——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman——

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to be interrupted until I have finished my statement. I shall then be glad to hear from my colleague from New York. By an arrangement entirely agreeable to the chairmen of these two Committees on Appropriations the matter contained in this resolution was deferred until the tariff bill might be disposed of. But unless action be taken before the 30th day of June we must reappropriate these amounts. It is true this resolution includes unexpended balances which will not be used, but the Secretary of War understands what ones are necessary.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman has that detailed information, why not make the law you are now attempting to pass specific, and not leave it in the loose way in which it is? There is no reason why that should not be done.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Because this resolution was drawn in May, agreed to by the War Department and by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, the gentleman is going too far. The Committee on Appropriations of the House does not exist, and those of us who used to be members have never been consulted except as to the general purpose. Now, all of us want to do what the gentleman desires to have done, but we do not believe it is good legislation to pass a loose general statement that an existing law shall not apply to such provisions relating to rivers and harbors as in the judgment of the Secretary of War they should not apply to.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. But the gentleman will recognize the importance of the resolution becoming law before

the 30th of June. Next Thursday we may be without a quorum and then it is likely to go over until the 1st of July. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman says this matter was carefully gone into. I call his attention to this fact, that on the 10th day of May a report was made, apparently by the War Department, to the Senate, and it gives the aggregate items affected as $1,154,662.74.

On the 15th of June the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to this House, in response to a resolution offered by myself, certain information, and said that the aggregate of the items affected amounts to $836,664.09, a difference of $317,998.65, or about 30 per cent difference, inside of a month. It does not appear to me that such great care could have been given to the preparation of that other report as the gentleman would have the House believe.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Let me suggest to the gentleman from New York that the statement made by the Secretary of War includes all of the unexpended balances which do amount to $800,000, or thereabouts, but the only balances with which we are concerned, and which will be touched under this resolution, amount to about, as I recall it, $650,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is mistaken. It is $645,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. And that amount is made up of balances which are needed to carry on work under improvement at this time, and which, unless this resolution passes, must stop.

Now, I appreciate the reason why the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] do not desire this resolution passed in its present form, and I have no fault to find with the general principle, as enunciated in section 10 of the last sundry civil bill; but here is a case that ought to appeal to Members of the House, because it affects appropriations which, if turned into the Treasury under section 10, will result in the stoppage of work in Kentucky, in Texas, in Minnesota, and many other States represented on the floor at this time. I think New York is not affected.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is one item in my district, if this report be accurate.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Very likely an item there. Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended, that Senate joint resolution No. 33 be taken from the Speaker's table, and that the same be passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] is to suspend the rules, take the Senate joint resolution which has just been reported from the Speaker's table, and pass the same. Is a second demanded?

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

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] is entitled to twenty minutes and his colleague from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to twenty minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to say more. I think the gentlemen of the House understand that we are not hostile to the principle of the sundry civil bill, but are simply trying to avoid what the framers of that bill did not intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Before the gentleman yields, I would like the privilege of asking him one question.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, this joint resolution, as I understand it, modifies section 10 of the last sundry civil appropriation bill, and that, I believe, is a provision which applies generally to all the appropriations, so that this resolution if passed will change for all time, so far as these appropriations are concerned, that rule which has been adopted after due deliberation by the House.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. It simply withdraws river and harbor balances from the action of section 10 of the sundry civil bill. That is all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But that, as suggested to me, would be a change of existing law.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Well, of course it is a change of existing law so far as these specific appropriations are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there is no provision here that this exemption, which will put these unexpended balances wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of War, shall not apply for all time to river and harbor appropriations.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Well, we can very easily remedy that in the next bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] six minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. Before the gentleman from Louisiana begins, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Well.

Mr. BURLESON. You say you have a report from the Secretary of War giving the concrete cases affected by that provision in the sundry civil act sought to be modified by the pending resolution. If so, why not amend this resolution so as to apply in terms to those particular cases, and then there will be no question about what the law means, no uncertainty about any unexpended appropriation affected by the law? If this action could be taken, there will then be no objection to the resolution, and you would accomplish everything that you have in mind to accomplish.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Well, the gentleman knows the difficulty of sending the resolution back to the Senate under present conditions.

Mr. BURLESON. I can see no difficulty. The gentleman knows the Senate can do anything it wants to do, and always finds time for action.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. No harm can come under this resolution, and much harm may come from the very courteous suggestion of my friend from Texas. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like the attention of the House. I do not believe the House clearly understands this resolution. Under the terms of section 10 of the sundry civil act of this year all appropriations made prior to July 1, 1904, which had not been expended, or for which contracts had not been made prior to the approval of that sundry civil act, shall revert to the Treasury. Now, a number of appropriations for rivers and harbors which were made prior to July 1, 1904, for one cause or another, had not been expended on March 1, nor had contracts been made for those works. One of these is the Ouachita River, in Arkansas and Louisiana, for which $177,146.27 was appropriated that had not been contracted for nor expended on the 1st of March last. Why? The Engineer Department had contracted for that work about four years ago with one of the most reliable firms in the city of Chicago. The forces of nature intervened. Three seasons of high water in the river prevented that work.

The contracting firm was unable to accomplish anything, lost very heavily, and the contract, by mutual consent, was annulled about a year ago. So no contract existed as to that $177,146.27 on the 1st of March last, and that is a work of the utmost importance, which should go on. Unless this resolution is adopted, that work must stop, and so must various other works in different parts of the country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON rose.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. If the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is touching that very thing that I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Very well.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How do you know that the Secretary of War will conclude that the use of that sum is essential for that work?

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I know that because of the report that the Secretary of War has made to the Senate, and which is attached to Report No. 4 of the Senate Committee on Commerce, to accompany Senate joint resolution No. 33.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let these specific items be attached to this resolution, so that we will know what we are doing.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I do not know that that is necessary, gentlemen; and, as a matter of fact, the Senate has not done it. Now, what harm can come from passing this resolution just as it came from the Senate? No money is being appropriated now. The money has been in the Treasury for years to the credit of a number of river and harbor projects all over the United States; and because that money had not been expended, you provided in section 10 of the sundry civil act that it go back to the general fund of the Treasury. That is all

right, as a general principle; but there are a few cases where the money could not be expended, and I say that we ought to extend the time, and leave the matter to the discretion of the Secretary of War, who is certainly the proper person to exercise that discretion. There are some of these funds that have been accredited to various projects for many years, and they ought to go back into the Treasury. There are a few cases where the Secretary of War will put them back; but why jeopardize a number of great projects? Why jeopardize the provision for $122,800 for the harbor of Boston? Why jeopardize the $35,368 for Pass Cavallo, Texas? Why jeopardize the $24,257 for the Columbia River, and $69,070 for Calumet Harbor, and $114,064 for the Sacramento and Feather rivers, and many others, especially the great Ouachita River, which has, as stated above, $177,146.27 involved in this controversy?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why not put them all in here?

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. The Senate might have done it, but has not, and it was a very difficult matter to get this resolution through the Senate. They tried to get it up at one time, but it was objected to. It was only by calling it up last Saturday in the absence of certain Senators who, had they been present, would have objected to it, that it was gotten through. They do not wish anything to be considered at this time until the tariff in disposed of. If this matter goes over until after July 1, we will have to make specific appropriations, and there is no rhyme nor reason for insisting on anything of that kind.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then the gentleman acknowledges that the Senate has picked out certain items in the sundry civil bill and sent this resolution over here, intending to close our mouths or put a gag on us and make us adopt these selections or none at all?

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Oh, not at all; this only applies to certain river and harbor appropriations. We need not cross any bridge until we get to it. We have not come to the other matters, and when we do come to them we will act upon them. This proposition is before us in concrete form, and I appeal to all of you to stand by us in this matter and pass the resolution called up by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, nobody desires to prevent the money appropriated for river and harbor improvements and actually needed being made available. In the last session of Congress a provision was placed in the sundry civil appropriation bill designed to effect a good purpose. It was found that funds appropriated for purposes ten years and more ago were being expended for purposes never contemplated by Congress. So this provision was put in the sundry civil act to cover into the Treasury the surplus funds of all moneys which had not been expended or obligated under contract by July 1, 1909.

On the 10th day of May the Secretary of War transmitted to the Senate a statement in which it is set forth that items aggregating $1,154,662 for river and harbor improvements might be affected by the provisions in the sundry civil act.

I introduced a resolution on the 7th of June, calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to point out the appropriations, the date when made, and purposes for which made for river and harbor improvements which might be affected by section 10 of the sundry civil act. On the 15th of June that information came to the House. It shows that $191,000 for various river and harbor improvements are no longer needed by the department; that $645,000 might be affected by this provision and is needed by the War Department in order to carry on certain river and harbor improvements or to maintain the projects.

The pending resolution has been pending in the Senate some time, and, according to the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana, was passed there under circumstances that would not commend themselves to me. It seemed to me, as the resolution was passed Saturday, that it would be desirable so long as the Secretary of War has specifically enumerated the items which it is desired to save from the operation of section 10 of the sundry civil act, to enumerate these items and to give exactly what is required. The fact that the Secretary of War prepares a resolution or prefers a resolution in some particular form does not appeal with any particular force to me.

Section 10 of the sundry civil act was designed to prevent the use of apropriations that had lapsed for some purpose not contemplated when made. The most vicious illustration that can be cited was the emergency appropriation of $3,000,000 made in 1898 for the purposes of the Spanish war, which was used last year to pay the detectives engaged in the Brownsville matter. Not only that, but the appropriation was utilized for the payment of certain services in connection with the occupation of Cuba.

If these moneys enumerated by the Secretary of the Treasury on page 2 of House Document No. 59, first session, Sixty-first Congress, are not needed, they should be converted into the surplus funds. The ones that are needed should be willingly appropriated and given to the department for its use. I desire to call the attention of the House to the phraseology of the resolution that we are asked seriously to consider and pass—

That the provisions of section 10 * * * shall not be construed as applying to the unexpended balance of any river and harbor appropriation the use of which may be essential, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, for the further maintenance or prosecution of the work to which it pertains and heretofore authorized by Congress.

I would much prefer, Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly frank, to provide that section 10 of the sundry civil act should not apply to any appropriation heretofore made for river and harbor purposes than, under this language, go through the pretense of converting into the Treasury appropriations not needed, while placing the entire matter in the discretion of the Secretary of War. I objected to the consideration of the resolution because I had hoped that the gentleman would at least afford sufficient time to-day for the preparation of an amendment which would enumerate the appropriations that the department says it needs, so that it might be offered as an amendment and perhaps accepted by the gentleman.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman from New York yield for me to make an inquiry?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to inquire whether or not, by unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman in charge of the resolution consenting, the resolution could be amended?

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent the motion of the gentleman from New York could be modified.

Mr. TAWNEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify the motion of the gentleman from New York to include the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out of the joint resolution all after the word "appropriation," in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Mentioned and referred to, on page 3 of Public Document No. 59, Sixty-first Congress, first session, amounting in the aggregate to $645,104.32, as follows:

Appropriation.	Act.	Balance.
Union River, Me	June 6,1900	$2,398.64
Lubec Channel, Me	June 13,1902	11,567.02
Penobscot River, Me	July 13,1892	8,500.00
Cape Porpoise Harbor, Me	June 6,1900	7,498.85
Rockland Harbor, Me	July 1,1898	5,474.21
Saco River, Me	June 3,1896	5,241.63
Boston Harbor, Mass.:		
27-foot channel	June 28,1902	33,000.00
30-foot channel	Mar. 3,1901	69,800.00
Charles River	Sept.19,1890	20,000.00
Harbors at Plymouth and Provincetown, Mass. (Plymouth Harbor)	June 3,1896 Mar. 3,1899	8,270.94
Wallabout Channel, N. Y	do	19,326.37
Cooper Creek, N. J	June 3,1896	3,454.98
Raccoon River, N. J	Aug. 2,1882	2,192.27
Appomattox River, Va	Mar. 3,1903	13,800.12
Mississippi River from mouth of Ohio River to Minneapolis, Minn.:		
Harbor of refuge below Davenport, Iowa	June 13,1902	1,931.95
Harbor at Muscatine, Iowa	do	1,851.40
Minnesota River, Minn. (survey of Big Stone Lake and Lake Traverse)	Mar. 3,1899	948.42
Great Kanawha River, W. Va	June 4,1897	43,310.40
Harbor at Dunkirk, N. Y	June 13,1902	2,203.16
Tonawanda Harbor and Niagara River, N. Y	do	30,149.86
Port Washington Harbor, Wis	do	2,066.96
Mississippi River from mouth of Ohio River to Minneapolis, Minn. (locks and dams)	Mar. 3,1903	6,645.97
Ouachita River, Ark. and La. (Locks and Dams 4 and 6)	do	167,881.21
Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, and Big Sunflower rivers and Tchula Lake, Miss. (Yazoo River at mouth)	Mar. 3,1901	4,704.91
Red River, La. and Ark. (at Shreveport, La.)	June 13,1902	2,308.96
Calumet Harbor, Ill	Mar. 3,1903	68,804.89
Calumet River, Ill. and Ind. (above the Forks)	Aug. 18,1894	5,050.75
Monongahela River, W. Va.:		
Locks 10-15, construction	Apr. 28,1904	65,974.17
Locks 3, 6, etc	June 6,1900	3,803.93
Monongahela River, Pa. (Lock No. 2)	Mar. 3,1903	3,770.42
Ohio River below Pittsburg, Pa. (Dam No. 7)	June 13,1902	4,737.20
Harbor at Tacoma, Wash	Mar. 3,1903	11,380.82
Harbor at Olympia, Wash	June 13,1902	7,053.91
Total		645,104.32

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York can modify his own motion if he desires to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The motion to suspend the rules having been seconded, it is beyond the power of the gentleman from New York to do that except by unanimous consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. If the House could vote down this motion, would it not then be in order to offer a motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution with the modification proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY]?

The SPEAKER. Well, this is suspension day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That could be accomplished in that way. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the objection to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is that it returns the resolution to the Senate, and there is danger that it will be delayed until after the 30th of June. The War Department does not intend using more than the $640,000 covered by the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, and for that reason I think the members of the former Committee on Appropriations can afford to allow the resolution to go through as it came from the Senate. The Secretary of War has not in mind to do anything other than the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] will allow him to do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then why did not the gentleman accept it at the start?

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. Because I wish the resolution passed as it came to us from the Senate. We had nothing to say about its form, but we desire it to pass the House now and not make further delay by sending it back to the Senate.

Mr. BURLESON. The Senate passed it unanimously.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. I hope we may pass the resolution as it is, and I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted——

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 152, noes 28.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point that no quorum has voted. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 26, answered "present" 13, not voting 184, as follows:

YEAS—164.

Adamson	Dwight	Keliher	Poindexter
Aiken	Ellis	Kendall	Pray
Alexander, Mo.	Elvins	Kennedy, Iowa	Randell, Tex.
Alexander, N. Y.	Englebright	Kennedy, Ohio	Ransdell, La.
Austin	Esch	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rauch
Barnard	Ferris	Knapp	Reeder
Bartholdt	Fish	Knowland	Richardson
Bartlett, Ga.	Floyd, Ark.	Kronmiller	Rucker, Colo.
Beall, Tex.	Focht	Langley	Russell
Boehne	Gaines	Latta	Scott
Borland	Gardner, Mass.	Lee	Sherwood
Bowers	Garner, Tex.	Lenroot	Small
Broussard	Garrett	Lever	Smith, Cal.
Burgess	Gill, Md.	Lloyd	Smith, Mich.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gillespie	Lovering	Sperry
Burnett	Gillett	McDermott	Stanley
Butler	Grant	McGuire, Okla.	Sterling
Byrd	Gregg	McKinlay, Cal.	Sulloway
Byrns	Guernsey	McKinney	Swasey
Calderhead	Hamilton	Macon	Talbott
Campbell	Hamlin	Madison	Taylor, Ala.
Candler	Haugen	Maguire, Nebr.	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Hayes	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Ohio
Cassidy	Heald	Martin, S. Dak.	Tener
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Conn.	Mays	Thistlewood
Clayton	Henry, Tex.	Miller, Minn.	Thomas, Ky.
Cline	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Thomas, N. C.
Cole	Hill	Morehead	Thomas, Ohio
Collier	Hobson	Morgan, Mo.	Tilson
Cooper, Wis.	Howard	Morgan, Okla.	Townsend
Cowles	Howell, N. J.	Morrison	Volstead
Cox, Ind.	Howell, Utah	Moss	Vreeland
Creager	Howland	Murdock	Wanger
Crumpacker	Huff	Murphy	Watkins
Cullop	Hull, Iowa	Needham	Webb
Dalzell	Hull, Tenn.	Nicholls	Wheeler
Dickson, Miss.	Humphrey, Wash.	Nye	Wickliffe
Diekema	Humphreys, Miss.	Oldfield	Wiley
Dixon, Ind.	James	Page	Wilson, Ill.
Dodds	Jamieson	Patterson	Wood, N. J.
Driscoll, M. E.	Jones	Payne	Young, Mich.

NAYS—26.

Ashbrook	Graff	Lindbergh	Sisson
Brownlow	Gronna	Livingston	Steenerson
Burleson	Hamer	Palmer, A. M.	Tawney
Davis	Hardy	Plumley	Tou Velle
De Armond	Hitchcock	Rucker, Mo.	Woods, Iowa
Dies	Hubbard, Iowa	Sherley	
Fitzgerald	Keifer	Sims	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Booher	Foster, Ill.	Hay	Stephens, Tex.
Chapman	Foster, Vt.	Johnson, S. C.	
Douglas	Hanna	Loud	
Flood, Va.	Hawley	Slayden	

NOT VOTING—184.

Adair	Edwards, Ga.	Joyce	Perkins
Allen	Edwards, Ky.	Kahn	Peters
Ames	Ellerbe	Kinkead, N. J.	Pickett
Anderson	Estopinal	Kitchin	Pou
Andrus	Fairchild	Kopp	Pratt
Ansberry	Fassett	Korbly	Prince
Anthony	Finley	Küstermann	Pujo
Barchfeld	Foelker	Lafean	Rainey
Barclay	Fordney	Lamb	Reid
Barnhart	Fornes	Langham	Reynolds
Bartlett, Nev.	Foss	Lassiter	Rhinock
Bates	Foulkrod	Law	Riordan
Bell, Ga.	Fowler	Lawrence	Roberts
Bennet, N. Y.	Fuller	Lindsay	Robinson
Bennett, Ky.	Gallagher	Longworth	Rodenberg
Bingham	Gardner, Mich.	Loudenslager	Rothermel
Boutell	Gardner, N. J.	Lowden	Sabath
Bradley	Garner, Pa.	Lundin	Saunders
Brantley	Gill, Mo.	McCall	Shackleford
Burke, Pa.	Gilmore	McCreary	Sharp
Burleigh	Glass	McHenry	Sheffield
Calder	Godwin	McKinley, Ill.	Sheppard
Cantrill	Goebel	McLachlan, Cal.	Simmons
Capron	Goldfogle	McLaughlin, Mich.	Slemp
Carlin	Good	McMorran	Smith, Iowa
Cary	Gordon	Madden	Smith, Tex.
Clark, Fla.	Goulden	Malby	Snapp
Cocks, N. Y.	Graham, Ill.	Mann	Southwick
Conry	Graham, Pa.	Maynard	Sparkman
Cook	Greene	Miller, Kans.	Spight
Cooper, Pa.	Griest	Millington	Stafford
Coudrey	Griggs	Mondell	Stevens, Minn.
Covington	Hamill	Moon, Pa.	Sturgiss
Cox, Ohio	Hammond	Moon, Tenn.	Sulzer
Craig	Hardwick	Moore, Tex.	Tirrell
Cravens	Harrison	Morse	Underwood
Crow	Heflin	Mudd	Wallace
Currier	Helm	Nelson	Washburn
Cushman	Hinshaw	Norris	Weeks
Davidson	Hollingsworth	O'Connell	Weisse
Dawson	Houston	Olcott	Willett
Denby	Hubbard, W. Va.	Olmsted	Wilson, Pa.
Dent	Hughes, Ga.	Padgett	Woodyard
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Palmer, H. W.	Young, N. Y.
Draper	Hughes, W. Va.	Parker	
Driscoll, D. A.	Johnson, Ky.	Parsons	
Durey	Johnson, Ohio	Pearre	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until tariff bill passes Senate:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Until further notice:

Mr. CARY with Mr. COVINGTON.

Mr. COCKS of New York with Mr. COX of Indiana.

Mr. CROW with Mr. DENVER.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. ESTOPINAL.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. DENBY with Mr. FLOOD of Virginia.

Mr. EDWARDS of Kentucky with Mr. GILMORE.

Mr. COOK with Mr. CRAIG.

Mr. FASSETT with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. GODWIN.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GOOD with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. HARRISON.

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia with Mr. HAY.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. HEFLIN.

Mr. JOYCE with Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey.

Mr. KÜSTERMANN with Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey.

Mr. MCCREARY with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan with Mr. MOON of Tennessee.

Mr. MADDEN with Mr. MOORE of Texas.

Mr. MANN with Mr. REID.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. SLEMP with Mr. SHARP.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. NORRIS with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. PRINCE with Mr. ROTHERMEL.

Mr. BENNET of New York with Mr. ADAIR.
Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky with Mr. BRANTLEY.
Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. CARLIN.
Mr. FOULKROD with Mr. WILLETT.
Mr. PEARRE with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.
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. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL.
Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN.
Mr. NELSON with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. CAPRON with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.
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. CALDER with Mr. KORBLY.
Mr. FULLER with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.
Mr. CHAPMAN with Mr. ROBINSON.
Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. ANDERSON.
Mr. TIRRELL with Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. KOPP with Mr. HELM.
Mr. DAWSON with Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia.
Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SMITH of Texas.
Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. MCHENRY.
Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. LINDSAY.
Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. O'CONNELL.
Mr. OLCOTT with Mr. RHINOCK.
Mr. LAW with Mr. LASSITER.
Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. LAMB.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. RAINEY.
Mr. DUREY with Mr. DENT.
Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. HOUSTON.
Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania with Mr. CANTRILL.
Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. FORNES.
Mr. BATES with Mr. BELL of Georgia.
Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. SHEPPARD.
Mr. PICKETT with Mr. SLAYDEN.
Mr. STURGISS with Mr. SULZER.
Mr. AMES with Mr. ANSBERRY.
Mr. BARCHFELD with Mr. BARNHART.
Mr. GREENE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. YOUNG of New York with Mr. WEISSE.
Mr. PERKINS with Mr. HUGHES of Georgia.
For the session:
Mr. MCMORRAN with Mr. PUJO.
Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.
Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds having voted therefor, the joint resolution is passed. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

FIRE AT CHELSEA, MASS.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the following joint resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) amending an act concerning the recent fire in Chelsea, Mass.

Resolved, etc., That the time within which certain accident, emergency, and maternity cases may be received and treated in the marine hospital at Chelsea, Mass., fixed by the act approved May 23, 1908, is hereby extended until October 1, 1909.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I think in one minute I can explain this to the House so that there will be no objection. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS], in whose district Chelsea is situated, would have made the request except for the fact that he was called away on account of his family yesterday.

A year ago the city of Chelsea was practically wiped out by fire. The hospitals were all destroyed, and Congress allowed for one year the use of the marine hospital, the United States institution there, for accident, emergency, and maternity cases. That year has expired. There was also appropriated then the sum of $3,600 for any extra expenses which might be involved. Of that $3,600 only $800 has been used, and now the new hospital, which it was hoped would be completed by this time, it is found will not be completed until the 1st of October. This resolution simply permits the continuance of the use of the United States hospital for those emergency cases at Chelsea until the 1st of October, when their own hospital will be completed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1033 and the consideration of a motion to insist on the disagreement to Senate amendments to the census bill and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman's request is for unanimous consent.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand this matter to be privileged. On the 19th day of April——

The SPEAKER. One moment. The gentleman from Indiana, as the Chair understands, moves to further insist on the disagreement by the House to the Senate amendments and assent to the request for a conference?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, that motion was made in April. This bill passed both Houses and went to conference. The conferees agreed and reported on the 19th of April last. The managers on the part of the House made the report on the 19th of last April. The Senate refused to concur in the conference report and asked for a further conference. Later I moved that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] moved that the House recede from, I think, amendment No. 17——

Mr. SIMS. No. 15.

Mr. CRUMPACKER (continuing). And agree to the same, and the question of order was made that no quorum was present. It was ascertained that no quorum was present, and the matter stands just in that way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana calls up the report——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The motion to further insist.

The SPEAKER. The House agreed to the report, and the Senate disagreed?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The House did not agree.

The SPEAKER. The House never acted?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The House never acted.

The SPEAKER. Now, then, the gentleman calls up the bill, and there is a motion pending, as the Chair understands it——

Mr. SIMS. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There are two motions pending.

The SPEAKER. Made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], that the House recede and concur in the amendments indicated.

Mr. SIMS. Amendment No. 15.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report amendment No. 15.

The Clerk read as follows:

(15) *Provided*, That hereafter all examinations of applicants for positions in the government service, from any State or Territory, shall be had in the State or Territory in which such applicant resides, and no person shall be eligible for such examination or appointment unless he or she shall have been actually domiciled in such State or Territory for at least one year previous to such examination.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands it, that motion was pending and being voted upon.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think it was being voted upon.

Mr. HAY. But to be voted on.

Mr. SIMS. The motion was made and not discussed, and I think a motion to adjourn was made.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that the motion was not really made.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is correct. The motion is pending. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized. Does the gentleman yield the floor to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he intends to insist on his motion without modification.

Mr. SIMS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a little time to state why I made this motion. I did not discuss the motion at the time it was made.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, the gentleman from Virginia wants to make a motion modifying that.

Mr. HAY. If the gentleman from Tennessee will permit me,

Mr. SIMS. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to explain the object of my motion, and during that time I will state what I have to say about any amendment to it.

Mr. HAY. Would it not be better to permit the amendment to be offered? I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. I would like to have it read, so that it may be acted upon by the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia to present his amendment.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, having made that motion, am I not entitled to the floor?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think I have the floor.

Mr. SIMS. Mine was a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct; and yet the gentleman from Indiana retains the floor. He can yield to the gentleman, although the gentleman makes the preferential motion.

Mr. SIMS. Having made the motion, I would be glad if the gentleman would yield me five or ten minutes to explain it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will take the floor for debate only.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia to offer the amendment he intends to offer. I do not know whether the amendment will come in as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee or as an amendment thereto. I would like to hear it read.

Mr. HAY. Well, Mr. Speaker, this amendment which I propose to offer is a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would like to have it read.

Mr. HAY. I would like to have it read——

Mr. SIMS. For information.

Mr. HAY. For information; and then I do not desire to take the gentleman from Tennessee off his feet at all, but will wait until he gets through.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman controlling the floor for debate yield to the gentleman from Virginia for debate?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia for debate, with the understanding that in the course of his remarks he will put his amendment before the House.

The SPEAKER. After all, the gentleman only controls the floor at this time for debate.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia for debate.

Mr. HAY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to debate unless I can have the amendment which I propose to offer pending. I want action on it.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman can offer an amendment, as a preferential motion is pending, the House will have to dispose of that motion, or at least a division, so far as the vote would be concerned, if the House recedes from its disagreement.

Mr. HAY. I will ask the Clerk to read the amendment that I propose to offer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have his amendment read as a part of his remarks, if he desires to do so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Concur with an amendment inserting as follows:

"Page 5, line 20, after the word "examination," *"Provided*, This provision shall not apply to technical and scientific positions in the government service nor to the employees provided for under sections 3 and 6 of this act."

Mr. HAY. Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment of the Senate provides that in all cases the appointments made in the government service hereafter the applicant for these places shall be examined and that they shall reside in the State from which they are to be appointed at least one year before the appointment is made. The places provided for in sections 3 and 6 of this act will come under that provision unless the amendment of the Senate is amended in the way which I propose. The appointments under section 3 are those of a geographer, chief statistician, appointment clerk, private secretary to the Director of the Census, two stenographers, and eight expert chiefs of division. The positions under section 6 are those to be filled by the clerical force to take the Thirteenth Census. The present Director of the Census informs me that if this provision contained in the Senate amendment is to be applied to the positions provided for in this bill, that he will be greatly handicapped in taking the census; that it will be practically impossible for him to get, through this amendment and through the provisions providing for the appointment of these clerks, clerks enough to perform the work of taking the Thirteenth Census. If that is true, then they should be excepted from the provisions of the Senate amendment. I hope, therefore, that the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his motion to recede and concur, and will unite with me in amending the amendment of the Senate so that these clerks and these positions provided for for the decennial period of three years shall be appointed under the other provisions of this bill. This Senate amendment is a general provision.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, it exempts certain scientific and technical service in the temporary force for the decennial census?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It applies to all the rest of the classified service—the permanent classified service?

Mr. HAY. It does not affect at all the general idea of the McCumber amendment. That is to apply to all places under the Government under the classified service.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that the Chair was under a misapprehension as to what the Journal shows touching the action of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] on a former day. The gentleman from Tennessee demanded a separate vote on Senate amendment 15, but made no motion. Pending that demand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WALLACE] made a point of no quorum, and as there was no quorum present the House adjourned. So that the Chair was in error when he stated that the motion was pending having formerly been made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Now a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment would tend to bring the two bodies together and would be a preferential motion. Ordinarily the motion is made that the House do recede and concur. That motion, however, is divisible, and if the House should recede from its disagreement then it could concur in the Senate amendment absolutely or with an amendment.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly used the language, whatever the Journal may show, to move to recede and concur, and stated as a matter of argument what I wanted to do. Now I move to recede and concur in amendment 15.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, and I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair that at the proper time, under the circumstances, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] ought to be recognized to make the motion.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; but I felt this way.

The SPEAKER. Of course he could not take the gentleman from Indiana from the floor in his hour.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I hoped that the gentleman from Tennessee, after he had reflected on this proposition, would agree to the modification proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY]. It would reach substantially all that is desired to accomplish. The RECORD clearly shows that the gentleman from Tennessee made the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment on the other occasion. That is clearly shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. But the Journal does not show that fact.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I know it, and we are bound by the Journal; it governs the action of the House. But I looked the matter up in the RECORD and supposed that motion was pending. Personally, I will have to resist as earnestly as I can the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, because I believe the Senate amendment is wrong. The President of the United States recommended, in a special message to the House a year ago last winter, that the civil-service rule of appointment to the temporary census force be modified in relation to the provisions for geographical apportionment. There is not a man in this country acquainted with the requirements of the temporary census that does not agree to the proposition that the rule of geographical apportionment should not apply to the temporary force.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Did not the rule of geographical apportionment apply when the census of 1900 was taken by an apportionment among all the congressional districts?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No, indeed. We did not trammel the Director of the Census in any way, shape, or form. The report of the Director of the Census to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in 1908 specifically recommends that the rule of geographical apportionment for the temporary appointments should not obtain. The present Director of the Census agrees to that proposition. The committee of experts appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor in December, 1908, to investigate and criticise and make suggestions respecting the then pending census bill, composed of Mr. Carroll D. Wright, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Wilcox, and other experienced statisticians, all agreed to that proposition, and they agree that the rule of apportionment as

administered by the Civil Service Commission then should not apply, and this provision now makes it not only applicable, but much more rigorous. This provision requires the applicant to be examined in the State or Territory from which he is to be appointed. It requires him to make proof of actual domicile in the State or Territory for at least one year before he is examined. I am not seriously objecting to such an amendment of the general civil-service law, but it ought not to be in this bill. But if the House does agree to the Senate amendment, it ought not to apply those rigid requirements to the temporary census force. The Civil Service Commission itself has recognized the impracticability of the geographical rule in temporary service, because in all temporary appointments it makes modifications of the rule. It makes selections for temporary service without regard to the question of residence.

The Senate provision has already resulted in the increase of the minimum salaries of the great force of clerks in the Census Office from $600 to $720 a year. That amendment will cost the people of the United States a quarter of a million dollars, and I am asking the House now to consider rather the welfare of the 80,000,000 people whose business this is than that of the 3,000 job hunters and holders who will be employed to do the work. Let us use a little business sense in relation to this particular service. I am not concerned now about what may be done with the general civil-service law.

Mr. CARLIN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is his purpose to abrogate the apportionment rule so far as temporary appointments are concerned?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Simply in so far as the temporary appointments in the Census Office are concerned.

Mr. CARLIN. Will that be the effect of this resolution?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That will be the effect of the proposition of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. CARLIN. I favor that, if that is the effect of it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is the effect of it. If the motion that is contemplated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] shall prevail, it will require the rule of geographical apportionment to be applied to all of these temporary appointments, to the clerks, the messengers, the charwomen, who are paid but $20 a month. Every one of them will be covered by it. Each one has to be examined in the State from which he or she appplies and must show actual domicile there for a year. That would be the effect of it.

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

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Does not the bill as agreed upon by the two Houses now provide that the apportionment rule shall be applied to all these offices which are created in section 6 of the bill—clerks, messengers, and charwomen?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. There is no question about that. The amendment that I am offering does not interfere or affect at all the provision in the bill which is already agreed upon by both Houses, and therefore, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it can not now be interfered with. The amendment I offer does not affect that at all.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I understand that.

Mr. HAY. The apportionment rule has been applied and is now the law so far as the two Houses are concerned.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My position is this, I wish to say to the gentleman from Virginia, that if the House recede and concur without amendment in Senate amendment No. 15 it increases very greatly the rigidity of the geographical apportionment rule, and applies it to all the temporary force in the Census Office.

Mr. HAY. Undoubtedly that is so, and that is the purpose of my amendment; but it does not get around the apportionment proposition. It does not interfere with that at all.

Mr. CARLIN. I understood the chairman to state that it did.

Mr. HAY. It does not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question or two to get at the straight of this business. Now, the Senate amendment as it stands, as I understand it, compels this geographical distribution as to everything.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. To the whole civil service of the Government.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] offers an amendment. How far does his amendment affect that senatorial proposition?

Mr. HAY. My amendment affects it only in so far as it will apply to the technical and scientific positions, and to the employees provided for in sections 3 and 6 of this act, who are the temporary employees to be used in the taking of the Thirteenth Census.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are the very same kind of employees who were distributed out ten years ago, are they not—$75 and $100 clerks?

Mr. HAY. That is true, but another provision of the bill provides that they shall be examined through the civil service, and that the rule of apportionment shall apply to them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, where are they going to be examined through the civil service?

Mr. HAY. Wherever the civil service chooses to examine them.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They are to be examined in the States from which they apply.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What objection is there to that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The objection I have made on the floor a number of times is that this work is temporary, emergency work, and this great force of employees are a low-paid force. The maximum salary is only $1,000 a year, and if we are bound by the civil-service rules of employment, we are bound to employ under the geographical apportionment rule, and in selecting them through the Civil Service Commission the effect will be to procrastinate, to delay, and embarrass the work and make it substantially as inefficient and worthless as the permanent service.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does that come about? They are not going to take this census for twelve months. They have surely ample time between now and the 1st of next June to examine everybody in the United States who wants to be examined.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Suppose they examine everybody who wants to be examined. There will be at one time in this great undertaking an army of 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000 people in the field gathering data, making enumerations, preparing schedules, and they may come in avalanches—millions of them. Now, nobody can foresee what emergencies may arise that may require the immediate employment of 50 or 100 or 300 additional clerks at once.

If, now, those highest on the roll should live in California and an emergency should arise requiring a large immediate increase, what are you to do? You would have to wait, under the law—there is no discretion—you have to wait until you communicate with these eligibles in distant parts of the country and give them a reasonable opportunity to come or else you have got to have a large waiting list here on the government pay roll to provide against a possible emergency of that kind, and it will cost the people of the country probably a million dollars more to conduct the census in that manner than it will if we should give the director a reasonably free hand and let him meet the emergencies as they arise as best he can.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How do you figure out it will cost $1,000,000 more or $200,000 more?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In the first place the bill demonstrates it. The Senate put this proposition in the bill. Now, the minimum salary was $600 a year. The Senate then decided that the clerks can not afford to come here from remote parts of the country at $600 a year, so the minimum fixed by the House was increased to $720 a year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senators did not know what they were talking about.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know about that; they thought they knew, and therefore they raised the minimum salary $120 a year to make the geographical rule practicable. Now, it will increase the cost of the work at least a quarter of a million dollars besides the increased cost resulting from delays. This is the result—legislation for job hunters rather than for the people.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You take an extreme case when you talk about California, but anybody can get in from California in five days, and the census business was very well done ten years ago——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was because there was no limitation at all; the law contained none; and whatever distribution of employees the Director of the Census made, he made of his own free will and accord. He had a large margin of discretion, so that when an exigency came about he was able to meet it with clerks immediately at hand. The director of that census appeared before the House Committee on the Census and said that an arbitrary geographical provision would seriously handicap the census work and greatly add to its cost.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Which provision?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This geographical apportionment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They had it ten years ago.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They did not. That is what I just said to the gentleman. There was no restriction, and the Director of the Census, in a general way, divided up about half of the appointees over the country, because he foresaw and knew that a certain force would be normally required, but he always reserved plenty of discretion to meet every emergency as it arose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Another question: Have the two Houses already agreed that all of these appointments shall be made through the civil-service examination? Is that part of the bill, anyway?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Why, no; they have not agreed on anything. The Senate refused to ratify the agreement, and it is all open. Of course, there were certain things agreed upon by both Houses.

Mr. HAY. I will ask the gentleman from Indiana if it is not a fact that so far as the apportionment rule is concerned, and so far as the examination of these employees throughout the civil service is concerned, the two Houses have not agreed upon it? The House agreed upon it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. A general provision; yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One other question.

Mr. CARLIN. If the gentleman is correct as to the general provision, is not that the law to-day? How are we going to change that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The question in controversy now is an amendment changing the law. The amendment, No. 15, changes the law as it is to-day, and it is suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] that that ought to be modified, and I think if we recede and agree to the amendment, it ought to be modified. I am not for it at all.

Mr. CARLIN. I concur with you, however, that it ought to be modified so far as this apportionment is concerned; but the gentleman from Virginia, who is the author of this resolution, says it does not affect the apportionment.

Mr. HAY. It does not.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. We disagree.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do they appoint charwomen through the civil-service examination?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They do; and messengers and everything.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Surely, they do not examine the charwomen.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; they are classified.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It seems to me that this amendment, No. 15, is not affecting the apportionment, but it is a proviso that the parties applying for the examination from the different States must have lived in the State within the last year. In other words, it is not intended to affect the apportionment, but it is intended to make it effective, as I understand it. If the gentleman will pardon me for extending the question, I would say that there has grown up in the city of Washington a habit with people who were appointed twenty-five or thirty years ago, and raising a family in the city, every time they apply to the civil service to put themselves down as residents of Iowa, Minnesota, or whatever State it may be.

This amendment provides that they must have lived in the State during the past year, and they must take the examination in the State. Why does the gentleman object to that?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I object to it because we hoped when we started out that we would enact a census law calculated to bring the best results to the people of the country; that we would have a law that would give the people the largest amount of benefit for the expenditure; and that we would regard the question of jobs as merely an incident to the service. Now, as I said a moment ago, all of the experts, the men who have carried responsibilities in relation to services of this kind, and many men who carry them now, without a single exception, have asked the legislative branch of the Government to omit in the selection of these 3,000 or 3,500 low-paid temporary clerks the rule of geographical apportionment.

We will expect the administration of the Thirteenth Census to be good and efficient. The country will hold those in charge of the work responsible for the result of the work, and can we justly hold them responsible when every man in the country who has any special knowledge, who has had any experience in such service, has asked Congress to omit that particular rule from the legislative provision for the appointment of the temporary clerks?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Leaving out the question of the difficulty of getting men from California here, what other objection is there to the geographical apportionment of these places?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is perhaps the chief thing. There is no objection to the geographical apportionment if the clerks can be here when needed; but they can not, because, as Governor Merriam said in his testimony, exigencies arise every week that can not be foreseen or provided against; and in order to secure geographical apportionment we would have to have two or three hundred extra clerks to meet emergencies that could not be foreseen, and it will cost the country a million dollars more if we insist upon injecting this provision in the law.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. I agree in the main with the argument of the gentleman from Indiana; but apparently the fact has been overlooked in the discussion thus far that there is a provision in the bill, on page 7, which enables the director, in cases of emergency, to make appointments from the eligible list of those who are immediately available, and independent of the geographical apportionment. So that there is an opportunity under that provision to meet in some measure the difficulty that would follow the rigid enforcement of the apportionment law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That has not been agreed to in the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. I understand it is in the conference report.

Mr. LANGLEY. It was in the House bill and agreed to by the Senate with an amendment, but the idea is exactly the same, so that the two Houses are practically together on the point.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But that has all gone by the board. It has not been agreed to by both Houses at all.

Mr. HAY. Not at all.

Mr. LANGLEY. Not literally, but practically.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What emergency is there to arise? We took about ten years on this census.

Mr. HAY. Oh, no.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are still sending volumes of the census taken in 1900.

Mr. HAY. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have received something of that kind in the last three weeks.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is one of the special reports.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And the gentleman might obtain a copy of St. James's edition of the Bible, printed one hundred years ago.

Mr. HAY. The last census was completed in three years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Outside of taking the enumeration of the people, what is there that is likely to call for an emergency force created here?

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman addresses the question to me, and the gentleman from Indiana will permit——

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will ask the gentleman to answer that question, as he is an expert.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not claim to be an expert; but I have had some experience on this particular point. There are conditions often arising in emergency work like this where a number of clerks are needed at once, and they can not be obtained without delay under a literal enforcement of the plan that is being urged here. This frequently occurs in a great emergency work like that, and, judging from my own experience in the Twelfth Census, I am of the opinion that if this proposition passes without an amendment, so as to exempt the temporary force, it will seriously handicap the Thirteenth Census work. Therefore, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia ought to be adopted if we are to recede and concur in this Senate amendment, instead of leaving it open for the conferees to settle.

Mr. SIMS rose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield, of course, to the gentleman from Tennessee for the purpose of offering an amendment; and therefore I can only reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Before I do that, I desire to yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who wants to make a few observations.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, my attention was attracted by the question of the gentleman from Missouri, and I simply wish to give an answer to it. He was asking why there should be apportionment. It seems to me of very little importance whether there is an apportionment or not. It seems to me

that that is really not a serious question, but the seriousness and interest in it come from a narrow and obsolete view of the government service. The reason an apportionment is desired by Members of the House is, I suspect, that Members of the House shall be sure that the patronage goes to their States.

Now, under the system in use ten years ago in the census that was important because we, of course, wanted to appoint the men whom we knew. Each Congressman was eager to have friends come here from his district, and therefore it was important to see that they should be fairly apportioned to the different States. But now when they are appointed by civil service this rule of apportionment is to us of little importance, and it is really vicious for the country because what advantage is it to us whether a man from our State comes to Washington giving up his citizenship there and becoming a clerk of the Government? Is that an advantage to us? When we could get our friends here, why of course it was an advantage to us individually no matter how it was for the country. But, if we can not appoint our friends here, if the man who stands at the top of the rolls is to be taken, is it not really a disadvantage to the State to have an active young man brought here from that State, give up his citizenship, and settle down as a citizen of Washington?

Mr. CARLIN. I agree with the gentleman in the argument he is making, but there is a question of fact here to be determined. The chairman of the committee says that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia there would be no apportionment, and the author of the resolution——

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman refer to the whole bill or to this provision?

Mr. CARLIN. The chairman of the committee has stated upon the floor that if the resolution offered by the gentleman from Virginia passes, there will be no geographical apportionment. And the gentleman who offers the resolution says it is not so.

Mr. GILLETT. I am not deciding that question.

Mr. HAY. If the gentleman is familiar with the provisions of the bill——

Mr. GILLETT. I am not familiar with the gentleman's amendment. The point I want to make is that it seems to me the House is apt to be diverted from the real issue, and that Members' feelings are being influenced in a way which, logically, would seem unreasonable, because the House is considering that it is an advantage to us to have this apportionment when, as a matter of fact, it is unimportant and indifferent. I think this is an obsolete view, a view that comes from the old patronage system, where Congressmen appointed their friends; but under the modern system, under the examination system, it is really a disadvantage to us to have the young men taken from our State, give up practically their citizenship, and come to Washington and become clerks. The House really has not now any selfish interest in this matter of apportionment. Consequently we can look at it impartially and consider what is best for the Government—and I do not see why the best men should not get the clerkships, no matter where they live or how unequally they may be apportioned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman is chairman, or was chairman, and will be again, of the Committee on the Civil Service in the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I yield another minute in order that the gentleman from Massachusetts may answer the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman is chairman of the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. GILLETT. I was.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the regular civil-service law, the old one, provide for an apportionment of clerks among the States?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What objection is there to having the same rule go into this census bill?

Mr. GILLETT. I am not discussing that.

Mr. HAY. It is already in the bill.

Mr. GILLETT. I am discussing the point and trying to show that our interest in this subject of apportionment ought not to be what it used to be. Whereas formerly it was of great selfish interest to us, now it is immaterial, and it seems to me that it is practically immaterial to the country itself. I am perfectly willing that they should get the best clerks, wherever they come from.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all right for States close to Washington.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has twenty-four minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment 15, and that amendment is in this language:

Provided, That hereafter all examinations of applicants for positions in the government service, from any State or Territory, shall be had in the State or Territory in which such applicant resides, and no person shall be eligible for such examination or appointment unless he or she shall have been actually domiciled in such State or Territory for at least one year previous to such examination.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House do recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would be entitled to a division before it was voted upon.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the amendment in which I move to concur. It provides that an applicant for a position from a State or Territory must be examined in that State or Territory, and must have been a bona fide resident of that State or Territory for twelve months prior to such application. Now, what is the objection to that requirement? Why should not this amendment be concurred in just as it is? Who has any objection to requiring the applicant in a State for a position to be a bona fide resident of that State for twelve months prior thereto? If the object and purpose is to not practice a fraud, why should not a person claiming to be a resident and citizen of a State, applying from that State, be actually such for twelve months prior thereto? The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] is that it shall not apply to sections 3 and 6. They have been discussed here from the standpoint of temporary appointments. What does a temporary appointment mean here under section 6? It is that certain persons may be employed in the Census Office during the decennial period. Now, what does the decennial period mean?

Mr. HAY. Three years.

Mr. SIMS. Yet Members call that, very flippantly, a temporary appointment.

Mr. HAY. I want to say to the gentleman that that three years is supposed to last from the 1st of July, 1909, to the 1st of July, 1912; that at least two-thirds or certainly one-half of these appointees will not hold their places longer than for one year, and some of them not so long.

Mr. SIMS. But the period is three years.

Mr. HAY. And the vast number of them for only six months.

Mr. SIMS. A period one year longer than the Members of this House hold their offices, and yet they call that temporary.

Mr. HAY. Well, I call this temporary, don't you? [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Yes; with some of us.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what other positions outside of those in sections 3 and 6 and the ones requiring technical and scientific attainments are there to be filled in the Census Office?

Mr. SIMS. That is a question I was about to ask, myself.

Mr. HAY. The part of the amendment applying to the positions of technical and scientific character applies not to the Census Office alone, but to the entire classified force of the Government. The Senate amendment does not apply to the Census Office alone. It applies to the entire classified force.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is there a provision in this bill providing for the taking of the census which purports to amend the permanent civil-service law?

Mr. HAY. Yes; that is the amendment we are discussing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding is that that is to affect employees to be taken into the census only.

Mr. HAY. Not at all. It affects all the employees in the classified service in every department of the Government. If the gentleman will read section 15, he will see that that is the fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I had supposed they had in contemplation merely the employees in the census.

Mr. HAY. No; it is a general provision affecting the entire force of the Government.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I heard this conference report discussed in the Senate when the rejection by the conferees of this very amendment caused the Senate, as I understand it, to refuse to accept the report, and I never heard in that discussion—I might not have heard every word—anything to the effect that it applied to all of the employees of the Government; but suppose it does, what is wrong about that?

Mr. HAY. I do not object to its applying to all the departments of the Government. I will agree with the gentleman that it ought to do that. I say that it ought not to apply to the temporary force to be employed in the Census Bureau.

Mr. SIMS. And that temporary force is for the decennial period, which means three years; and while each person may not actually be employed for three years, when you except sections 3 and 6 from the operation of this amendment, you have excepted everything. In other words, the permanent census force is employed and is in office and does not have to be appointed.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is discussing the Hay amendment, and it is not properly before the House for discussion.

Mr. SIMS. The Hay amendment was read for the information of the House——

The SPEAKER. The motion is that the House recede and concur——

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Virginia, in his time in the way of debate, read an amendment which he wanted to offer, and I was discussing that because it is pertinent. It might affect the action of the House upon my motion, which is a preferential motion. I think it is entirely in order as a matter of debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the House do recede and concur; but the gentleman from Virginia gave notice that he will demand a division, namely, first upon the motion that the House do recede from its disagreement, subject to division, and then a motion to concur, subject to amendment. It occurs to the Chair, by a fair interpretation of the rule, that the gentleman is in order.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I intended to be in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. The whole thing is mixed up so that nobody understands it. Now, if there is a person who wants to enter this service from Tennessee, does this Senate amendment provide two things: In the first place, that he must be examined in Tennessee?

Mr. SIMS. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And in the second place, that he must have lived in Tennessee the last preceding year at least?

Mr. SIMS. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, suppose there happened to be a Tennessean here in Washington—your clerk, for instance—who wanted to stand an examination for one of these places. What is the sense of his being sent back to Tennessee to stand that examination?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know that there is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The residence feature of it is all right, and he ought to be compelled to be a resident of the State for twelve months, but it seems to me he ought to be allowed to be examined anywhere he happens to be.

Mr. SIMS. It is a question of construction of this amendment in its practical application. The object of the amendment is to prevent persons being charged up to a State in which they never did live, do not live now, and are never going to live.

Mr. BURNETT. Allow me to ask the gentleman, Does not the use of the word "shall" in there make it imperative? For instance, there are a number of clerks in the immigration commission. Their term will expire after a while and perhaps some Members of Congress who have secured their appointments would like to see them placed in the Census Bureau. Many of them are women who are receiving very small salaries and will receive very small salaries. What is the justice of forcing these women to go to Alabama or Missouri or Tennessee to be examined?

Mr. SIMS. They may be transferred.

Mr. BURNETT. But they are not under civil-service law at all; they are not under the classified service at all.

Mr. SIMS. They would have to be subject to the civil-service examination to be appointed at all in the census.

Mr. BURNETT. Not at all. I am talking about those in the employ of the immigration commission. It is a matter of fact that there are some hundred or more there now working and that their term will expire in a very short while. Many will desire appointment in the Census Office no doubt, and a good many will be recommended by their Congressmen. They can not be transferred there because they are not under the civil service. Now, where is the justice and right in forcing those people to go back to the State of their residence to be examined and then come back here? Why not allow them to be examined, in other words, in the place where they now are? It is for the convenience of the applicant. As the gentleman from Missouri has said, the question of residence is all right, and I believe it ought to be there, but the question of the locus of the examination is for the convenience of the applicant evidently. Now, I suggest why not, instead of using the word "shall" there, use the word "may," and allow this examination to go to the convenience of the applicant instead of forcing them to go away two or three times to be examined and then return?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, we are passing a general law here applying to the whole United States.

Mr. BURNETT. You can not get around the proposition that that is imperative.

Mr. SIMS. As a matter of fact, because there are a lot of good women here that are going to apply for appointment, I do not think that we can change legislation to meet the convenience or inconvenience of them.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman from Tennessee contend that this law should be applied to every case in the Census Office, from the highest to the lowest grade, so that if the Director of the Census wanted to employ some expert statistician, we will say, who happened to be temporarily here in Washington, he would have to go back to the State where he resides in order to pass the examination?

Mr. SIMS. I do not know that this section would really cover such an extreme case as that.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman has read the section critically, he will see that there is no room for exception whatever.

Mr. SIMS. It was shown that the conferees were opposed to the amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. To what amendment?

Mr. SIMS. Amendment No. 15. Now, let it go back to conference, and of course we know in advance what is means.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman does not mean to say, does he, that it will necessarily follow that the conferees will do in the next conference exactly what they did in the other? Will they not be governed more or less by the temper of the House as indicated by this discussion? I understand that to be one of the purposes of the discussion.

Mr. SIMS. The House concurred in the conference report before.

Mr. LANGLEY. The House did not—the conferees did. There are several changes in the House bill that the former conferees on the part of the House agreed to that I think they ought not to have agreed to, such as reduction of salaries, the narrowing of the provision regarding appointment of former census employees, the provisions regarding a census of woodland on farms, the turpentine and resin business, and so forth, and I hope they will not do it next time, now that they know the views of Members regarding them.

Mr. SIMS. The House conferees concurred in the report that was rejected in the Senate. That conference report rejected Senate amendment No. 15. I heard it discussed and I know what the Senate conferees think about it. They were hostile to it. The conferees of this body are also hostile to it.

Mr. LANGLEY. If both Houses agree upon a distinct proposition, is not that binding on the conferees, even though it may be coupled with another proposition so as to be really one amendment? I think it ought to be.

Mr. SIMS. If the amendment applies to all employees hereafter to be appointed, say, in section 3 and section 6, what is then left for it to apply to besides? If we concur with an amendment, will not that carry the whole amendment back to the conferees, to do just as they see proper?

Mr. HAY. Unquestionably.

Mr. SIMS. So, concurring with an amendment is equal simply to not concurring?

Mr. HAY. If the House practically instructed the conferees of the House, by concurring in an amendment offered, the House conferees would be bound to stand for that amendment, and as the Senate has already refused to concur in the conference report, it would be inferred that the Senate conferees would also be bound to agree.

Mr. LANGLEY. Because both Houses have, in fact, agreed on the first part of it.

Mr. SIMS. We can settle this without any inference. In section 6, salaries from $720 to $1,000 are provided, and employment for a term potentially three years, and yet they are called "temporary employees." Then, what is left in the bill to act upon? If we are going to live up to the civil-service law, why not do it?

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. SIMS. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman says that he heard the debate in the Senate on the conference report. So did I. Now, does not the gentleman know that the purpose of the amendment was not so much to have these census employees put under this provision as it was for the purpose of amending the general

civil-service law so as to place all the employees of the Government under it?

Mr. SIMS. I never got that impression, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAY. Now, the gentleman says, if you exempt the employees under section 6, that will be the end of it. There will be nothing that you can apply the amendment to. It will apply to every place hereafter made and to every man hereafter appointed in any position in the classified service.

Mr. SIMS. I am perfectly willing to leave section 6 open to further action in conference.

Mr. HAY. Section 6 is not open.

Mr. SIMS. My amendment is simply to concur in amendment No. 15, and nothing further.

Mr. HAY. But the gentleman must know that section 6, that provides for the employment of these employees, is not open, because the House has agreed to it and the Senate has agreed to it. The House passed it and the Senate agreed to it, and it is not now subject to the action of the conference committee.

Mr. SIMS. The Senate amended it.

Mr. HAY. Only as to the salary of one grade

Mr. SIMS. That takes the whole section.

Mr. HAY. Oh, no; it does not.

Mr. SIMS. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was clearly shown in the debate over there that the civil-service law, in its spirit if not in its letter, has been abused. Persons have been appointed and charged to States that were not and never have been citizens of those States, people who did not live in the States and never contemplated living in them. The object of this amendment is to prevent that, and provide that they must be actual residents of the State for twelve months prior to applying as an applicant for the position. It does not apply to those who are now in the government service under the civil service at all. I believe we should not minimize the matter by talking about having to send to California or to Tennessee for temporaries. The trouble is that there are more temporaries applying than we have places for. So far as that is concerned, I have no applicants, and I hope I will not have any. But I think it is time either to repeal the civil-service law or make it effectual.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. SIMS. Yes.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Whether, in the opinion of the gentleman from Tennessee, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will destroy the force and effect of amendment 15 of the Senate in so far as it affects sections 3 and 6?

Mr. HAY. Section 3 applies to the private secretary of the director.

Mr. SIMS. But section 6 covers a number of other positions.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that if the House agrees to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia that that would practically strike out section 15?

Mr. SIMS. It sends it back to the conferees, so that they can do as they please; but if we concur in Senate amendment 15 as it stands, without amendment, then the conferees can not do anything further with that identical amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] desires some time, and I wish to yield to him as much as ten minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, in his advocacy of the bill and in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, proceeds upon a false basis. He says in effect the apportionment law is fixed by this amendment, when, as a matter of fact, it has been agreed to by both Houses. The bill provides, after providing for a civil-service examination of all applicants to positions—

> Copies of the eligible registers so established and the examination papers of all eligibles shall be furnished to the Director of the Census by the Civil Service Commission, and selections therefrom shall be made by the Director of the Census, in conformity with the law of apportionment as now provided for the classified service, in the order of rating.

That disposes of this proposition with reference to the apportionment, independent of the concurrence in this amendment. The gentleman tries to create and does create, doubtless, in the minds of many people, a prejudice against concurrence in this amendment by charging that all who are in favor of concurring are simply after a job. No Member of Congress has any opportunity to secure a job by concurring in the amendment, for all of these places are under civil service. That is already provided for in the law placing it in the classified service, and in the apportionment to the States. What are we trying to do by concurring in this amendment? One thing, and only one, and that is to protect the people in the States, the men and women who really live there, in their opportunity to secure employment under the Federal Government in this new class of work.

If adopted as fixed by the Senate amendment, it will prevent people born in the District, raised in the District—men and women who have never lived in the various States—from putting themselves in as from States they have never even seen. They belong to the District and should be charged to the District. That is all this amendment provides; nothing else. All the other talk is mere frills and furbelows in this discussion. The only proposition that is affected by this is not the apportionment, not the method by which they shall be selected, but whether they shall reside in the States affected or not, or be residents of the District of Columbia and territory immediately contiguous thereto.

Mr. SULLOWAY. And be charged to some of the States.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That disposes of this emergency, so far as I am concerned. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] proposes the question that a Member's secretary might want to take this examination, and that it would be a hardship on him to go home and take it and then return to fill the place. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if that is not about what he stated?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is about it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Let me suggest this, that there is no cast-iron rule that can be adopted that might not work a hardship in some individual case. What we should try to accomplish is the greatest protection to the greatest number of individuals and localities. Now, I do not believe that any man's secretary would desire a place here unless it was a good, high-salaried position; and, in my judgment, it would work a less hardship on him to go to his State to take the examination than it would to throw the doors wide open so that every man who applied could be given the examination here if the authorities thought that they could grant that permission. That would let in all the District residents.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am going to vote for the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], so the gentleman from Iowa need not try to convert me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I am delighted to hear that, because I notice that when the gentleman from Missouri acts on any question not affected by politics he is nearly always right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is so; and on politics, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. HAY. Does the gentleman from Iowa think that the employees provided for in section 3 ought to come under the provision of the amendment which he is advocating?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. O Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the chief statistician and these other men would be affected by this one way or the other. They are not selected through examinations entirely; some of these positions are above the civil service.

Mr. LANGLEY. These in section 3 are not.

Mr. HAY. Under the language of this amendment they are not.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I want to say that if it is necessary to protect the States or the different districts in their rights, that it is no hardship to a man who is getting the high salary of a chief statistician to go to his own home and be examined.

Mr. HAY. But the gentleman must remember that the chief statistician under the provisions of this amendment must have lived in the State twelve months preceding the examination; he could not live here and in the State, too.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That does not mean an absolute domicile.

Mr. HAY. It uses the word "domicile."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. A man's home may be there, although he may not have occupied it all the time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish, without yielding the floor, to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] to ask unanimous consent.

WAGES AND MANUFACTURES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on last Thursday resolution No. 72 was under consideration and a motion was pending. It is apparent that there will not be a quorum this afternoon when the vote is reached and I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending motions with reference to that resolution be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the vote on the pending motions on resolution No. 72 be postponed until Thursday next.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. What is the motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion was to lay on the table a resolution offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I still have the floor, I believe, and I wish to know if there is any other gentleman who wants to occupy time in favor of the amendment I have offered. If not, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the previous question on my amendment.

Mr. HAY. I ask for a division of the motion.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I have general control of the time, I believe, and I yielded the floor to the gentleman from Tennessee so that he might make his motion. I think our side ought to have the close.

Mr. SIMS. If there is any further debate desired, I will withhold my motion for the previous question and reserve the balance of my time. I only wanted to do what I thought the gentleman from Indiana desired.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Virginia want any more time?

Mr. HAY. No.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say upon this question. I am interested in the legislation only as a Member of the House, and I have given the subject of the census work a great deal of study and attention during the last ten years. The position I occupy in resisting the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] is in perfect accord, I repeat, with that of every man in this country who has any special knowledge upon the subject of census taking. The recommendation, I desire to repeat, that the rule of geographical distribution as to temporary employees should be eliminated, was contained in the report of the Director of the Census, Mr. North, in his report for 1908. It was embodied in a special message of the President to Congress in January, 1909. It was indorsed by the commission of experts appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor about a year and a half ago. In fact, it has the indorsement of every man in the country who appreciates the real importance of giving the Director of the Census a wide latitude of discretion in the administration of this work—a work that is peculiarly emergency work all the way through. I do not believe it is good legislation to embody in a census bill a provision for the amendment of the general civil-service law in the first place, but the House has the power to dispose of that question. If it is thought the proper thing to do to amend the general civil-service law, let it be amended; but I do insist that it will be a grave mistake to concur in Senate amendment No. 15 without change or modification. It will result in delay, in the embarrassment of this important undertaking, and it will increase substantially the cost of the work.

I desire to emphasize again that the Senate amendment has already resulted in a provision that will increase the expense of the work a quarter of a million dollars, in so far as the Senate can control it.

Now, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], who of course is always vigilant in defense of the interests of the people of that great State, I think, in his enthusiasm in support of the interests of probably 100 or 150 applicants for jobs in the Census Office, is altogether overlooking the interests of 2,000,000 men and women who pay the taxes and contribute to the maintenance of the Government.

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

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the gentleman fear that they will be able to get competent men from the States?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Oh, no; I do not doubt that competent men can be gotten in North Dakota and in South Dakota and in all the other States; but if a man establishes a large industry in the District of Columbia and a law was proposed requiring him to select his employees by the rule of apportionment among the States, from Maine to California, and, when a vacancy occurred, compelling him to go to an eligible list and select the one that made the highest and best rating, without regard to the delay that might be entailed or other embarrassments that the exigencies of the industry might involve, how many Members of this body would support it?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is not that the law now?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes; in so far as the permanent classified service is concerned; and I repeat that the standard of efficiency in the public service is not more than 50 per cent of the standard of efficiency in similar service conducted by private enterprise throughout the country.

I am hoping and seeking, Mr. Speaker, to save the temporary census work from the handicap that I think every man who is acquainted with the conditions of administration down here must admit exists. The permanent administration may stand it; temporary emergency work, where time is a vital factor, can not.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I will say, in reply to the gentleman from Indiana, if that point is well taken, why not apply it to all the appointments?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would not object to that. I want to relate again an experience of the Census Office in the selection of an assistant engineer at a salary of $60 a month through the civil-service law under the rule of apportionment. A requisition was made and the Civil Service Commission certified the names of three who stood highest on the eligible list—one in St. Louis, one in South Dakota, and the other in Utah. The director, of course, selected the one from St. Louis, because he thought he was a little closer at hand. It took five or six weeks to communicate with that man and have him arrange his affairs at home and come down here to accept the job that paid $60 a month. That is a fair illustration of the operation of this rule of geographical apportionment in the general service.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. How does this amendment affect any case of that kind?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will tell the gentleman how. He knows as well as I do that under the general civil-service law in all temporary service the rule of geographical apportionment does not apply.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Does not the gentleman know that temporary appointments are made for a period not exceeding three months?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. No; that is by construction.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It is the law, and then they can renew it if there is no permanent man to go in.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is not a law; it is a rule of the commission.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is the same as law; it is a regulation that applies to the entire service.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes. Your opinion is that——

Mr. HULL of Iowa. In your case of an engineer they put a temporary man in until he came. Under your rule we ought to put him in and rule the St. Louisan out.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The plan of the gentleman from Iowa would be, when the eligible who was entitled to the appointment is not ready, has not got his corn husked or his harvesting over, he would put in a temporary, somebody in the city of Washington, for two or three months and train him until he got so he could earn his salary and then turn him out and put in the eligible from Indiana or somewhere else. That may do in the permanent service, but it would cause delay and unnecessary expense in the temporary census office.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will ask the gentleman, so that we can get at the facts—he and I are differing on facts more than we are on policies—I will ask him here, on page 5, if this language in here, put in by the House on motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STERLING], in regard to apportionment, does not absolutely govern as to the right of the States to fill these places?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That depends.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is not that true? Was not that the object of it? Was not that what the House thought it was doing?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Each Member put his own interpretation on it. It provides the same rule that obtains in the general classified service; and if the Civil Service Commission decides that these positions are temporary, of course the rule of geographical apportionment would not apply. We are to apply the same rule in relation to these employees as in the general service.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Section 7 in its beginning provides that these are additional clerks and temporary clerks.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Temporary.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Those who were exempted by the House were messengers, assistant messengers, messenger boys, unskilled laborers, and charwomen. Now, the Senate, I understand, is willing to go back and agree to our provision, or whether or not they are they ought to be made to do so—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Now, this is affecting the temporary forces. I would like for the gentleman to be frank with the House as to whether this amendment that we are talking about creates a single additional job, makes a single additional place here; if its adoption increases the power of a Member of Congress in the selection of a single man in all this vast force to be employed, or is not its sole purpose to provide that the State and the locality under the law of apportionment already agreed to by both Houses of Congress, not before the conference committee now, but agreed to, if the whole provision of this amendment is not simply this, that in making these examinations the safeguard is thrown around and protects the localities

of the State so that people in Washington, or adjoining districts, whose fathers have been in the service for forty years, born and raised here, are deprived of the right to take these examinations against the men in Iowa, Missouri, or Kansas, or Nebraska, who have been at home helping to build up those great Commonwealths. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I assume the purpose of this amendment is to require absolutely and imperatively the geographical distribution of the positions in the temporary census office throughout the country. That is what it is for. I have not been making any question about that and it will increase the employees only to the extent that the Director of the Census, who will be responsible of course for the success of the work, in order to avoid any delays and embarrassments, will be required to keep a force of clerks on hand in Washington all the time in order to obviate the necessity of delay in sending for the clerks when an emergency arises. It will cost the Government a great many thousands of dollars more than it would otherwise. Now, that is the thing to which I am objecting. I am objecting to the geographical distribution in regard to this temporary service.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. That is already provided for by a part of the bill that is agreed to by both Houses.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This amendment makes it infinitely more rigid. In the first instance, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is right, the House made a mistake, in the judgment of every expert statistician, every man who has had experience in census work in all this country. The House went right in the face of the advice and suggestions of all these men. Now, not satisfied with that, the gentlemen who are supporting this motion propose to augment the embarrassments and the delays by increasing infinitely the rigidity of the apportionment rule. Nobody knows how that provision would dovetail into the general civil-service law. Nobody in this House has made any investigation of this question; that is, any careful investigation, I think I am free to say. It has not gone to the Committee on the Civil Service; has not gone to any committee that has given the subject any consideration at all, and here it is proposed now to inject into this bill a piece of new legislation amending a permanent statute in a vital particular without any considerable thought or investigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question at that point?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As to the gentleman's illustration, which I heard him use some weeks ago and again to-day, it struck me as capable of little elucidation at any rate. The gentleman spoke of three engineers that were certified to the director—one from St. Louis, one from Utah, and one from Dakota. Instead of writing to one and waiting until he husked his corn, why could he not wire each one of them, "If appointed, can you come immediately and accept a certain position under the civil service?" And if they wired they could come, he could telegraph to the nearest one to come.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That might have been. I think it is within the bounds of truth and reason to say that the ordinary citizen of the country who takes a civil-service examination has some employment. He can not quit his employer the very next morning after he receives notice of his selection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that he takes the examination in order to get the work?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. He expects, generally, to have a reasonable time in which to get ready to enter the service. I think I have made my attitude clear on this matter before the House. I understand there is to be a division of the question. I hope, if the motion to recede be agreed to, that the motion to concur shall be defeated, in order that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] may have an opportunity to present his amendment modifying the Senate provision. I violate no confidence in saying that when this matter was in conference it was discussed by the conferees of both sides, and the Senate conferees agreed that the Senate amendment ought not to be embodied in the bill without a further amendment, after having received a letter from the Chief of the Geological Survey in reference to the selection of those engaged in scientific branches of the service.

Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Indiana demand the previous question?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I reserved my time and did not insist on my previous question, because the gentleman wished to say something further. And now I wish to say a few words in reply.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Very well.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It seems to me that the better way would be, when we have concluded the debate, to vote upon the proposition, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] desires to move to concur with an amendment.

Mr. HAY. I have asked for a division of the question.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the House should vote for the previous question, while it would not cut off the division of the question, would it not preclude any further amendment? Would it not compel us to vote simply on concurrence?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. As I understood, the question was on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to recede, and then the other question is to concur, and would not be cut off from debate until somebody moves the previous question on that motion.

Mr. HAY. As I understood the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, it is to recede and concur; but I asked a division.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That is all true; that is one motion, and if the previous question is ordered, it will be contained in the entire motion.

Mr. SIMS. Do I understand the gentleman from Indiana to yield?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. A parliamentary inquiry. Would the motion for the previous question upon the motion to recede alone be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not want to take the gentleman from Tennessee off the floor, if he wants to make some remarks.

Mr. SIMS. I want to make some remarks in reply to the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has thirty-four minutes remaining.

Mr. SIMS. I do not wish to occupy that much time.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will listen to the provisions of amendment 15, and get it into their minds exactly:

(15) *Provided*, That hereafter all examinations of applicants for positions in the government service, from any State or Territory, shall be had in the State or Territory in which such applicant resides, and no person shall be eligible for such examination or appointment unless he or she shall have been actually domiciled in such State or Territory for at least one year previous to such examination.

The object of this amendment is clear on its face, and was certainly made clear in the debate in the other body. It is to prevent persons claiming to be citizens of a State in which they are not citizens, and never have been, applying for appointment from a State the quota of which is not full, by claiming that they are citizens of that State when they are not and never expect to be.

The gentleman from Indiana spoke about the difficulty of getting a fireman or engineer. This can not apply and does not apply to that sort of employment, because such employees are exempt by the bill itself, in which we find this language:

That the foregoing provisions as to apportionment, residence, and place of examination shall not apply to employees operating mechanical appliances.

So that as far as stopping the engines or the machines or any mechanical apparatus goes, it would not have to be done in order to have persons take examinations in distant or near-by States.

But I want to call the attention of the House to another provision in this bill, which makes it very important to concur without any amendment, because you will see what can be done if this amendment of the Senate is not concurred in and goes out of the bill. Here is the provision I wish to call attention:

And provided further, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred shall be eligible to appointment to positions in any department held by them at date of transfer to the Census Office without examination: *And provided further*, That during the decennial census period, and no longer, the Director of the Census may fill vacancies in the permanent force of the Census Office by the promotion or transfer of clerks or other employees employed on the temporary force authorized by section 6 of this act.

So you see, from failing to concur in this amendment or concurring with an amendment providing it shall not apply to section 6, the Director of the Census can fill all the vacancies in the regular force by promotions from those on the temporary force during the decennial period, which is three years.

Now, I am not assuming for a moment that the Director of the Census would do anything improper. But if we permit the employees under section 6 to be exempted, they can be transferred from the temporary force to the permanent force any time the Director of the Census may see fit to fill vacancies that may occur; and they will not be apportioned to the States, but

they can be transferred to the permanent force from the temporary force by the action of the Director of the Census under the terms of this law and made permanent employees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman have in mind the fact that the permission or the authority to transfer is only temporary? It is a temporary transfer from a permanent position during a temporary period, and then the bill expressly provides that the service terminates. That provision is simply to give the Director of the Census general control over the office and to use the employees where he can use them to the best advantage, and he can only transfer them for the temporary period.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman from Indiana has been discussing the possibility of extra expense. Now, section 6 provides that salaries shall not exceed $1,000, and another portion of the bill provides that the director may transfer to the permanent force these employees at whatever salary may be provided for the place to which the clerk has been transferred in the permanent force. That gives the director the power to increase a man's salary whom he may see fit to transfer to the permanent force, even if he should not serve longer than three years. So you see how this can be worked for the benefit of those so promoted, and most any employee would like an increase in salary, even if it is only for two or three years.

Now, it has been made clear that if we amend Senate amendment 15 by concurring with an amendment of any sort, it carries the whole amendment back to conference, and with the action of the Senate and the House conferees on the matter having stricken out this amendment, what must we expect in the future? We must expect, after all we have heard from the chairman of the committee, that he is opposed to section 15 in toto. The amendment talked of virtually amounts to concurring without a concurrence, concurring in it and robbing it at the same time of all effectiveness. Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked before for the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I started to make a motion myself, and out of courtesy yielded to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SIMS. I had the floor and made the motion, but yielded as a matter of courtesy to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe under the rules I have a right to ask for a division of the motion; and the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee merely applies to the motion to recede.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That depends entirely on what the motion is.

Mr. SIMS. I move to recede and concur, and ask for the previous question on that motion.

Mr. HAY. Do I understand that that would cut me out from a motion to concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman from Tennessee moves for the previous question on his original motion, then, in the opinion of the Chair, there could not be a motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. HAY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he desires to shut out my amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee for the previous question on his motion to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRUMPACKER) there were 48 yeas and 38 noes.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House recede from Senate amendment No. 15 and concur therein. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire a division of the question?

Mr. HAY. I did demand a division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to suggest to the gentleman whether or not his motion now amounts to anything.

Mr. HAY. It does not, if I am shut out from offering an amendment, and I therefore withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 15 and concur in the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the other amendments?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the remaining Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House further insist on its disagreement to the remaining Senate amendments and agree to the conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection, the Chair will appoint the following conferees.

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CRUMPACKER, Mr. BURLEIGH, and Mr. HAY.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KOPP, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. HUGHES of Georgia, for one day, on account of sickness of wife.

To Mr. CLARK of Florida, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies papers in the case of Matilda C. Lyman, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on Thursday last there was a motion pending on resolution No. 72 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the absence of the gentleman from New York from the Chamber, the House by unanimous consent agreed to postpone that until Thursday.

Mr. PAYNE. That was rather a surprising move to make when I was out of the Chamber. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print some remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my motion.

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an estimate of appropriation for replacement of articles and material for the Geological Survey destroyed by fire (H. Doc. No. 60)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, an estimate of appropriation for the immigrant station at Ellis Island, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 61)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill for settling a disputed boundary line of the Fort Adams (R. I.) Military Reservation (H. Doc. No. 62)—to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers relating to the claim of the Roman Catholic Church of Zamboanga, P. I. (H. Doc. No. 63)—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

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. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 10885) placing licorice and licorice paste, etc., on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10886) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. James Winchester, of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 10887) to make Scranton, in the State of Mississippi, a subport of entry, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10888) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers by railroad to properly man their trains—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10889) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers by

railroad to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10890) to regulate the issue of injunctions from the federal courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 10891) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUSTIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) providing for a joint commission to visit Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) to restore the status of the Third Colorado Volunteer Cavalry who served during the civil war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: Resolution (H. Res. 79) relating to the use by any committee of the House of Representatives of any information affecting the financial interests of the country which can not be given to the people at large—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: 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.

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. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 10892) donating 100,000 acres of land to Cumberland College, Cumberland, Chaves County, N. Mex.—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 10893) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Miles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10894) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ripkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 10895) granting a pension to G. B. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10896) for the relief of the estate of David F. Kennel—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10897) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jefferries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10898) granting an increase of pension to George Radell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 10899) granting an increase of pension to John A. Kellar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10900) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 10901) granting a pension to D. W. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 10902) granting a pension to John Halpine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 10903) granting a pension to Feemster Penland—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10904) granting an increase of pension to Henry Jordon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10905) granting a pension to Charles Roddy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10906) granting a pension to Mary Jane Jackson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10907) for the relief of Joseph McAndrew—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10908) for the relief of the estate of Nathaniel Murray—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10909) granting an increase of pension to Hugh M. Cory—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10910) granting an increase of pension to Wyman F. Patten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10911) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10912) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10913) granting an increase of pension to William P. Gilleland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10914) granting a pension to Julia E. Sterns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 10915) granting a pension to Annie McLeod—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 10916) granting a pension to Jane McNalley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 10917) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10918) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Edward H. Bergmann—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10919) granting a pension to Thomas J. Parker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: A bill (H. R. 10920) granting an increase of pension to Harrison N. Mott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10921) granting an increase of pension to Marlow F. Brandamore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10922) granting an increase of pension to Harmon Varner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 10923) granting an increase of pension to Almon N. Keeney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10924) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Goss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10925) granting a pension to Margaret Halpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10926) for the relief of Zachariah Thomas—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10927) granting an increase of pension to Abner J. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 10928) for the relief of Mrs. M. L. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 10929) granting a pension to Herbert P. De Lano—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10930) granting a pension to Charles D. French—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10931) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Cole—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10932) granting an increase of pension to A. C. Fairman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER: Petition of permanent committee on temperance of the general synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of the United States, relative to the acts and duties of Congress in preventing the sale of intoxicants—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CREAGER: Petition of the governor and 22 other state officials of Oklahoma, requesting legislation placing under jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission control of rates and charges of transportation by steamers engaged in coastwise trade—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of Lewisburg (Pa.) Council, No. 926, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for legislation preventing immigration of all Asiatics save merchants, students, and travelers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of O. A. Call and 5 others, of Odin, and C. W. Dammann & Co. and 6 others, of Ormsby, all in the State of Minnesota, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Spangler Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellaire, Ohio, against portrait of Jefferson Davis being placed on silver service of the battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Petition of business men of Salida, Colo., against parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Independent Italian Political Club, to make October 12 a holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary L. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of the bar of Goldsboro, N. C., asking for establishment of a United States court in said city—to the Committee on the Judiciary.