SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 22, 1909.*

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

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES presented a petition of the Pacific Coast Lumber Manufacturers' Association, of Washington, praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to pass upon the reasonableness of rates charged by various railroad companies for the transportation of freight, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides and sole leather, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Manhattan Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the adoption of the so-called "Overman amendment" to the present tariff bill increasing the capitation tax on immigrants from $4 to $10, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OWEN. I present resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Oklahoma Traffic Association, held at Guthrie, Okla., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUTHRIE, OKLA., *June 12, 1909.*

Senator ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At a recent meeting of the Oklahoma Traffic Association the following resolutions were adopted, to wit:

Whereas under the laws of the United States only steamships of American registry are permitted to handle freight and passengers between two ports in the United States, thereby preventing the freest competition between water carriers; and

Whereas this restricted competition has made it possible for the rail carriers, through the ownership of some steamship lines and through threats of refusal to participate with other independent water lines in the bulk of the through traffic, to absolutely control the freight rates of the water carriers operating between Atlantic and Gulf ports to such extent as to frequently increase the freight rates of such water carriers far beyond a profitable basis for the service involved, to the detriment and often to the distress of the citizens of the southwestern portion of the United States; and

Whereas the United States Government not only establishes and improves but actually maintains the ports of entry of such water carriers, dredging channels, constructing and maintaining buoys, light-houses, and so forth, at the expense of the taxpayers, with the idea of cheapening transportation charges for the benefit of all the people; and

Whereas the control of water rates between the various United States ports has not been specifically placed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the belief that competition on the high seas between numerous water carriers would serve to sufficiently reduce such transportation charges; and

Whereas the very reverse of this condition has resulted, and rates are steadily being increased by the coastwise water carriers: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we urgently request the Congress of the United States to pass an act at the earliest possible moment remedying the conditions above recited by placing under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission the control of rates and charges for the transportation of freight and passengers by all steamers engaged in the United States coastwise trade, and that we call upon all other interests in the Southwest, as well as any other sections of the United States where similar conditions exist, to aid us in securing this legislation.

As members of the state administration of the State of Oklahoma, we, the undersigned, wish to add our request to the above resolutions, that you use all proper efforts in an endeavor to see that the sense of said resolutions be made into law.

Respectfully,

C. H. Haskell, governor; Bill Cross, secretary of state; M. E. Trapp, state auditor; Charles West, attorney-general; J. A. Menefee, treasurer; Charles A. Taylor; state examiner and inspector; J. E. Love, chairman corporation commission; A. P. Watson, corporation commission; J. J. McAlister, corporation commission; E. D. Connant, superintendent public instruction; M. J. Kane, chief justice; J. J. Dunn, associate justice; R. L. Williams, associate justice; John B. Turner, associate justice; S. W. Hayes, associate justice; Henry M. Funvan, presiding judge circuit court of appeals; Thomas H. Doyle, judge circuit court of appeals; Henry G. Baker, judge circuit court of appeals; W. H. L. Campbell, clerk supreme court; Kate Barnard, committee charities and corrections; W. G. Ashton, assistant commissioner of labor; F. J. McComb, insurance commissioner.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2644) making an appropriation for the redemption of an internal-revenue stamp; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 2645) granting an increase of pension to William Armstrong;

A bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Jacob S. Boreman; and

A bill (S. 2647) granting a pension to Elizabeth Henry (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2648) granting a pension to Nannie B. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

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

AMELIA L. DICK BOYD.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate resolution 59.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Amelia L. Dick Boyd, widow of Charles W. Boyd, late a laborer of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TAXATION OF CORPORATIONS.

Mr. BULKELEY. I hold in my hand part 1 of a report of the Commissioner of Corporations on Taxation of Corporations, dealing with the system of corporate taxation in the New England States, and published by the Department of Commerce and Labor. A very limited edition was issued. I ask that 1,000 copies be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be made.

Mr. BULKELEY. It is suggested that I should ask for the printing of 2,000 instead of 1,000 copies.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know what the expense will be?

Mr. BULKELEY. The estimate is $166. The estimate was made by the printing clerk in the Secretary's office.

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

Ordered, That 2,000 copies of a paper, Taxation of Corporations, part 1, New England, be printed as a document, and that the usual number be not printed.

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. ALDRICH. I should like to dispose of a few formal amendments before the discussion of the hide question is proceeded with.

Mr. McLAURIN. I wanted to make some observations in reply to what had been said yesterday evening against my amendment. If the chairman has any formal amendments to present, I will wait until those are disposed of, if they will lead to no discussion.

Mr. CULLOM. Then there will be more Senators here to hear the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator wants to go on, I will not insist.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is all right. I wish to make some observations further along in reply to the objections that were made to my amendment yesterday by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Rhode Island desires the floor.

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was making the request that the committee might be able to dispose of some amendments to which there will be no objection. They are merely formal amendments. I do not want to take up any amendment that will lead to discussion; but if Senators desire to proceed with the discussion of the hide question, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have no objection to the Senator from Rhode Island proceeding with his formal amendments. I think the chairman of the committee ought to be permitted to do so.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

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

Aldrich	Cullom	Hughes	Page
Bacon	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Paynter
Bailey	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Penrose
Beveridge	Davis	Jones	Perkins
Borah	Dick	Kean	Piles
Briggs	Dillingham	La Follette	Root
Bristow	Dixon	McCumber	Scott
Bulkeley	Dolliver	McEnery	Smoot
Burrows	Elkins	McLaurin	Stone
Burton	Fletcher	Martin	Sutherland
Carter	Flint	Money	Taliaferro
Chamberlain	Foster	Nelson	Taylor
Clapp	Frye	Nixon	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Oliver	Warner
Crawford	Heyburn	Overman	Warren

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

Mr. McLAURIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island to yield to me until I can have a correction made of the amendment which I offered. I ask that the word "paragraph" be put in the place of "bill" and that the words "and calves" be added in the amendment at the point indicated in pencil.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment is modified by changing the word "bill" to the word "paragraph" and by inserting the words "and calves" after the word "cattle."

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 61, on page 15, refined saltpeter was taken from the free list by the action of the Senate, and it will be necessary that this amendment should be disposed of. I ask that the paragraph may be reconsidered and the amendment reconsidered.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The SECRETARY. On page 15, paragraph 61, restore the House text.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 65, page 16, I ask that the following amendment may be adopted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 65, page 16, line 11, after the word "foregoing" and before the semicolon, insert the words "wholly or partly manufactured."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 53, on page 13, which was passed over, may be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to paragraph 53—zinc, oxide of? The Chair hears no objection, and the paragraph is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 88 was passed over at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], I think. I will suggest to the Senator from Ohio that he permit the paragraph to be agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. I will state that I desire to be heard in behalf of placing crude asphalt on the free list, and also there is another amendment to the paragraph relating to fuller's earth. According to the report from the Treasury Department, there is some difficulty in discriminating between the crude fuller's earth and that which is wrought or manufactured. It has been suggested that the same phraseology be adopted as that in use with reference to crude asphaltum not dried or advanced in any manner. On page 21, lines 10 and 11, I move to strike out the words "unwrought and unmanufactured" and insert "if not dried or otherwise advanced in any manner," and then in lines 11 and 12 to insert "dried or otherwise advanced in any manner," so that the paragraph may have the same phraseology pertaining to fuller's earth which it contains with reference to crude asphaltum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the Senator as offering the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. That is what I desire. I prefer the paragraph be not agreed to at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph remains passed over.

Mr. CLAPP. While the Senator from Rhode Island is disposing of these minor matters, would he have any objection at this time to disposing of paragraph 262 and of withdrawing the Senate committee amendment in reference to the drawback on oil cake?

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee will consider that in connection with the general drawback provision.

The committee some time since offered an amendment to paragraph 86 imposing specific duties upon Keene's cement. If there is no objection I would be glad to dispose of that. It is a matter which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] is somewhat interested in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island offers an amendment to paragraph 86, which will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 20 strike out all of line 12 and insert the following:

If valued at $10 per ton or less, $3.50 per ton; if valued above $10 and not above $15 per ton, $5 per ton; if valued above $15 and not above $30 per ton, $10 per ton; if valued above $30 per ton, $14 per ton.

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire if the amendment increases the duty?

Mr. ALDRICH. The purpose of the committee was to fix specific duties which were equivalent to the 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not paying any special attention to it, except that I do not want to vote for any increase of duties.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is merely to change from ad valorem to specific, with the intention on the part of the committee to make it equivalent.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. To paragraph 157, page 53, the committee offered an amendment some time since fixing the rate of duty at 40 per cent ad valorem. The manufactures of the country, while not very many of them in number, are quite important. The manufacturers of St. Louis and other parts of the country suggest that a rate of 40 per cent is 5 per cent less than the rate on the iron ore from which they are made, and they are very anxious that the duty should be restored to 45 per cent ad valorem. I ask that the paragraph as adopted by the Senate may be read.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 157 as a substitute for the House paragraph reads as follows:

157. Table, kitchen, and hospital utensils, or other similar hollowware, of iron or steel, enameled or glazed with vitrous glasses, but not ornamented or decorated with lithographic or other printing, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that "40 per cent" be made "45 per cent." I will say, if it develops subsequently that that rate is too high, it will be taken care of in the Senate or in conference. The claim made by the manufacturers of this ware that the rate certainly ought not to be less than the rate on iron and steel is proper. I ask, therefore, that the amendment be made.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Before the words "per cent," strike out "forty" and insert in lieu "forty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ALDRICH. There are two or three items in the free list that I should like to have disposed of. Paragraph 488 was passed over, and I ask that it may be agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 196, paragraph 488, "arsenic and sulphide of arsenic, or orpiment."

Mr. JONES. Before that is agreed to, I have an amendment pending which I should like to offer at the proper time.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee are very strongly of the idea that arsenic certainly should be upon the free list. It is largely used by the farmers throughout the country as a destructive.

Mr. JONES. I want to present reasons why it should not be on the free list, when the proper time comes.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is used for destroying insects very largely all through the country.

Mr. JONES. I understand that, I will state to the Senator.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator desires not to have it disposed of now?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I ask that it may go over, to be taken up in regular order.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether Paris green is on the free list? Paris green is a product of arsenic, and it is the commercial article which is used by the farmers to kill potato bugs. We can not get along without it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Arsenic in various forms is used as an insecticide.

Mr. TILLMAN. I know; but London purple and Paris green are the two commercial articles which we use to kill insects.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish the Senator would prepare an amendment to cover that particular article.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not know that it needs any preparation. We can very easily look it up. If the Senator will give it to me, I will fix one to put both on the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the Senator move to amend the paragraph by inserting Paris green and London purple.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will do that with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, let the matter go over.

Mr. DICK. I did not get the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from South Carolina proposes to put Paris green and London purple on the free list by name.

Mr. DICK. May we not have the paragraph go over?

Mr. ALDRICH. The paragraph will go over with the amendment pending. Paragraph 491 relates to asbestos. I think the Senate committee would like to have that amendment disposed of.

Mr. STONE. The Senator is going on with the free list?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am taking certain paragraphs of the free list which were passed over that I would be glad to have disposed of, if there is no objection.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to make, but the Senator from Georgia has an amendment to move before the free list is finally disposed of.

Mr. ALDRICH. The free list will not be finally disposed of for some time. I am taking up some items which were passed over.

Mr. CLAY. I understood the Senator to say that he is taking up paragraphs on the free list that were passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. For the purpose of disposing of them if possible.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator does not intend to act on paragraph 480 now?

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee are not ready yet to make any recommendation as to that paragraph.

Mr. CLAY. I hope the Senator's committee will be ready at an early day, so that we may dispose of it.

Mr. BURTON. We are unable to understand what paragraph is now under consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 491.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have no clearly defined suggestion further than to say that the production of asbestos in this country is becoming a live interest in large quantities, and it will be some time before we shall have an opportunity again to consider the propriety of imposing a duty upon this article. It comes in the same class as lead ores and other ores. Among the many other things in Idaho we have quite a large asbestos mine which supplies a factory of very considerable importance. I merely wanted to call attention to the fact so that it would not be overlooked. I should like if the committee consistently can do so to investigate the proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. We will consider that paragraph. It may be agreed to, and the committee will investigate it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, paragraph 491 is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I would be glad if paragraph 524 would be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the paragraph.

The SECRETARY. On page 201, paragraph 524:

Chromate of iron or chromic ore.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the paragraph? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those are all the amendments I have to present this morning.

Mr. BACON. Are the other items that were passed over on the free list in order now?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; not now. I was trying to dispose of some that could be disposed of by unanimous consent. The matter of hides is before the Senate, and I asked the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] to yield to me to dispose of some unobjected paragraphs.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me before he begins, I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will indicate some time when other Senators may have an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate items on which they desire to have action.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is my purpose to dispose of the question about hides, and then to take up the lumber schedule and dispose of the important items which have not yet been considered. That would leave only coal, I think, in regard to which the committee has any amendment to offer of any important nature. It is my purpose to go to the lumber question as soon as the question of hides is disposed of.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am not going to make any extended remarks upon this important subject. It has already been dealt with in detail both by those Senators who favor the retention of the present tariff and those who are opposed to it. I decline to go very much into the details of the matter for another reason, and that is that no argument, however specious or otherwise, can in the slightest degree obliterate the two great principles that are affected by this proposed amendment. The one is that the farmers of this country do get a benefit of 15 per cent duty upon the hides. The second is that they would lose that 15 per cent benefit and that they would get nothing in return, and the leather-manufacturing interests would secure the only benefits under this amendment.

Mr. President, if we were to search for some great example to portray the limit of human ingratitude, we could scarcely find a more apt one than this attempt on the part of the manufacturers of leather and leather goods to deprive the stockman and the farmer of the little remnant of protection which has been left to him upon hides.

By the Dingley law hides were given a protection of 15 per cent ad valorem, a meager duty, indeed, Mr. President, when compared with other protective duties. The leather manufacturing interests, ever alert to secure advantages, secured a ruling from the Treasury Department that while skins of cows and steers were hides, that skins of calves were not hides.

So all the calfskins that enter into our fine shoes come in free of duty, because they are not hides. Having made this decision, wherein the stockman and the farmer lost by a single blow the protection on nearly one-half of their hide products, it became necessary to establish some rule to determine when a calf ceases to be a calf. The hide itself did not seem to give very much information to the customs officers upon this subject of age, and so some other scheme had to be adopted. It was finally determined that if a green hide weighed less than 25 pounds, it was not a hide, but a skin; that if a sun-dried and salted hide weighed less than 15 pounds, it lost its cognomen of "hide" and also became a skin; and if a sun-dried and arsenicated without salt hide weighed less than 12 pounds, it also lost its hide character and became a skin.

Now, every one of these skins gets in absolutely free of duty. Was that the intent of Congress at the time it passed that law? Was there any reason for putting hides upon the protected list that would not also apply to the placing of calfskins that went into the higher-priced shoes upon the protected list?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Does the Senator know that from time immemorial almost—I do not know for how many years—the custom of merchants has been to subdivide the hides or skins taken from neat animals into three classes? Under 15 pounds were classified as "calf," 15 to 25 as "kip," and 25 and above as "hide." This is not an accidental ruling. Every market in the world has come to regard a hide as weighing 25 and above, the kip as weighing 15 to 25 pounds, and a calf under 15 pounds.

Mr. DIXON. Dry hide.

Mr. PAGE. Dry hide, 15 pounds, if dried with salt.

Mr. McCUMBER. Twelve pounds if arsenicated.

Mr. PAGE. Twelve pounds if arsenicated. That is nothing that was discovered afterwards. I know, I want to say, that at the time the bill was passed the matter was discussed. A friend of mine went to Senator Allison and asked him how that law was to be interpreted, and he said, "according to the custom of merchants." It was not a mistake. It was understood beforehand just where the division was to be.

Mr. DIXON. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont a further question. In classifying hides, they take the weight of a green hide as freshly stripped from the animal?

Mr. PAGE. No, sir; a green hide will shrink about one-sixth from the green, with the horns, skull, and tail bone in, to the cured, salted condition in which it is sold in the marts of commerce. The duty applies to what is termed the "green salted," or "cured" hide.

Mr. DIXON. After it is dried?

Mr. PAGE. Not after it is dried, but after it is put in salt and cured; after it is shrunk by taking out the horns, skull, and tail bone, and by the shrinkage which comes by putting on salt, which is about one-sixth of the green, untrimmed weight of the hide.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator's observation does not answer my question whatever. My question was this: What reason is there for placing a duty on what is called commercially "hides" that does not also apply to what is known commer-

cially as "kip" and as "calf" skins? Why should there be protection on hides without any corresponding protection upon kip or upon calf? It requires the same amount of labor to produce one as the other, except that the continuing time and continuing labor may add a little more value to the one than the other from the labor standpoint.

The Senator will remember that when we went from free hides everything had been placed upon the free list prior to the Dingley law. Not only the kip, but the calf and the heavier hides were on the free list. Then we discussed this matter in Congress. I can not find anywhere that there was anything in the debate that led the farmer to believe that the hide of his calf or his yearling was not to be protected. There might have been some understanding with certain Members that they were to make a distinction between the hides of cows and steers above a certain age and hides that weighed a less number of pounds than other hides.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure.

Mr. PAGE. We are not producers to any considerable extent of goatskins. Goatskins are not being produced here, and it was thought best to admit them free of duty. It is a fact to-day that we bring in millions and millions of goatskins and tan them and send them to all the markets of the world. We make a better goatskin in this country than is made anywhere else in the world. I think those who were interested in sheepskins reached the conclusion generally that it was not best to put a duty on sheepskins, perhaps, because many of them came in with wool on. The sheepskin and the goatskin proposition was talked about, and I think there was no question raised as to the advisability of receiving those free of duty; and for reasons which seemed to appeal to them at the time, inasmuch as there was no duty on goatskins and sheepskins, they thought best to take in calfskins free.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can see no reason why, because we were to take in sheepskins and goatskins free, we should necessarily take in calfskins and kipskins free, any more than I can see any reason because we take in sheepskins and goatskins free we should also take in cowhides and steer hides free. We still get back to the simple proposition that there is no logic whatever in making this distinction between the character of the hides upon the cow and the steer and the hide upon the yearling and the calf. So glaring is this inconsistency that it has been surprising to me that neither the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], in whose State an immense quantity of cattle is raised, nor the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who has discussed this question very fully, has attempted in any way to place the duty back upon the calfskin and the kipskin.

A generously inclined Democrat in the goodness of his heart, observing this inconsistency, has come to the relief of the Republican Senators and asked them to place the kip and the calf upon the same basis that we place the cowhide; and I, for one, think that is absolutely right. I do not know what his view is as to whether this duty should be 15 per cent or 20 per cent, but I do know his view is correct, that there should be no difference between the cowhide, the kip hide, and the calf hide.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. PAGE. I believe that the principle of protection involves the hide in general, and that what we can not and do not produce here should come in free. Is that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. McCUMBER. That is all right. I have no objection to your goatskins, for instance. We produce very few of them.

Mr. PAGE. Now, let us pursue that. We tan in this country of hides about fourteen million domestic and perhaps three or four million—I do not carry it exactly—foreign hides. The very large proportion of the hides, the heavy hides, that we consume or use in our tanneries are the home production. When we come to the matter of calfskins it is different. We produce very few goatskins, and the great bulk of our goatskins are raised abroad. We produce a few colt skins, but I do not believe there is a hide house in this country that can furnish 100 or 200 colt skins, while you can go to Russia and buy a million.

The proportion of calfskins which are produced in this country compared with those which we buy abroad is very small. I think there are about five million of our home production, and more than double, I do not know but more than three times, that number imported. There would seem to be good reason for taking in those hides free which we do not produce here in large proportions.

Let me say just one word more and I will stop at that point.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator can go on if he wishes.

Mr. PAGE. This matter was fully discussed. Those who favored free hides in 1897 had the question of calfskins and goatskins and sheepskins brought up for consideration. I do not know, for I have not given it any thought, as to the arguments that prevailed in inducing them to place goatskins, kipskins, and calfskins on the free list. But they discussed it; they were good men; and they reached the conclusion they did.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish the Senator would keep closer to the steer and the calf and leave the goat out of the consideration of this matter. The goat is such a negligible quantity that we do not need to consider him at all, and we should confine our discussion to the question of cowhides and kip hides and calf hides.

Mr. PAGE. Calfskins and kipskins are not under consideration at this time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am considering them at this time. I appreciate the fact that the Senator would like to avoid that consideration, but there is an amendment to this bill pending, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], which does bring them for consideration before the Senate. Now, if the Senator will just stop and think, following out his own argument—that where we do not produce enough to supply the home market, therefore we ought to have the raw material free—and apply it to conditions in his State and to the conditions in all of the Eastern States a few years ago, he will see where he will land. But a few years ago we did not manufacture anything in this country of any consequence; but a few years ago we were importing the great bulk of our manufactured articles. We gave protection so that we might enlarge our production and so that we might hold the American field, which was five times as good as any other field of consumption in the world. We gave you your duties for that purpose. You took advantage of that; and with the duties we gave you upon leather you have advanced until you have taken the entire American market from the foreigner. We want to follow along exactly the same lines. We want such protection upon our calfskins, upon our kips, and upon our hides that we may expand by reason of the greater valuation of those products until we have filled the demand for home consumption. Now let us both take the American field. But you have no right to ask for the entire American field while denying us the same right.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I want to correct the Senator from North Dakota upon another point, if he will allow me. He assumes that Vermont is a tanning rather than a cattle-producing State.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not necessarily.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, our good friends from Idaho are talking about that being a cattle State. Vermont has about 9,000 square miles, and we have almost 50 per cent more cattle in Vermont than they have in Idaho. The garden State of Nebraska raises——

Mr. HEYBURN. May I interrupt the Senator a moment?

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

Mr. PAGE. We have a little more than 500,000 cattle in Vermont.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not see that that settles this question one way or the other, but I am willing that the two Senators shall determine that by figuring it out between themselves.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator from Vermont will permit me, I will suggest that we have about three times that many cattle in Idaho.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, here is a leaflet—I do not know by whom it is published, and I do not care, but it was handed to me by the Senator from Montana. I find therein a statement as to the number of cattle in the different States. Idaho has 76,000 milch cows and 347,000 other cattle, while Vermont has 288,000 milch cows and 214,000 other cattle. I have no means of knowing as to the facts referred to by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], except what I get from this leaflet.

Mr. HEYBURN. How many thousand does that leaflet give for Idaho?

Mr. PAGE. Seventy-six thousand milch cows and 347,000 other cattle.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have a letter from the Hon. Joseph P. Fallon, who is the officer in charge of those statistics in the State. This letter is dated April 26. I asked him for those on the assessment roll, which is not always the full amount, and he gives 303,225 cattle. That does not include other animals that come under the denomination of cattle, but he gives 303,225 of that class.

Mr. PAGE. That is less than I was crediting to the Senator's State. I find in this leaflet 345,000 as being the number of that class.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I am not seeking to pit one class against another in the Senator's State. I appreciate the fact that the farmers—the producers of hides—have not that organization which makes their influence felt, as have the manufacturing industries, including the leather industry, the shoe industry, and the tanning industry. I am assuming that the farmers of the Senator's State are making no complaint, and I am assuming further that they probably have the same view which the Senator has—but it is of little consequence whether they have or not. They may think that they save about as much by reducing the tariff as they make by having it. I will try to convince them before I get through that they are in error upon that assumption.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. PAGE. Excuse me just for a moment. Let me say that we are the great cattle-raising State of this Union, from one point of view. The little 9,000 square miles that we have in Vermont is turned up on edge, and we have not a great amount of tillable land——

Mr. McCUMBER. It is perpendicular.

Mr. PAGE (continuing). But, according to what we have, we can beat the whole world, or, at least, this whole country, in my judgment. We do not confess to the Senator from North Dakota that we are not a great cattle-raising State.

I was about to say that even the State of Nebraska, which has almost all its acreage level, raises less, or has less, cattle to the square mile than has Vermont, rough and broken as our State is. I think I have the right to speak for cattle, and if I believed, as the Senator from North Dakota does, that we were making great gains for our farmers by retaining this duty, I do not know but I should be with him; but I am perfectly satisfied that that is not correct, and that what we gain by the duty on hides we lose by what we pay more for shoes and harness.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will, Mr. President. Still is unanswered my question, What reason is there for levying a duty on hides that *does not apply* to kip and to calf? If there is any Senator on this floor who can answer that question, I am ready to listen to him and hear what his argument is. I will leave that branch unanswered because it is unanswerable.

It often happens that a hide of a small cow will weigh less than that of her yearling steer. Therefore the cowhide may possibly come in as kip and free, and the yearling steer hide, by reason of weighing a trifle more than 25 pounds, will come in as dutiable; but that is not likely to happen. It more often happens that a certain hide weighs a trifle over 25 pounds green, or 15 pounds salted and sun dried, or 12 pounds sun dried and arsenicated; but a very slight trimming of the heavy ends of the legs changes that from hide to kip or calf skin. By that method skins that are actually hides come into this country as calf or as kip and pay no duty.

To an ordinary individual with a fair sense of justice, it would seem that this breaking down of the protection wall affecting such a large percentage of the American-produced hides, together with the drawback provision which exempts imported hides from paying any duty where the articles manufactured therefrom are exported again, ought to satisfy the greed of any class of men. It seems, however, that it does not do so.

The gross injustice of this demand for free hides becomes more startling when we remember that our protective system has built up these leather manufacturing industries until it has enabled them to not only dominate the whole American market, but also to enter into every other market of the world. We have surrendered to them our entire market, and they are now reaching out into the markets of the world.

Having secured these advantages and defrauded the American farmer of a duty on calf hides, they have had their appetites whetted for further advantages, and now, with a lobby, amazing in its power and influence, they seek to destroy the last vestige of protection on American-produced hides.

Mr. President, I want to show the eternal selfishness of the manufacturers of leather in demanding this reduction. The farmer, by his support of the protective tariff for the manufacturer of leather, virtually says to him, "I will not buy a single leather article, boot, shoe, or harness from abroad, but will purchase every one of them from you and at your protective price." "Thank you, Mr. Farmer; much obliged." "But, Mr. Shoeman, I want you to purchase every pound of hide you use for your manufactured article from me at protective rates." "Oh, no; we can not do that. We must have cheaper raw material, so that we may enter the foreign markets. We not only want to compel you to buy our goods at protective prices, so high that they amount to a prohibition of imports and consequent foreign competition, but we want to take away all of your protection, so that we can manufacture at less cost, and thereby sell to the foreigner cheap enough to capture his market." That is the proposition, Mr. President.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Just one moment, and I will yield.

Mr. President, I have heard that the strife for gain sometimes hardens and destroys men's consciences, but I can hardly conceive of a man who would make that proposition without a blush; and yet it is made in this Congress with an aggressiveness that will swerve, I fear, very many from the straight and narrow path of equal rights, equal justice, and equal protection to all.

Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I feel that I ought not to be compelled here to defend my Republicanism and my fealty to the doctrine of protection. Vermont is the one State that always stands up for protection and for Republicanism. Every other State in this Union, even North Dakota, has sometimes gone astray, but Vermont is the star that never sets in Republicanism. Vermont sent here her Collamer, her Foot, her Morrill, her Edmunds, her Proctor, and her DILLINGHAM. Those six Senators have been the sheet anchors of protection since the Republican party was organized. I do not allow any man to say that I stand here for any principle that is not protective, and I dislike to have the Senator accuse me of coming from anything but a cattle State and of being anything but a good Republican.

I want to ask the Senator right here one question: If he could be assured that the additional amount which the cattle raiser receives for his hides because of this duty was offset, or more than offset, by the amount he paid for his shoes, for his harness, and for his leather that goes into carriages, into belting, and into other things—if one absolutely balances the other—would he feel that in that case it would not be best to have free hides?

Mr. McCUMBER. First, Mr. President, I do not feel so, and, second, if I did feel that they just about balanced each other, I would still insist upon the duty for the revenue, if for nothing else.

Mr. PAGE. I suppose we agree that the revenue received from the duty on hides has been less than $2,000,000 per year for the last five years. Am I right about that?

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; that is a nice little sum.

Mr. PAGE. Now, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he has any faith or any belief in the theory which I advanced yesterday and to which he listened with a great deal of intentness—and I was glad to see it—that there is springing up in this country a condition of things which now seems to point to the beef producers of this country going into the markets, buying the hides, and controlling the tanning business with a trust larger than has even been conceived in any other line? I would ask if he would not take that into account and, if it were actual, whether he would not surrender his doctrine of protection in order that a great industry like the tanning industry might prosper?

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not unaware of the aggressive advance of the great beef trust. I am not prepared to say, however, that their advance has in any way depreciated the price of hides. I am not prepared to say that it has not advanced the price of hides by compelling a closer competition between buyers to get the balance of the hides in the United States, but I will take that question up in a very short time. I will not deal with it extensively, because I intend to limit my remarks very much this morning.

I share in the glory of the Republicanism of the State of Vermont during all of these years, and I am sorry myself to see that glory dimmed in any respect by her coming now before the American Congress and asking us to surrender protection in the West for her special benefit or for the benefit of one class of her citizens, because I do not think that it is for the benefit of the farming communities, even of the State of Vermont.

Let us not for a moment forget that nothing which the farmer produces can be properly said to be raw material. Everything is the product of years of labor. Our schedules show that the

farmer's protection, outside of wool, runs from 15 to 20 per cent ad valorem, on wools about 45 per cent ad valorem, while the manufacturer's protection runs from 15 to 100 per cent ad valorem.

I think, if I had time, I could demonstrate that there is not a single thing that is produced upon the farm that does not require more labor to produce for the value that is received for it than any manufactured product in the whole United States.

There are but few instances, Mr. President, where the farmer gets a direct benefit from the tariff. He is getting it to-day upon his wheat; he is getting it to-day upon his barley; he is getting it to-day upon his hides; and he is getting it to-day upon some few other articles, such as live cattle; but he is not getting it upon corn and cotton and many other agricultural products. His benefit, Mr. President, is that which comes out of the increased prosperity of the country, and that is a benefit to him without any possible question. Every page in American history demonstrates that truth to him.

We can divide this country into two great general classes—the farming community, about one-half of the population, which produces the things to eat, and the remainder of the people of the United States producing the things to wear and to shelter us and to transport those things from one part of the country to another; and one trades his commodity for the commodity of the other. If it is essential to the prosperity of the farmer that the manufacturer should be prosperous and thereby enabled to pay a good price for the farmer's product, the reverse is equally true, that the prosperity of the manufacturer depends upon the ability of the farmer through prosperity to purchase the manufacturer's products. The farmer stands ready to give the protection to the manufacturer necessary for him to compete against cheaper foreign manufactured products. He demands in return, and he rightfully demands, equal protection against cheaper foreign agricultural products. Would the Senator from Vermont deny him that right?

The manufacturers of leather goods want the tariff removed from hides. Why? Because it will make hides cheaper. At the same time, they declare that the producer, the farmer, gets no benefit from the tariff. It is difficult to understand how the manufacturers are going to get cheaper hides by the removal of the tariff without injuring the farming producer to the same extent. The manufacturers in this country are too prone to believe that the American market, which has been protected for their interest, is a just subject of spoliation. The whole farming producing country of the United States has been safer for the principle of protection than the manufacturing section of the country.

The Senator is mistaken when he speaks of my State as ever having gone astray in its Republicanism. Not only in territorial days, but through every year of its statehood, it has been a Republican State and has been for protection without one single instance to the contrary.

In each one of our great political battles when the principle of protection itself was at stake, these leather manufacturers, these shoe men, have always looked to the farmer for his support.

When your manufacturing Democratic cities vote the Democratic ticket, you pray for clear weather that you may get the farmer vote to overbalance the Democratic manufacturing votes. Mr. President, you have had throughout the United States no such staunch, unyielding friends for the cause of protection as are found in the rural districts in the United States. They have come to the front every time that the protective principles of the country have been endangered.

Now, if the manufacturing section will just remember that the protection which is guaranteed them by the consumers demand reciprocal consideration, if they will get it out of their minds that they must have free raw material for all their factories while holding the monopoly of the American trade for their product, their attitude will bring about a far better solution of the protection question and place that principle upon a far safer and more enduring basis.

In the discussion of this subject I have heard the word "threat" used. Mr. President, no threat has been uttered. A prophecy has been uttered. The principle of protection is either a national principle or it is nothing. It has got to have universal support or else it has got to go to the wall. You can not protect your manufactured articles and say to the farmer that he shall not have protection as against cheaper foreign production upon those things that he puts years of labor upon. We must stand or fall upon that principle; and certainly, if Congress should so far forget iself that it will vote for no protection to the farmer's product, while voting a duty for the manufacturer's product, certainly we must then agree that the farmer's representatives can not vote a protection for their product. We have either got to stand together for the protective principle or to go together for the free-trade principle.

If there is to be a protective tariff, the farmers and the stock raisers are entitled to an equal share in its benefits. A proposition which denies them the right to free access to the markets of the world for their purchases and at the same time forces them in competition with the lower priced products of the world in their sales is a monstrous proposition. If they are compelled to sell their products in competition with the cheaper products of the world, then they are entitled to purchase their products upon the same basis.

If the American stock raisers and farmers must patronize the American protected market when they buy an article, they have the right for a protected market when they sell an article.

Mr. President, one of the principal reasons for protection is the expansion of a business and the consequent development of the wealth of the country by that expansion. Our farms and our plains are capable of furnishing all of the leather consumed in the United States. We should expand that leather production until we do supply the home demand. These leather manufacturers supply to-day the entire demand of the American people for the manufactured article, and, in addition to that, export a large percentage of their product. And yet in the face of that great privilege they are asking that their customers, the people who buy their products, shall have no protection whatever. They ask the American consumer to not only bind himself to take everything they produce, but also to surrender his own benefits and rights of protection that they may expand their sales in foreign countries, a proposition, Mr. President, that ought to be rebuked by the unanimous vote of an American Congress.

Mr. President, it costs the American farmer and stockman far more to raise his cattle than it costs to raise cattle in Argentina or any other place in South America. This 15 per cent duty, in my opinion, does not measure one-half of the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. It ought to be doubled.

The Senator from Vermont will agree with me that the principle of protection ought, at least, to measure the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. Does this 15 per cent duty equal the difference between the cost of production of a steer or a cow in South America and in the United States? If it does not equal that, then should you not apply to my manufactured articles the same principle that I have tried to apply to yours?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Why has not the farmer, the stock raiser, a right to have applied the same principle of protection to his steers that is applied to any other commodity? I know the Senator's answer. It is all comprised within these few words: That it would be true if the farmer got any benefit, but he does not get any benefit.

Mr. PAGE. That is right, sir—absolutely right.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know what the Senator's view is upon that subject. But that is not the case, as I think I can demonstrate. And I can not understand why the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], a stockman, who has argued this case for hours, has not even suggested that we ought to stand not only for a 15 per cent duty, but we ought to stand for a duty that will measure the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. If the position of the Senator from Wyoming is correct, that we ought to have a duty, then he is irresistibly led by the logic of his argument to the conclusion that we should have a duty of at least 25 or 30 per cent, and not a mere duty of 15 per cent.

Mr. President, the tanners to-day have free access to the markets of the world for everything that they purchase from abroad and export again. What more can they rightfully and conscientiously ask of the American farmer? The injustice of denying the farmer and the stock raiser protection becomes more apparent when we stop to consider the capital invested in raising such stock compared with the capital invested in the manufacturing business. I have made no close estimate; but my observation and my reading lead me to believe that the annual gross product of nearly every manufacturing establishment in the United States equals, or nearly equals, the value of the plant or establishment. In other words, a million-dollar plant ordinarily has a gross output of a million dollars in value.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. In some instances they have much more; in other instances they have much less.

Mr. PAGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. McCUMBER. Just one moment. A million dollars invested in farm lands does not, on the average, produce over $150,000 gross.

Now I will listen to the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is absolutely right so far as the tanning industry is concerned. There are about $250,000,000—$242,000,000, I think—invested in plants, and there is about the same amount of annual product from the tanneries. He is right about that.

Mr. McCUMBER. And I think that will apply to most manufacturers.

Mr. PAGE. And I might go further, Mr. President, and say that nine-tenths of all that the Senator is stating here on this matter is absolutely true and correct; and no one will disagree with him on the great majority of his statements. The trouble is that he starts from a wrong premise, and consequently must reach a wrong conclusion.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will get to the Senator's premises in just a minute, and we will see.

Again, I wish to call attention to the fact that while the boot and shoe manufacturers have exclusive control of the markets of the United States, and, as I believe, by combination or by gentlemen's understanding have fixed the retail prices for practically every article that is produced by them, and in addition are able to enter the foreign fields, about 20 per cent of the hides used in the United States are imported. I believe the estimate is, Mr. President, that we produce in the United States about 714,000,000 pounds of cured hides and import about 134,000,000 pounds. That is exclusive of kip and calf. From these 134,000,000 pounds imported, upon which the duty of 15 per cent is levied, we must deduct 31,000,000 pounds converted into sole leather and leather manufactured articles, upon which a drawback is allowed.

Mr. President, no Senator, save perhaps the Senator from Vermont, claims that anyone will get the benefit of this reduced duty on hides, this injustice to the farmer, except the manufacturer. I have not heard anyone else make what seems to me to be the audacious claim that we are going to get our shoes one penny cheaper than we got them before; that our harnesses are going to be any cheaper; that any other leather manufactured article is going to be any cheaper than it was before. My observation in the mercantile line has been that the prices of commodities are lately being fixed by the ability of the consumer to pay.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. And the prices always reach the limit of his ability to pay. And when hard times come, such as we had in 1907, everything goes down, not because the manufacturers are selling at a loss, but because, there not being the same ability to pay the higher prices, they are compelled to sell at a lower price in order to get consumers.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. With pleasure, Mr. President.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator, I am sure, has read with a great deal of care what has been said before the House committee in regard to the profit on shoes. I believe there is no industry in this country that is so free from combination, that is so free from trusts, that is the subject of such absolutely free competition, as the manufacture of shoes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator a question just at this point. What would become of the merchant down here if he should sell this Douglas shoe that has a $3 brand on it for $2.50?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, Mr. Douglas stated before the commission here—I can not vouch for Mr. Douglas's integrity, because I do not know about it; I only know that he stands very high in Massachusetts—that the profit on his shoes is 7 cents per pair.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not care if it is not 3 cents per pair. I want to know what becomes of the merchant down here if he sells a $3 Douglas shoe for $2.50?

Mr. PAGE. I presume that Mr. Douglas may insist that his retailers shall sell their shoes for a stated price, though I do not know anything about it. But there is one thing that I think there can be no doubt about. The man who buys the Douglas shoe has to pay enough for it so that he can not sell a $3 shoe for $2.50. It probably costs him so much that if he should do that he would suffer a loss.

Mr. McCUMBER. Would Mr. Douglas allow him to sell it for $2.90?

Mr. PAGE. But the point is, Mr. President, that there are, comparatively speaking, only a few Douglas shoes made. We quote Douglas, and we quote a few of these manufacturers who do a large amount of advertising; and they have an especial reason for maintaining their price. I suppose it is a fact that the cost of advertsing and selling some articles in this country is even more than the cost of manufacture. I have heard that stated by good manufacturers—that the cost of selling was more than the cost of manufacturing. That is not true in regard to shoes. But Mr. Douglas spends annually hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising his shoes. What other concern in this country does that?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not run across very many of these philanthropic people who are selling their goods for less than they cost them. There may be a few of them, but I have not yet found them in my travels through the world.

Mr. PAGE. I think it is not fair to characterize the whole shoe-manufacturing industry—which is, in my judgment, as free from combinations as any in the country, and doing business at as small a margin as it possibly can do it—as on a par with Mr. Douglas, who spends a great amount of money, hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, in advertising, and therefore must, in some measure, control the price of shoes. I do not see the logic of the Senator's argument.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will make the logic plain right here. My logic is that if Douglas gets his sole leather for making that shoe on an average of 2½ cents less than he now pays, he is not going to change the price of his $3 shoes to $2.97½. That is the logic of it.

Mr. PAGE. That may be true as to Mr. Douglas; but the shoe manufacturer whose shoe is sold at wholesale for $1.25, with no tariff on hides, has to sell it for $1.35 to $1.40 with the tariff on hides. There is no question about that. When you come to the final consumer he has not only paid the added cost of 10 cents per pair, but he has paid the percentage of profit which the manufacturer adds because of that 10 cents, which is perhaps 2 cents more; he has paid the added profit which the jobber gets, which is 2 or 3 or 5 cents more; then he has paid the added profit or percentage that the seller, the retailer, gets, and in the end, in my judgment, the added cost of 10 cents becomes 20 to 25 cents to the consumer.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, every free trader I ever talked with made the same argument as to every article upon which we levy a duty, that it cost us more than we get out of it.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator further yield?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator if he will apply that to the basic principle upon which we start? Does the hide man get every cent more for his hides that we add as duty or is that in part lost by the foreigner? Does the tanner in buying his hides pay abroad every cent more of the amount of the duty or is that divided between the American farmer and the foreign seller?

Mr. McCUMBER. On hides, my candid opinion is that it is not divided. On many things undoubtedly it is. Why is it not divided? Because, Mr. President, the leather manufacturers of the United States not only demand every hide that we raise in the United States, but they also take in 134,000,000 pounds annually of other hides produced outside, hides of calfs, kips, and goats, and are reaching into the foreign markets; and with that great demand for hides, the value of the American hide is absolutely fixed by the value of the imported hide with the duty added. That is my conviction upon that point.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, suppose I should turn around and say to the Senator from North Dakota that that is just exactly the argument offered by every free-trade Senator in this Chamber, what kind of an answer would that be?

Mr. McCUMBER. There are instances, Mr. President, when the duty is not added to the price. Sometimes an article is sold below the cost of the duty; and when that is done we certainly can not claim that the duty is added to it. Salt, I think, is to-day sold for less than the duty on salt. Certainly it can not be said, therefore, that the duty is added to its price. That is true in the case of a great many articles.

But I believe that there are some few articles, like leather, in the case of which the farmer gets the full 15 per cent duty. I am not saying that the packers of Chicago do not very often buy the hides for less than they ought to pay for them, the same as they buy that which is under the hide for less than they ought to pay for it. All I desire to say is that they could still do the same thing if the duty were off of hides. That would not in the slightest degree affect their combination.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. PAGE. For the sake of reaching a fair basis in this argument, why not let us confess that the price of the hide is increased by the exact amount of the duty? And with the same fairness, instead of branching off and saying that "That is the argument of every free trader," why do you not come down to a square business proposition and say: "We will confess that the price of hides is increased; we will confess with equal fairness that the price of shoes is increased?"

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator has confessed it. I will join my confession to his—that the cost of hides and the value of hides are increased to the extent of the duty. But the Senator's argument was that it is divided; and I was trying to show him that it is not divided in the hide business.

Mr. PAGE. Will you confess the same in regard to shoes? And if not, why not?

Mr. McCUMBER. All right; we will suppose that that is true in the case of shoes.

Mr. PAGE. That is all I ask.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let us suppose it is.

Mr. PAGE. Put them on a parity.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will confess a whole lot more about shoes.

Mr. PAGE. The argument is made to this Senate that the packer, when he goes out to buy the animal, does not look at the number of pounds there are in the carcass, and figure on that; he does not look very much at the number of pounds of hide, and figure on that. He buys the animal mainly for the beef. But I want to say here, in all fairness, that in the discussion of this question as Republicans on this side of the Chamber, I think we should confess that the price of hides is increased by the duty and that the price of shoes is increased by the duty.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; we are on common ground there. I hope the Senator will also confess that while the manufacturers can very easily raise their prices, having the entire American market, whenever the tariff is added, you have no lever to compel them to lower them when you take it away. You do have that lever upon the farmer, because you have the importations to compel him to lower his prices. But you have not that lever upon the shoe man, because you have not any importations of shoes to compel him to lower his prices.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I believe that argument to be absolutely fallacious. Why? Because the increase in the demand for shoes for the past ten years has outgrown by a very large percentage the production of hides. Hides are a by-product. They do not raise hides in Vermont; they do not raise hides in Idaho; they do not raise them in North Dakota. They raise beef and they raise cattle, and the hides are the incident. It is true, and I want to confess it for the sake of being fair, that that is one of the elements that enter into the matter. But, on the other hand, the demand for hides is world-wide and is constantly increasing, and to-day this country is in the strongest kind of competition on hides and on shoes. The only danger of a trust, in my judgment, is that danger which comes to us because the great beef producers, the packers of this country, are embracing in addition to their hide business the leather business. They have gone to tanning, and the result is they are going to establish a monopoly here the like of which this country has never seen. And when I tell you that in New England they to-day control from 75 to 80 per cent of all the hides that are produced, I tell you a fact that is not only true, but can be demonstrated.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well, Mr. President. The Senator has agreed with me that in all probability the price of these shoes will not go down by reason of taking off the tariff. That is all I wanted him to admit.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. I am speaking now of this particular brand of shoes. If it will not be reduced to the extent of the 2½ cents or the 5 cents, or whatever it may be, who will get the benefit of that saving of 2½ or 5 cents—the difference that you unjustly take from the farmer's hides?

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I can not consent to let that statement go unchallenged. I have said nothing of the kind. I do believe that if the tariff is taken off of hides, leather will be lower and shoes will be lower; and when the Senator says that I have conceded that it will not make any difference, he has gone so far wide of what I said that I must protest.

Mr. McCUMBER. I beg the Senator's pardon if I misunderstood him. I was speaking especially of this one brand of shoes. Of course he speaks generally of everything.

Mr. President, I have noticed for twenty years that the value of hides has fluctuated. They have gone up, and they have gone down; but the old $3 brand of the Douglas shoe goes on forever. I have never seen that changed in the slightest degree, no matter what the value of the hides might have been. And I can say that of practically every manufacture of leather that I know anything about. I admit that there are a great many things about which I have not followed the market quotations, and know very little about the retail prices.

It may be interesting to know that while hides declined from January, 1907, to the extent of 28 per cent boots and shoes did not decline 1 cent. They still held their own prices, exactly as they did when hides were 28 per cent higher.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Will the Senator claim that the advance in the price of shoes has been in any respect commensurate with the advance in hides?

Mr. McCUMBER. With the advance in hides?

Mr. PAGE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have stated before that hides fluctuated, went up and went down, but shoes did not. They still held their old price. That means that the price of shoes has remained practically stationary, without going up when hides went up, and without coming down when hides went down. Why? Because it was upon a sufficiently profitable basis to enable it to stand either condition.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am not surprised that the Senator may make a mistake about that. I happen to know that the price of hides has advanced very much more than the price of shoes. There is one thing, however, that I am a little surprised about; and that is, when I stand up here and say that Vermont is the one Republican star that never sets, that he places North Dakota upon a parity with Vermont. I say that because my recollection was—and I had to verify it after he said that I was mistaken—that North Dakota did elect a Democratic governor two or three years ago, and that last year she re-elected him. Am I right about that?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes, on a local issue; but the State has never gone back on the protective principle. It has always sent protectionists here to Congress.

Mr. PAGE. I want to claim for Vermont a little higher grade of Republicanism than you have out there in North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. She has more to cheer her along this line, at all events.

Mr. President, it is said that the tariff does not affect the price of hides. Can it be denied, Mr. President, that the price of American hides will always fall to the level of the price of imported hides after the duty has been paid?

Mr. PAGE. The Senator is absolutely right as to that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Good. Certainly no tanner will pay a higher price for the American hide than he would have to pay for the imported hide. I know the Senator agrees with me in that; but from their arguments, all Senators do not agree with me upon that proposition. Therefore I want to refute those arguments. Then, does it not conclusively follow that by the removal of the tariff on hides the cost of the product will be lessened to the extent of the tariff reduction? In other words, the value of the American hide will have to drop to meet the reduced cost of the foreign hide, and when the tariff is added it adds so much to the value of the American hide.

Let me give a definite case: Here is a lot of hides from Argentina, landed in the port of New York. They cost the importer, after he has paid, say, $15 duty, $100. Here is another lot of hides of the same quality and value lying in a New York warehouse for sale. Does any Senator seriously claim that these latter hides can be sold for more than $100, the price paid for the imported hides? Their price will be fixed by the cost of the imported article, including the duty paid.

Suppose we take off the duty of about $15 on these imported hides. They can then be bought for about $85. Will not the $100 worth of American hides at once drop to $85? And will anyone purchase the American hides for $100 when he can get the same class of imported hides for $85? Mr. President, everyone knows that American hides will immediately become cheaper when we take off the tariff or reduce it to any appreciable extent. That is what the tanners, the shoe men, and the manufacturers want. They do not care anything about the packers' trust. What they want is cheaper hides. They know they will get them by a reduction of the tariff; and they do not care at whose expense they get them cheaper.

There is nothing in the claim, Mr. President, that the tanners are forced to depend upon the packers for hides and skins. They have, first, the whole outside world to draw from. Second, they have 73 per cent of all the home production to draw from. I mean in the case of calf hides and kip hides and cowhides, all together. They have not that percentage, of course, of what are

called "hides" according to the strict definition that has been given to the word. What is the trouble? The trouble is a natural economic advantage which the packers have in making a profit on both the hide and the meat. They can make a profit at both ends and the middle and all along every line of their business, which is denied to the tanner.

Mr. PAGE. And on the leather.

Mr. McCUMBER. The tanner does not stand on an equal footing with them so far as the economy of the production of the finished hide is concerned, either in the matter of purchase or in the matter of tanning. The packers dominate the meat trade of the country. There is no meat imported. Their greater profit in their meat product enables them to do their tanning at a less profit. That is all there is to it. And to equalize this advantage on the part of the packers, the tanners and the manufacturers demand the removal of the 15 per cent duty upon hides. In other words, they want the American farmer to make up the difference in the economy of production between what they convert into leather and what the packers convert into leather. And I for one am not willing to say that we farmers are going to pay it.

Mr. President, these manufacturers seem to ignore the fact that what they call their "raw material" is the farmer's finished product.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Before the Senator leaves the thought he has just had in mind, I should like to ask him if the advantage which might perhaps accrue to the tanner under the circumstances he has detailed would not also accrue to the packer and still leave the packer and tanner in the same relative position.

Mr. McCUMBER. Absolutely. As I stated before with the tariff taken off you are not going to touch the combination; you are not going to prevent the packer having this advantage in buying both the hide and the meat from the same man and the economic operation in changing the meat into the finished product and the hide into the finished product. We can not take that advantage away from them.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator from North Dakota has touched on the vital point of this whole question. He asks "Would not the packer have the same advantage if we remove the duty on hides?" To-day the packer controls forty-odd per cent of all the hides of animals killed in this country, and by the purchase of hides sent to the market by the hide dealers he now controls sixty-odd per cent.

Mr. WARREN. I want to enter my dissent to that and to state that the Senator is mistaken about the amount.

Mr. PAGE. Very well; but the whole point that you ignore is this, that the packer is going into the tanning industry. That is the vital point of this whole matter. In 1897 that condition did not exist. It exists to-day; it is notorious.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator seems to leave out of consideration the fact, which he has admitted again and again, that the taking off the tariff reduces the price of the American article and enables him to get it cheaper. He agrees with me and with the other Senators here that he wants to get it free from abroad, the same, as he claims, that probably the trust does at home, but at the expense of the farmer. In other words, he has got to pay the farmer now $100 where he would have to pay him only about $85 if the duty was off; it would give him that advantage at the expense of the producer.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. It occurs to me that the logic of the Senator from Vermont is this: The duty has enabled the independent tanner to have exactly the same facility in the foreign market that the packer has. I do not suppose the packer would buy hides cheaper abroad than the tanner. They have the open market abroad. It is conceded by the Senator that there are certain advantages of trade which give the packer the control, virtually, of the market in America. The Senator concedes that; I do not. If you remove the tariff, they are still on an equality. I can not follow the Senator's logic whereby the removal of the tariff is going to remove this discrepancy and difference in business conditions.

Mr. PAGE. Because in America they control a large per cent of hides. When you get outside of the country there are millions upon millions of hides that they do not control. They have not their hand upon Argentina yet, but they may have. The whole world is too large even for Swift and Armour to put their hands upon and control, but they are controlling this country, and you say that, having control of this country to-day, the tanners shall not go into the whole world and buy hides.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the whole force of the argument has been summed up by a little expression of the Senator from Wyoming, when he says that the Senator from Vermont asks the Government to go into partnership with the leather trust to beat the beef trust, and the farmer is asked to pay a big price for the club. I am hardly willing to go to that extent, even though it might be that we would like to destroy the beef trust.

The shoe men and the leather men seem to ignore the fact that this very raw material which can be turned a hundred times in a year by the manufacturer, requires from three to seven years to be produced by the farmer. They close their eyes to the fact of the heavy investment of the farmer in his land, of his investment in the cows from which the cattle are bred, of the labor cost in cultivating the land, in plowing it, and harrowing it, and planting it to corn, in cultivating that corn, in husking it, in building structures to hold it, in sowing the land to timothy and clover, in cutting the hay and drying it, in stacking and hauling that hay, and when all this is done in putting up buildings to shelter the stock during all the long winter, and then in feeding that hay into their maws from three to seven years, and finally turning off the meat and the hide as the farmer's finished product.

I want the Senator to recognize that there has been more labor and time and expense and higher labor impressed upon the hides by the farmer than is impressed upon the manufactured article by the manufacturer.

The manufacturer of shoes and leathers wholly ignores in his demand for free hides all of these years of incessant toil. He may be kindly disposed toward his own employees who have their breakfasts at half past 7 in the morning and begin their work at 8 and cease their labors at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. He may be willing to divide a little of that profit that converts from the farmer with his labors. But he seems to be wholly blind to the fact that this stock raiser, this farmer and his boys, are up and feeding their stock at least two hours before the manufacturer's employees sit down to their morning meal; that instead of ceasing their work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon you will find them still doing their chores in the winter time as late as 8 and in the summer time as late as 9 or 10 o'clock at night. The manufacturer wants this farmer and his boys to receive no protection after laboring upon an article for on an average of five years and on an average of at least fourteen hours a day during those five years, while he taxes his shoes and his harness and his buggy tops and everything on earth that he purchases of the manufactured article.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the fact that a great many of these shoe manufacturers say that they would prefer to have free hides and free shoes than to have protected hides with protected shoes. Their self-sacrificing inclination is certainly beautiful to behold, and would be very impressive if we did not stop to analyze it. They have had sufficient protection for probably half a hundred years to keep out foreign shoes altogether and give them exclusive control of the splendid American market. They have developed their plants and their machinery in this atmosphere of protection until they have reached a degree of perfection and economy in the manufacture of shoes that have enabled them, after meeting the home demand, to enter the foreign fields of consumption against the foreign manufacturer not only by exports, but by establishing factories all over Europe. They are employing cheaper labor over there; they are developing their trade enormously, and are now saying to the American people, "You have given us this protection; you have helped us until we got on our feet; you have shielded us against foreign aggression, until we have your market, and until we have built up our factories in the Old World. You can now go to the equator; we do not care whether there is a tariff or not. Why, if you keep the tariff on we will supply the American market from the American factories. If you take it off we will be able to supply the American market from our European factories. We have got you both coming and going."

Mr. President, I not only want this tariff of 15 per cent upon hides, but I want a tariff of at least 25 per cent, not only upon hides, but upon kip and upon calfskins. I want the foreign article legislated against by a tariff duty to an extent that will make the home market so valuable that the hide product will be increased until it supplies the home demand.

The Senator from Georgia the other day stated that we ought to be an exporter of all our agricultural products. I do not concur with him in that. While I do concur in the proposition that if we do raise a surplus of any article, we ought to export it. I am free to say that I would like to see a rearrangement of the agricultural productions of this country so that more land will be used for the production of sheep and their products and cattle and their products and a proportionately less amount sowed to wheat. The wheat acreage to-day is producing a surplus of wheat which must be thrown into the world's market, thereby keeping down the price of the home product, tariff or no tariff. We are still importing hides; we are still importing wool, a very heavy percentage. We are still exporting wheat and flour. Now, if we could expand our wool

product and hide product up to about the limit of the home demand, and decrease our wheat product to about the limit of the home demand, we would enormously advance the price of all three articles. We have got the land in the country; we have got to use it for some purpose. If the raising of cattle and wool is not sufficiently remunerative, we will use that land for raising grain. If we allow heavy importations of wool and hides, we will keep down the price of the hides and the wool, and thereby force the greater production of wheat. If, on the other hand, by a tariff sufficiently high, we keep out the greater portion of the imports of wool and hides, we will raise the value of those articles in this country, use more of our land for the production of those articles, use less for the production of wheat, and thereby also enhance the value of our wheat.

Now, Mr. President, your manufacturers of these leather products have got the entire market of the United States for your product. Why not give us the same thing? Why are we, the farmers, not entitled to the same thing? I should like an answer to that.

Most of the leather men and tanners claim that they are at the mercy of the packers, and I am coming right to that proposition now. In leather manufactures I am taking not only the tanners, but the leather manufacturers of all kinds generally. But even if this were true, is not the farmer who sells the meat that is under the hide equally at the mercy of the packers? And carrying the matter a step further, is not every consumer at the mercy of the manufacturer of all articles of leather?

Go into the market and see if you can get any particular brand of shoe one penny cheaper in one city than you can get it in another, in San Francisco a cent cheaper than in Denver. You will find such a combination as prohibits the retail dealer from selling a shoe for any less than a certain specified price.

I am not saying, Mr. President, that the prices are not reasonable. I am assuming that they are; but the best information that I can get is that generally in all these known brands of shoes there is no competition. There may be in some of the cheaper lines of shoes.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROOT in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to know why the Senator picks out one manufacturer, or two or three, of shoes who makes a very, very small percentage of the great aggregate and couples the whole trade with them?

Mr. McCUMBER. I can probably pick out dozens of those, and, taking all the manufacturers, it is probably the greater proportion.

Mr. PAGE. That is a mistake as wide as anything could possibly be. The great manufacturers of shoes in this country, extending from one end to the other, make shoes that are sold through the jobbers. I do not know what the per cent is, but the Senator is certainly far away from the fact when he says that men like Douglas, who make a widely advertised shoe, control the market. It can not be true.

Mr. McCUMBER. I mean all of the better shoes that are used by the American people generally, and probably by the greater majority of them. The American people wear pretty good shoes these years. I saw an exhibit here the other day of a pair of shoes. It appealed to my younger days very much, when I used to be upon the farm. I can not imagine how they can sell a great many pairs of those shoes in a year, because, as I remember, they would last a boy a lifetime. They were so hard you could not make a dent in them even with an ax. I can not suppose that there is any great quantity of those shoes being consumed by the American people.

But, Mr. President, these manufacturers are not at the mercy of the packers, by any means. First, they have the entire outside world to purchase from.

The Senator admits that the packers have not got control of the outside world as yet.

Mr. PAGE. That is right.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then the tanners have got an equal chance for all the hides produced outside of the United States, and they have an equal chance for the greater amount of hides produced in the United States.

Let us see. In 1907 we imported:

	Pounds.
Hides, dutiable	134,671,020
Skins, not dutiable	120,770,918
Total	255,441,938

They could have purchased every pound of these imported hides, if they desired, and they probably did purchase a greater quantity of them, as I understand very little of the imported hides are purchased by the great packers. They had the same opportunity as the packers. It was only a question of who would pay most for them. Second, about 73 per cent, now mark you, of the hides of cattle and calves produced in the United States are not owned or produced by the packers. They have all this 73 per cent to draw from. The total number of cattle slaughtered at the packing establishments last year was about 5,320,000. The total number, exclusive of calves, slaughtered in the United States is approximately 12,500,000. There are slaughtered elsewhere in the United States, exclusive of calves, 7,180,000.

Out of 71,267,000 cattle in this country, more than 2,000,000 die of disease or by accident, and from that source comes probably 1,000,000 fallen hides. All this is available to the tanner.

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 slaughtered in the United States of 18,500,000 head of cattle and calves, and so forth.

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.

These people who claim that they are at the mercy of the Chicago packers must not forget that from 40 to 45 per cent of the cattle purchased in Chicago are not slaughtered there—are not slaughtered by the packers—but are sent to the different States and generally to the Eastern States, where they are further fattened and slaughtered. That brings hides right home to the eastern manufacturer.

The total number of cattle marketed in Chicago in 1907 was about 3,305,314; calves, 421,943; total, 3,727,057.

Of the cattle thus marketed there were from the western ranges 377,000, or 11.4 per cent. The balance came mainly from the corn belt States, Iowa leading.

The following table will show the importations into this country since 1898.

I want to give the first table:

Total slaughter, exclusive of calves	12,500,000
Slaughtered by the trust, exclusive of calves	5,000,000
Fallen hides	1,000,000
	18,500,000
Less the packers	5,000,000
Total	13,500,000

The large packers would then produce 27 per cent, and from all other sources 73 per cent.

Now, the shoe men or leather manufacturers have 73 per cent of the home product and all of the foreign product that is imported into this country to go to, as against the trust production in the United States.

I have here a table of the imports into the United States of hides and skins other than furs, which I ask may be incorporated in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

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

Year ending June 30—	Cattle hides.			
	Dutiable.		Nondutiable.*	
	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	10,989,635	103,024,752	17,045,304
1905	113,177,357	14,949,626	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

* 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.

Mr. McCUMBER. If there are those who doubt that the duty on hides is a benefit to the American farmer, the following

table showing the greatly increased importation of hides and skins prior to the adoption of the Dingley tariff may be interesting:

	Pounds.
1902	319,094,698
1903	274,733,467
1904	337,874,862
1905	425,280,110
1906	370,983,815

This will show the enormous amount of hides that were imported over and above what has been imported under the protective system, and as everyone understands the value of the hide is fixed by the quantity of hides at the place of consumption—the less of the imported hides you bring into the United States the greater the value of the home-produced hide at the place of protection.

I carried on this colloquy a little longer than I intended. I have, I think, demonstrated one thing, and all agree with me upon that; first, that the 15 per cent duty is a benefit to the farmer. I think I have demonstrated another thing, that the farmer ought to have double that instead of 15 per cent. I think it needs no demonstration whatever to convince every Senator that if he is entitled to 15 per cent or 30 per cent upon the hide he is entitled to the same amount upon the kip and upon the calfskin. I think it is almost self-evident to everyone that we are not going to get any reduction in the price of the manufactured article by reason of taking off the tariff. There is just one thing that will reduce the value of the manufactured article, and that is hard times, when the consumer will not be able to pay the present price; and if we have good times, as I believe we will when we get through with this tariff, the chances are that it is going to raise the prices about to the ability of the American consumer to pay, tariff or no tariff.

Mr. McLAURIN obtained the floor.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to have a moment for a question.

Mr. McLAURIN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator from North Dakota said that he would instruct me or he would give the Senate facts in regard to the duty on hides. I understood him to make that statement in answer to a question. I should like to have him tell the Senate what he thinks the actual gain to his North Dakota farmer is on each hide, if he has figured it out, because I think that is a very important point to be brought out in this discussion.

Mr. McCUMBER. That would depend entirely upon the weight of the hide. Take the number of pounds in the hide and add 15 per cent to it. The Senator can determine what it would be just as well as I could. I simply say that he gets 15 per cent benefit, or $15 on every hundred dollars' worth of hides.

Mr. PAGE. I can make the computation in a minute, if the Senator will yield to me.

I have since yesterday figured it to a penny. I took the values of hides for several years, as given by the representative of the Cattle Dealers' Association here, and they averaged nine and a fraction of a cent per pound. The average of hides has been for the twelve years reported 8.96. Now, that represents 115 per cent of the value of foreign hides. In other words, the foreign hide would be worth 7.79, leaving the duty on a pound of hides 1.17 cents. The average weight of hides, as I know it to be in New England, is 48 pounds. In the West it may be as much as 58 pounds.

Mr. McCUMBER. The western hide is a thicker hide.

Mr. PAGE. I am sure it is. I believe that the average weight is 53 pounds, taking the East and West together. This gives us a duty of 62 cents on each hide, or 62 cents and a very small fraction.

The claim of the senior Senator from Wyoming is that we have 10,000,000 farmers. It is an admitted fact that the number of hides slaughtered annually is 14,000,000, or 1.4 hides to each farmer of the country. Sixty-two cents per hide, multiplied by the number of hides produced by each farmer—1.4—gives the average farmer 86.8 cents as the total supposed benefit accruing to him from this duty, provided he gets the whole duty.

Now, just one word further. I want to tell the Senate what has gone out to the world from the western people in regard to this matter. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some statistics put in by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] yesterday:

> 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.

Now, think of the facts as they are and as they are here represented.

I want to go a little further. They have even gone so far as to say that $1 per hide is added on calves and that the packer benefits $3,016,241 on calves, being a dollar apiece. I want to say to Senators that the cost of bringing a calfskin from Havre, France, to this country is 14 cents per hundred pounds. I do not know what it is from Denver to Chicago, but I am sure that it is more than five, and I guess it is more than seven, times as much. Trade is absolutely free on skins, and the price of calfskins is not changed one single mill by the 15 per cent duty, while the representations of the western cattlemen are that the duty on hides increases the value of calfskins $1 each.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, the question as to whether hides shall be taxed or whether they shall go upon the free list is not involved in the amendment. The only question involved in the amendment is whether or not it is right to discriminate against the producer of small hides in favor of the producer of large hides, and not, I was about to say, in favor of the manufacturer of leather and shoes; but it is only the question of whether it is right to discriminate in favor of the large hide against the small hide. That was the only question which I presented to the Senate yesterday. I was not in that discussion interested in any other question involved in the amendment, but only in the question involved in the amendment which I offered to the amendment of the committee.

I thought then, and I think now, that if the producer of a hide weighing 25 pounds or more shall be permitted to obtain the advantage of a revenue tariff or a protective tariff, the same advantage ought to go to the producer of a hide which weighs less than 25 pounds. All that I rose yesterday for was to explain to the Senate that this was the only question involved in the amendment which I introduced.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], however, took occasion to argue against my amendment and to felicitate himself upon the fact that the Treasury Department had made a ruling which cut out all hides under 25 pounds. He made a speech, which has many splendid points in it, and I am not here to criticise any Democratic point in his speech; but it had points in it which are not, in my judgment, Democratic, because I do not believe that it is Democratic to put a protective tariff upon shoes that will compel the wearer of shoes to pay a higher price for them, and to put upon the free list the hides of the farmer who wears the protected shoe, and thereby enable the manufacturer of leather and of shoes to purchase the hides of the farmer at a lower price.

It is admitted now that the duty on any article is added to the price of that article. It has been the doctrine of the party to which the Senator from Virginia and I have all of our lives belonged that the amount of the duty on any article is added to the price of that article; and that doctrine is now becoming recognized not only by the Democratic party, but by the Republican party, for you have heard it argued, asserted, and admitted here time and again by Republican Senators during this discussion that the amount of the tariff is added to the price of the article. That was admitted by both the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] in their colloquy just a few moments ago. It has been asserted, as I understood them, by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], and by a number of other Senators that the amount of the tariff is added to the price of the article upon which the duty is laid. That being so, Mr. President, there is no benefit to the wearer of shoes by giving to the manufacturer of shoes free hides.

The Senator from Virginia declaimed eloquently in favor of allowing people who are to wear shoes to get them at a cheap price. I propounded the query to him whether he was willing to vote for free leather and free shoes as well as for free hides. That question he did not answer. The amount of the tariff goes into the cost of the hide to the manufacturer, but it does not go into the price of the shoe to the wearer. In the very nature of the case it can not do so. The manufacturer of the shoe, when he goes to sell to his customer, raises the price of his shoe the amount of the duty upon his shoe. If he raises it more than that, the importer will come in, compete with him, and undersell him. Therefore he can raise it that much, and does raise it that much, and no more. It does not make any difference to him whether he gets his hides free or whether he pays a tariff upon his hides; he raises the price of his shoes the amount of the tariff upon shoes, and no more, just as I have said, because if he raises it higher than that, the importer will undersell him, and the customer will buy from the importer instead of the manufacturer.

The same rule holds good with the tanner. The large tanneries of this country raise the price of their leather to the extent of the duty on leather, just exactly as the manufacturer of shoes raises the price of his shoes the amount of the duty upon shoes that much, and no more. So the question of the price of shoes is not affected at all by the tariff upon hides. The only question involved in it is whether the shoe manufacturer and the manufacturer of leather will get the benefit of

the tariff or whether the Government will get it. That is the only question involved in the amendment offered, which proposes to put a duty upon hides if the duty remains upon leather and shoes.

Mr. President, the ruling, upon which the Senator from Virginia felicitated himself, which put all hides under 25 pounds on the free list cost the Government of the United States in the years from 1899 to 1907, inclusive, more than $16,000,000 of revenue. Does anybody who knows anything about the question at all suppose that that amount of revenue was left in the pockets of the wearers of shoes which were purchased from the manufacturers of the shoes? A boy 15 years old could go into a bookstore and butt his head against the counter and know more than that. It went into the pockets of the manufacturer of shoes and of leather.

Now, I refer to page 479 of Imports and Duties, and I ask that Table No. 2043, calfskins, including the years from 1898 to 1907, inclusive, be appended to my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

No. 2043.—Calfskins.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Rate of duty.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty collected.	Average.	
					Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
		Pounds.				*Per ct.*
1898	15 per cent	1,647,465	$280,859.00	$43,478.85	$0.176	15
	Free of duty	10,085,978	1,473,287.00		.146	Free.
1899	do	24,659,369	3,616,434.27		.147	Free.
1900	do	44,403,466	7,177,053.60		.161	Free.
1901	do	34,466,797	5,695,394.66		.165	Free.
1902	do	39,679,119	6,820,631.98		.172	Free.
1903	do	34,074,137	5,837,877.67		.171	Free.
1904	do	34,501,775	5,862,988.99		.17	Free.
1905	do	50,144,313	9,775,400.02		.195	Free.
1906	do	56,102,594	11,466,027.64		.204	Free.
1907	do	48,991,055	11,163,702.51		.227	Free.

Mr. McLAURIN. This table shows that in 1907 the imports of calfskins into this country amounted to 48,991,055 pounds. The value was $11,163,702.51. Estimating the tariff which then existed upon hides it would be a little more than two and three-fourths million dollars. For 1906 the amount was $56,102,594 pounds, valued at $11,456,027.64. The tariff on that would have been considerably more than two and three-fourths million dollars. The other is from the time that the calfskins were put upon the free list by the ruling of the Treasury Department, taking on down from 1899 to 1900, 1901, and so forth, and they are something less, but they increased every year up to 1906, and then they decreased for 1907.

Mr. President, the tariff upon shoes amounted last year to a little more than $41,000. The tariff upon hides was nearly $3,000,000. Do you propose to leave the tariff on shoes, which will enable the manufacturers of shoes to tax the consumer to the extent of 15 per cent, to take the tariff entirely off of hides and give that to the manufacturers of shoes, not to the Treasury of the United States? That is the proposition involved in putting hides upon the free list and leather and shoes upon the dutiable list. I am not in any sense a protectionist, as those who advocate the unjust and unequal doctrine of the Republican party are called, but whose doctrine could more properly be denominated "extortion." The fact that only $41,000 was collected from the importation of shoes evidences that few shoes were imported, and therefore that the manufacturers of shoes had practically a monopoly of the shoe business of this country and could tax the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer as they pleased.

If I could have my way, I would put leather and shoes and hides all upon the free list. Why? Because if you put boots and shoes upon the free list it will enable the wearer of shoes to purchase his shoes that much cheaper—15 per cent cheaper than if the duty is upon the shoes. Then if you put shoes upon the free list, the tariff must necessarily be taken off of leather. Leather must necessarily go upon the free list; and if you put leather upon the free list, necessarily you must put hides upon the free list. This would reverse the order of the Senator from Virginia. He said that if you should cut the sill and destroy it the fabric would come down. That may be so; but the foundation of this is not the tariff upon the hides, but it is the tariff upon the shoes. When you put the tariff upon shoes, the next tariff comes upon leather; then the next tariff comes upon hides; but if you take the tariff off of shoes, then you must necessarily take the tariff off of leather and off of hides. So that the foundation of this, the sill of this, is not the tariff upon hides, but the tariff upon shoes.

Mr. President, men do not wear green hides nor dry hides; they do not wear shoes made of green hides nor dry hides; but they wear shoes made of leather. Therefore, taking the tariff off of hides can not affect the price of shoes; it can not affect the consumer of shoes. For this reason I am in favor of putting all three of these articles—hides, leather, and shoes—upon the free list; but I am not in favor of putting a tariff upon shoes that will enable the manufacturer of shoes to sell his product higher to the wearer of the shoe, the consumer of the shoe, and taking it off of hides, and taking the revenue that is produced from hides out of the Treasury, thereby allowing the manufacturer of shoes to buy from the farmer the raw material, the hides, at a cheaper price.

This revenue must be made up somewhere by somebody. If the duty is taken off of hides, then the $3,000,000, which is taken out of the Treasury of the United States by putting hides upon the free list and putting that $3,000,000 into the coffers of the shoe manufacturers must be made up by a tariff taxation upon the people on some other product. If you put shoes on the free list and leather on the free list, then I will vote for putting hides on the free list; but if shoes are put on the dutiable list and leather on the dutiable list, I shall vote for a tariff on hides, provided all hides are included.

It has been said by the Senator from Vermont that it is known in technical parlance that calfskins are those weighing up to 15 pounds, and between 15 pounds and 20 pounds are called "kipskins," and after that they are called "hides." I do not believe that the language employed by Congress putting a duty of 25 per cent upon all hides was intended to be construed by that technical parlance, but it was understood to be a tariff upon the skins of animals, whether they weighed 1 pound or whether they weighed 25 pounds. The same reasoning, as was so well said by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], for putting a tariff on hides weighing 50 pounds exists for putting a tariff on hides weighing 10 pounds. That same reason must have moved the Congress in putting a tariff on hides. When we begin to construe the language of Congress and to interpret the intention of Congress we do it by getting at the reason and the motive that prompted Congress in the enactment of the law; and the same reason, as was well said by the Senator from North Dakota, that would prompt the putting of a tariff on hides weighing 50 pounds would prompt the putting of a tariff on hides weighing 10 pounds.

It is understood all over the country that when we speak of hides we speak of the hides of all animals, however small, and it is the common understanding of the people of the country who are to be governed by the law, and this construction ought to be given by all those who administer the law.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. PAGE. I think I can say, without any question, to the Senator from Mississippi that the matter was carefully considered and discussed at the time of the enactment of the Dingley bill. My reason for saying that is this: As a dealer in hides and calfskins I was very much interested, as I thought then—I do not think so much so now—in that matter. I wrote to Senator Proctor, who was my intimate friend, and asked him if the provision covered calfskins as well as hides. He went to Senator Allison and, after conferring with him about it, wrote me. He said:

> I have been to Allison, who knows all about this matter, and he tells me that they have decided not to place a duty upon skins, but only upon hides.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, when we want to get at the meaning of the language of Congress, we do it by taking the common understanding of the common people as to that language and what it means. The law is made to govern all the people, and ought to be in language that all the people can understand. What is the meaning of it as understood by all the people of this country? What do we understand? You may go to a thousand farmers in this country and you may ask them the question, "What does 'hide' mean?" And they will tell you that it means the hide of a yearling just as much as it means the hide of a steer. If you have not raised this question with them, you may take a thousand men, and they will tell you that they never heard of the word "hide" meaning anything else but the hide of an animal. So you are not to take the private understanding of this man or of that man, but you are to take the understanding that is given by the language

used, the import of that language, and the import of that language is that "hides" means hides.

I know it has been said that nobody engages in the business of raising hides; that they raise beeves, but not hides. I should like to see that breed of hideless beeves. I have never seen one of them yet, and until this discussion came up I never heard of a hideless beef. I thought all beeves had hides and that the hide was a part of the beef, just exactly as much as his eyes or his meat or any other part of him, and anything that is valuable about him for sale goes into the price of the purchase.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. PAGE. I do not rise to further discuss the question of the duties on hides. I have already taken more time than I ought to have done, but the Senator says that the farmers of this country would all say that the language of this applies to all *classes* and *all* weights of hides. That is true; but the Senator unquestionably knows that the language which governs tariff bills is the language at New York before the Board of Appraisers.

Mr. McLAURIN. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not understand that, unless the language of New York is just exactly the same as the language of the remainder of the country.

Mr. PAGE. I only know that that is the general understanding. I know that I was very much interested in a decision on lumber. Once the question arose as to what was a manufacture of wood and what was a dressed board. I was before the Board of Appraisers for weeks, and this illustrates this case pretty well. The Board of Appraisers held, first, that a board that was surfaced and planed and matched, we will say, or edged, was a dressed board only, but the lumbermen claimed it was a manufacture of wood. Different pieces of wood were brought in there; some were planed and matched, some were planed on two sides.

Those who contended that such wood was not manufactured wood were able to present in the course of that discussion pieces of board, all of which those who claimed a matched board was simply a dressed board said were clearly dressed boards and not manufactures of wood. But an expert came there, and picking up those pieces, in about a minute he put together one of the finest molded window frames. It was so nicely done that those who claimed that matched boards were not manufactured wood were astounded and they were convinced—although the Supreme Court afterwards overruled the decision—that they were wrong.

The point is that you go by the decision of the Board of Appraisers. They have had a long experience in deciding what *this or that article is*, and they come after a time to take the common understanding among the merchants as to what is a hide, what is a kipskin, what is a calfskin, and that rules rather than the understanding of the farmers of the country.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I think the laws ought to be interpreted according to the common understanding of our language, and not to any occult meaning that is to be given to it by any cult of any kind. I feel that it is a dangerous thing for the people to find upon the statute books a law which is in language that is understood by all the people of the country to mean one thing, except by a few people who are a society unto themselves, and who have a meaning that is a secret meaning to themselves. The laws ought not to be secret; the laws ought to be open, and they ought to be in language that will be understood by all the people of the country. That can not be done unless you adopt in your laws the language of the plain, common people of the country.

Mr. President, I have taken a great deal more time than I intended, but the interruptions have caused me to say more than I intended to say; not things that I would not have said if they had occurred to me, but more than I intended to say at the time I rose.

I want to be understood as being opposed to this discrimination and to register my voice here as well as my vote against any discrimination between hides of small cattle and the hides of large cattle, between the man who is not able to drive his great herds to market and the man who is able to drive his great herds to market.

It ought to be understood by the people of this country that when the Congress of the United States assembles, it assembles for the purpose of representing everybody, and that the man who is not able to come and lay his case before the committee will have justice administered to him as faithfully, as impartially, and as equally as the man who is able, out of the abundance of his wealth, to come before the committee and advocate special privileges and special laws in his special behalf. I am not in favor of that. I still believe that it is the first downward step in the destruction of this Government or in the destruction of any government by your laws' discrimination to say that no man can get right and justice in this country by the representatives that are sent by the people of the country to legislate for them unless he comes himself and advocates before the committee and before the Senators and before the Representatives in Congress the interest that he has in common with all the other common and plain people of the country.

I can not without registering my voice as well as my vote against this proposition permit it to go to a vote. I hope my amendment to the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. President, it was my purpose to submit at some length some observations upon the pending question, but it has been discussed at such length, and every phase of it has been so fully covered, I feel as though it would be an imposition upon the Senate to unduly trespass upon its patience or to overtax its indulgence. I will endeavor in what I have to say to be brief, and will not dwell unduly or at length upon statistics covering the industries involved. They have already been largely submitted by those who have addressed the Senate.

Mr. President, although my vote on this question will not be governed by the interests in my own State alone, yet I feel, in justice to the farmers and stock raisers of South Dakota, I should make my position known and do everything possible to conserve and protect this important industry of my State.

South Dakota stands ninth among the States of the Union in its live-stock interest. As shown by the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, it had on January 1, 1908, a total of 2,034,000 cattle and milch cows, with a farm valuation of $42,663,000.

The people of the State therefore have a vital and a pressing interest in the question now under consideration. They feel the rate of duty proposed is just and equitable, and that they are beneficiaries thereunder. To remove the present rate of 15 per cent and subject them to the free competition of the foreign producer, to my mind is unfair and unjust, and under the conditions proposed is utterly indefensible.

If, however, the farmers and stock raisers of the country had the slightest assurance that by a removal of the duty any benefit or advantage whatever would inure to them or to the general public, in the lowering of the price of boots and shoes, or of any of the products of leather, there might be some reason or justification upon which to base this demand. But neither from the witnesses who testified in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House or before the Finance Committee of the Senate, nor in the speeches that have been made here, has any assurance been given that any benefit, direct or indirect, would accrue to the consumers of leather products, or that the prices in any respect would be lowered.

Mr. President, for such a demand to be made, and under such circumstances, it seems to me unfair, unjust, and, to state it mildly, utterly selfish. The proposition made is that the farmer and stock raiser are to be sacrificed, and they are to be stripped of the protection afforded them, while the tanners and the manufacturers of boots and shoes and of all the products are to retain the rates of duty under the provisions of the bill. The further suggestion is made that the hide of the steer is the raw product, and, under the rule proposed, should be admitted free of duty. This, it seems to me, is a false doctrine, and, in fairness to the farmer, can not and should not be urged. It has already been fully answered, and I do not feel like trespassing upon the patience of the Senate to review it.

But the steer is the product of three or four years of care, of expense in capital invested in the farms, in wages paid to employees, in the consumption of the products of the farm on which he is fed to maturity, including the risks of loss by disease or otherwise. To the farmer the steer ready for market, with the hide, is the finished product as far as he is concerned. Technically, the hide may be the raw material to the tanner. But it is no more the raw material to the tanner than the product of the tanner is to the maker of boots and shoes or to the harness maker or the saddler or any of the other finishers of leather.

I submit, Mr. President, the producer of hides, in all fairness, is entitled to a like degree of protection, the same as the tanner and the manufacturer of its products. He is obliged to meet the same competition from the foreign producer. He has capital invested, he has labor to pay, he bears the risks and uncertainties of the business. If the hide market of this country is to be opened to the free competition of the world, what superior claims have the tanners or the manufacturers of boots and shoes or the manufacturers of leather in any form over those of the American farmer?

I submit, Mr. President, if this duty is to be removed entirely I can see no just ground why the duties on leather or any of

its products should be retained on the dutiable list. The same argument applies to the one as to the other.

Much has been said in this debate, largely, it seems to me, to divert the issue that the present duty, like the one proposed, is in the interest of the great packing industry or beef trust, and that now the farmers receive no benefit from the duty now in force. It occurs to me it has been clearly demonstrated in this discussion by abundant proof that the farmers do receive the full rate of protection from the present duty. I am not here to justify the packers or speak in their defense. If they are violators of the law, let the machinery of the courts be brought into execution, that they may obey it. It should not be insisted here that the farmers of this country, through this legislation, should bear the responsibility for the wrongdoing of others.

According to the statistics submitted this morning by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the product of the hides controlled by the beef trust is 27 per cent. No one during this debate has placed the amount over 43 per cent of the annual production of the entire country. I regret this as much as anyone, but it has not been demonstrated by any suggestion made during this debate that the removal of the duty would alter or change existing conditions, as far as this particular trust is concerned. This situation must be met in some other way, and can not be relieved in the manner suggested.

This same argument was invoked and the same issue raised twelve years ago, when the duty was placed on hides in the Dingley Act.

The duty proposed could be sustained upon the ground of revenue alone. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] a few moments since made reference to it as a source of revenue and declared it produced upward of $3,000,000. To be exact, Mr. President, for the year 1907 the duty on hides produced $3,115,390; but it must be remembered there was returned in drawbacks to the importers of foreign hides $907,386, leaving a net revenue of $2,208,004.

If it were demonstrated that the manufacturers of boots and shoes and of leather had not been successful in their business and were not now successful, there might be some justification or excuse for them making the plea for a reduction of this duty. These industries, however, have been most prosperous during the time this duty has been in force. If the duty is to be removed and the farmer and the producers of cattle and live stock are to meet the competition of the world in the free importation of hides and the lower rate of wages of foreign countries and the less investment of capital on account of cheaper lands, then the same rule should be applied to the manufacturers of leather products. Considering the number of people engaged in the raising of cattle and the capital invested in the industry, it occurs to me at least a like consideration should be shown to the farmers and stock raisers as to the boot and shoe manufacturers or the producers of leather.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. GAMBLE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish to suggest to the Senator that probably a majority of those who favor taking the duty off of hides favor removing, or at least very materially reducing, the duty on boots and shoes. One may vote to take the duty off of hides because he does not believe the duty does anyone any good. He may vote to take the duty off of boots and shoes for a similar reason. But he never ought to vote to take them off simply because the duty has been taken from something else. If, however, he believes, as I do and as others do, that the duty on boots and shoes is unnecessary, he should vote to take it off.

But here is another question that I should like to submit to the Senator: I advocated the removal of the duty on hides because the duty, as interpreted, only applies to certain kinds of hides; and the average farmer, in my judgment, does not get any benefit from that duty. That benefit is so diminished that by the time it gets into active operation the ordinary small farmer gets nothing from it. That is my objection to it. On the other hand, I would be in favor, if we tax any hides, of taxing all hides. And while the man who produces a hide is laboring under one condition, and the man who is producing a shoe is laboring under another, and there is no analogy, yet the men who produce hides that weigh 25 pounds and hides that weigh 15 pounds are laboring under precisely the same conditions. And why should they not both have the same benefit?

I should like to ask the Senator that question.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestions made by my distinguished friend, I will say that I am in favor of a retention of the existing duty upon hides. I am also in favor of a proper duty upon boots and shoes and all of the products of leather, so that the wage-earner upon the farm and elsewhere, and the farmer and stockman who have their investments in the farm and in the cattle, may be protected against foreign competition at a less investment and at a lower wage rate. And in view of the great production of cattle in Argentina and other South American countries on their cheap lands and at a low wage scale and the danger from large importation from that source and with cheap ocean freight rates, I would protect the farmer at least in the present duty upon hides. I would also protect the tanner, the manufacturer of boots and shoes, and the manufacturer of all the products of leather with a proper, fair, and just rate, so that they, in like manner, would be protected from foreign invasion and against the cheaper labor from abroad.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, whether the person engaged in the business of the production of the hide, or in its tanning, or in the manufacture of its product, there should be the same fair and equitable rule applied to the one as well as to the other. I find the number of wage-earners in the tanning and finishing business and in boots and shoes in 1905, as returned by the Bureau of the Census, was 219,435, and the output for that year, as shown by the returns of the Government, was $572,728,000. This represents large and substantial interests not only in wage-earners, but in the extent of the manufactured product, and should be conserved and is entitled to receive the most careful consideration of this Congress in the provisions of the pending bill. When, however, we compare the foregoing in the aggregate, in the number of people directly engaged therein and in the capital invested, the producers of hides far overreach the other, not only in number, but in the amount of the investment.

I find that—as shown by the census returns for 1905—the invested capital in the boot and shoe industry and in the leather and tanning industry aggregated $365,000,000, and the number of employees, as I heretofore stated, 219,000. The number of males engaged in agriculture and directly or indirectly interested in the production of live stock, as shown by the census of 1900, aggregated 8,771,000, and, I presume, at this time they have nearly reached 10,000,000. Independently of the investment in the farm or the matters necessarily connected with this great industry, the value of the live stock upon the farms alone on January 1, 1907, as shown by the report of the Department of Agriculture, aggregated $2,153,320,439.

I do not claim this is a matter that should be decided simply according to the amounts involved or the number of those engaged in the different industries; but what I do say is that in legislating on these related interests, and especially when the one is antagonizing the other and when the law proposed to be enacted is liable to remain in force for an indefinite period, there should be fairness and equity in the rates prescribed and in justice to all the interests involved. Mr. President, the statistics of the Government show the development and growth and prosperity of these two great industries—the boot and shoe and the leather industry.

I will not take the time of the Senate to review all of the statistics given. I find in the Statistical Abstract for 1907, in the case of the boot and shoe industry, that the capital invested in 1900, practically three years after the passage of the Dingley law, was—I will only give round numbers—$99,819,000, and in 1905 the capital invested had increased to $122,526,000. The average number of wage-earners had increased from 141,830 in 1900 to 149,924 in 1905. The total wages paid in 1900 were $58,440,000, and in 1905 they had increased to $69,059,000. The value of their products, Mr. President, great as they are, had increased amazingly—from $258,969,000 in 1900 to $320,107,000 in 1905.

Take the industry of leather, tanned, curried, and finished. With $173,977,000 of capital invested in 1900, it had increased to $242,584,000 in 1905, and in the number of employees from 52,239 in 1900 to 57,239 in 1905. The total wages paid in 1900, $22,591,000, had increased to $27,000,049 in 1905; and the output had increased from $204,038,000 in 1900 to $252,620,000 in 1905.

Mr. President, it seems to me these great interests and industries dependent upon the product of the farmer as the producer of the hide have been wonderfully prosperous during the years while the present rate of duty has been in force. They have not only taken possession of our own markets, but have come into direct competition with all the markets of the world. And I find, Mr. President, as to the exports, that for the year 1907 there were 5,883,914 pairs of boots and shoes exported, of a value of $10,666,000; and during the past twelve years this great industry in export trade has increased from $1,436,000 to $11,469,000 during the last fiscal year, an increase of 1,000 per cent.

Mr. President, should there be any complaint made by this industry against existing conditions when such a tremendous showing has been made? It has been enabled, as I say, to possess itself of and retain the domestic market, which is the greatest market of the world, and has exported $11,500,000 of their product during the past fiscal year. The duty the Government has provided for this industry has aided in preserving the domestic market, because I find that in 1906 the quantity of boots and shoes imported from foreign countries was of the value of $43,000, and since that time to 1907 has increased only to $164,000.

It does not occur to me these interests are suffering or are endangered. Judging from the rate of wages paid, from the profits not only of the boot and shoe manufacturers but of the leather interest itself, they have been enabled to prosper, to develop, and to grow and retain the domestic market, and come into direct competition with the markets of the world and to secure their full share. Why should they during such prosperity at this time come and ask to strike down the nominal protection that is given to the farmers of this country upon the item of hides?

To me, Mr. President, it seems unwise, it seems unfair; to my mind it seems selfish in the extreme. The farmers of this country, especially in the area from whence this great product comes, are loyal protectionists. They believe in that policy. They do not believe in sectionalism.

I do not believe the manufacturing interests of the East should seek to take advantage of this great interest and despoil it of this limited protection, which, as it seems to me and as has been demonstrated here in this debate, inures to the benefit of the producers of cattle. Yet if it is stricken down, no compensation is proposed to be made, as far as the purchasers or consumers of either boots, shoes, harness, saddlery, or any of the products of leather are concerned.

Mr. President, I believe the proposed duty should be maintained in fairness to the great interests represented by the farmers and stock raisers of the country.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think that nearly every phase of this question has been covered by those who have spoken upon it; and yet I feel impelled to submit a few brief remarks bearing more particularly upon the political reason for maintaining the existing duty on leather, on hides, and on the products of leather.

I am not one of those who are in favor of putting shoes and the products of leather upon the free list merely because we can not, or in case we should not be able to, secure the duty we think we are entitled to. No greater element of danger could exist in this Government than that of retribution—of hitting back. There are times when it is a man's duty to hit back, but not when the responsibility of public service is behind his back. Spite legislation is intolerable even to contemplate. I am in favor of a duty, and a duty that will surely protect, within the principles of the Republican party, manufactures of every kind from leather. I merely say that in the beginning in order that there may be no mistake about my position on this question.

We have a right to demand at the hands of Congress a duty of 15 per cent upon skins and hides. You might imagine, from some of the suggestions that have been made, that the world was made yesterday. I find that in the first tariff bill that was enacted, at the beginning of this Government, they put a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem on hides and skins. They were wise enough then to frame their legislation so that it covered the skins of animals of whatever age or weight.

I suppose it may be suggested that we are wiser and that conditions have changed. Yes; we are wiser. We have available to us all of the wisdom of that period plus the wisdom that we have accumulated since. And I would not for a moment suggest that we are bound by the action of the First Congress; but I would suggest that it is in this day instructive to us in considering the application of the principles which are to be applied on the tariff question.

The Republican party stands pledged to a duty on hides. It stands pledged not only as a national party, but in the several States Republican majorities have been given because the Republican party was so pledged.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clay	Hughes	Paynter
Bacon	Crane	Johnson, N. Dak.	Penrose
Bailey	Culberson	Jones	Perkins
Borah	Cummins	Kean	Piles
Bourne	Curtis	La Follette	Rayner
Brandegee	Daniel	Lodge	Root
Briggs	Davis	Lorimer	Scott
Bristow	Dillingham	McCumber	Shively
Brown	Dolliver	McLaurin	Simmons
Bulkeley	du Pont	Martin	Smith, Md.
Burkett	Fletcher	Money	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Flint	Nelson	Smoot
Burrows	Foster	Nixon	Sutherland
Burton	Frye	Oliver	Taliaferro
Carter	Guggenheim	Overman	Warner
Chamberlain	Hale	Owen	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Heyburn	Page	Wetmore

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, because trusts exist and oppress us is not a sufficient reason for abandoning the principles of a political party.

There is another suggestion. There is nothing in the platform of the Republican party, nor does anyone, I think, claim that there is, that pledges us to reform either the Republican party or its principles. I know of no such declaration. So what I shall say in the few minutes—I hope to have the attention of those who remain—will be directed to that proposition.

There was a party in the political field last fall that pledged itself in favor of a revision of the tariff downward, and there was one that did not. The party that pledged itself in favor of a revision downward was defeated by more than a million votes at the polls. Are you going to undo that verdict? It is the verdict of the American people, and it is the verdict of the Republican party. Does any Republican dare to stand here and say he abides by and considers himself bound by the Democratic platform? Does he dare to stand here, or elsewhere, and say that the Republicans shall observe and adhere to the planks and political declarations of the Democratic party?

For one I do not. This question of the duty on hides is a large question, and affects perhaps more people than almost any other question that is before us. There are more than 10,000,000 people engaged in producing this article of commerce, and it is an article that comes home to more people of humble station than you would dream of. You talk about syndicates and trusts here. The cow that dies in the stable of the cotter means more to that household than the loss of a train load of cattle over an embankment on their way to the packing houses in Chicago.

Is there a man in the Senate who has not seen them weep over the death of that useful and necessary animal, and all that was left was its hide? The six, seven, eight, or nine dollars they got for it was all that remained to them. That instance can be multiplied by hundreds of thousands.

As I have had occasion to say before here, I am giving my thought most to that part of the people. The trusts need no protection. I do not care whether they have it or not. They are entitled to it as any other part of the people are, but I realize that they are strong enough to take care of themselves. But the poor are not, and the highest function of government is to protect the poor. Whenever one of these questions comes up, the first inquiry in my mind is, How will it affect the great mass of the people, who are neither trusts nor connected with trusts?

I am not going to discuss this for a moment from the standpoint upon which the Senator from Vermont discussed it. That is the side which needs no protection whatever. The question whether or not 10,000,000 hides taken off each year in this country are worth $3 or $10 is a question of importance. The average duty on a hide is from a dollar to a dollar and seventy-five cents. Of course it would be difficult to state it with absolute accuracy. That is the margin that stands——

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. In a moment. That is the margin that stands between the owner of the animal that wears the hide and competition in the field of competition. Certainly I yield.

Mr. PAGE. According to the report of the manager or agent of the cattle association, if it be correct, the average price of hides for the twelve years named by him was $8.96. I think it is susceptible of absolute proof that the duty on a hide is 86.8 cents.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is easy to calculate it. It varies with the value of the hide. Anyone can determine what 15 per cent

of the valuation is. It is just that superrefinement of reasoning that blinds the mind and the eye to the real question at issue. This subject has been refined clear out of sight. There is a practical side to it, and I am going to talk about that side during the few minutes I shall speak.

Mr. PAGE. I premised what I said by a statement that if the value of the hide is as given by the agent of the Cattle Growers' Association, then it is capable of ascertainment or proof that the duty is exactly 86.8 cents.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; when you take a false premise you will always arrive in some cul de sac of reasoning. I have seen it done for many years. I am talking about practical affairs. I know what cattle hides weigh, and I know what they are worth, and I know what the duty on them is. I know that they vary in weight as an animal grows older, and I know that they are raw material of an expensive character. And I know that all this talk about kip and calfskin and hides is a part of the superrefinement of a plain, practical question.

I think I can safely say that no hide under 2 years old is dutiable. I say it in the presence of men here who are presumed to know, and I repeat that no hide under 2 years old is dutiable under the ruling of the Treasury Department. I am speaking of the general average. These hides are the raw material of the farmer until he sells them to somebody else, whose raw material they become. It was well illustrated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that this raw material is only produced after years of labor and expense. Every man who ever lay by the camp fire in a cattle camp at night or stood upon duty or sat upon his horse upon the line all night long in the snows of winter knows that the raising of this material and the producing of it is not child's play. I have some knowledge of the subject. I know what it is to ride a horse upon the plain in driving snow to prevent a stampede or head one off or round up the cattle. I have lain by the camp fire when it was cold enough to freeze the people on this coast almost out of their homes, instead of in them.

The weight of these skins is an important question in this item, because the department has seen fit to classify nothing as a hide unless it weighs 25 pounds or more. That was an inaccurate and an unjust interpretation of the law. It was intended to be differently interpreted; but I am not quarreling with that now. That would be a waste of time.

If we were contending here for a change in classification of this item, then it would be material to discuss it. I am contending at this hour to see the duty maintained at 15 per cent ad valorem, and I say, as far as it is proper to say it, that we have a right to demand it and expect it at the hands of the Republican majority in this Congress. We had a pledge for this. I yield to no man, not even to the Senator from Vermont, in my Republicanism. I think I understand the principles of my party as well as another. You pledged us this protection. It was existing law, and you pledged the people of this country that you would maintain their prosperity. You can not do it and take the duty off of hides. You can not keep the pledge of the party and take the duty off of hides, unless you subscribe to what I will read. I will read it and see if you recognize it, any of you, and I will not look at any particular Senator when I read it:

> We favor the revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties.

I suppose you recognize it. It is a part of the Democratic platform in the last convention.

Mr. HALE. Is that the book the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] had?

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I carried that book through the campaign in my pocket and told the people that those pledges would be kept. They believed those statements, and they voted for those principles and for the Republican party, and they sent me back here because they believed that I would stand for it here; and I would be recreant to their trust if I did less than demand that I should speak in the councils of the Nation and the councils of the Republican party for the keeping of those pledges.

I know the days are long and the temperature is warm. Men are tired, but that is no reason for shirking a duty. It is no reason for slighting these great questions or their consideration. You might multiply the temperature and the length of the days several times before I would begin to consider them when I see in danger the interests not only of my State, but the interests of the whole people and the class of the people who vote the Republican ticket and who are entitled to the consideration and the application of Republican principles. When I see their rights in danger I certainly shall not consider the convenience of any Member of this body nor my own, and I shall not watch the clock nor the thermometer.

What are you going to say to the people when you go back to the various States about the pledge that was written in the Republican platform to protect these interests and they ask, Why did you not do it? Would you say the day was too warm; it was midsummer? Dare you do it? I think not.

Now, here is another little platform that I want to know if anybody on this side of the House has stored away in their minds as a possible refuge of political retreat:

> We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs, and that those articles be placed upon the free list.

That is in the platform, but it is not the platform that won. It is the one that lost.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. The memorandum book which the Senator presents has a familiar look to some of us. Is it the same vest-pocket edition of the Democratic platform that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] has so often presented to us?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think it is; but it has something more than our attention was directed to by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator from Idaho has not robbed the Senator from Missouri of this document.

Mr. HEYBURN. No. If that book were destroyed, and all like it, and every print upon which the precepts of the Republican party are written there, it would still be written; it would still be pronounced in the heart of the Senator from Maine, because those principles do not depend upon paper or ink for their stability and their existence, but they depend upon the spirit of patriotism and loyalty to the principles upon which the Republican party is founded.

Mr. HALE. I agree fully with the Senator. I was interested because the same document that he has brought from his vest pocket has been produced repeatedly by the Senator from Missouri as the Democratic platform.

Mr. HEYBURN. Oh, I see the point of the Senator's suggestion. That was the Democratic platform that has been referred to and relied upon and discussed pro and con by the Senator from Arkansas and Senators from other States. That is the Democratic platform. It was not the platform upon which any part of the present executive or legislative wing of the Government was elected in the last election.

Mr. HALE. And has been largely discredited, not only on this side, but on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is a growing discredit, Mr. President. It has multiplied, rather doubled itself, every time in the last three campaigns. Those same principles have been denounced by an increasing vote in every campaign since 1896.

Mr. HALE. The popular vote?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes, sir; the popular vote, the vote of the American people. That is what counts. It may not count in the final manner of reckoning, but it is the expression of the will of the people.

Mr. President, I can understand that it was rather difficult for the senior Senator from Maine to recognize the quotation that I read, because his mind generally dwells upon one which is much more to our liking. It is thus.

Just give me your attention a moment, until I give you the genesis of the Republican party, and see if anybody fails to recognize it:

> That, while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country, and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence. (Republican platform, 1860.)

The Senator from Maine will remember that. It is the first Republican banner under which I ever marched. With a little oilcloth cape on my shoulders and an oilcloth cap on my head, at the head of a company of Wide Awake boys, in 1860 I marched to that music on a great occasion, when John Sherman, then just having entered the United States Senate, was the orator of the day, the 11th of September, the anniversary of the battle of Brandywine, at the place where it was fought, and where Bayard Taylor presided over the meeting. My mind was opening to intelligence, it was learning the lessons of patriotism from worthy lips, and that doctrine sank deep in my heart, and it rested in the hearts of all around me. I learned it in the household, and I do not intend to forget it as long as I live.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. How stood that great statesman, John Sherman, on the subject of hides? Was he for a duty on hides, or was he for placing them on the free list?

Mr. HEYBURN. He supported those political principles——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did McKinley, also?

Mr. HEYBURN. And any man who ever expected a nomination, whether it be in the State of Indiana or elsewhere, at the hands of the Republican party subscribed to that doctrine, because it has never been unwritten.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Did McKinley also subscribe to that doctrine?

Mr. HEYBURN. Absolutely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And was McKinley for free hides or for a tariff on hides?

Mr. HEYBURN. That is about—I will not say as wild a question as I was ever asked—but I will ask the Senator from Indiana to take a living man in this body. What some man who has passed to his last rest would do does not appeal to me.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Idaho was referring, with his customary force and eloquence, to that first great pioneer of our party, and to an interesting occasion when he, as a young man, marched with oilcloth cape and cap and heard as the orator of the occasion that great man, John Sherman. I asked the Senator then, the subject of hides being under consideration, whether Sherman was for a duty on hides or was for free hides, and the Senator answered——

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me just a little; I want to call up this question, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. HEYBURN. This question will have to come up in a little more concrete form, if it is expected that I shall reply.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will put it into a concrete form.

Mr. HEYBURN. Of course, I am not going to accept the views of John Sherman or any other man, except as they may correspond to thoughts that arise in my own mind.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the Senator then replied, not answering the question, that he stood, of course, upon this platform; and since we have discussed this and since the Senator is applying that platform to hides, I asked whether or not McKinley, the prince of protectionists, would also stand upon that platform, and if he was for a duty on hides or for free hides?

Mr. HEYBURN. I will answer the question, and I want to answer it now. McKinley was a Republican who helped to make platforms, and he never helped to unmake a Republican platform which existed prior to or during his lifetime. He would have been loyal and true to the principles of protection. I will go no further, because no man can speak further as to what he would have done or what he would do to-day. I have faith that any Republican who is imbued with the principles of the Republican party will stand to-day where McKinley stood, and where other Senators stand, for the principles of the Republican party.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. Just a moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I want to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Idaho is very thoroughly informed——

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And I ask the question for information—since the Senator says that he can not tell what McKinley would do—whether it is a fact that Mr. McKinley, in making his great bill, put hides on the dutiable or the free list?

Mr. HEYBURN. I suppose the Senator knows about it, and probably in a minute or two I may refer to that question directly.

The Republican party has been a growing party; it has been an advancing party. It never took a step backward; it never unwrote a plank or a principle that it ever professed or that it told the people it stood for—never. Can any Senator name a plank for which the Republican party ever stood that is not to-day one of the foundation principles of the Republican party, and that is not to-day written in the laws of the land? There is not a statute on the books in force to-day that was not first written in a Republican platform. I say that without any fear of contradiction. The platform of the Republican party in the past is the law of the Nation to-day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And was in McKinley's time.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would be interested in reading the platforms upon which President McKinley was elected on both occasions? I think I shall not take time to read them, but I will commend them to the attention of the Senator from Indiana, who, I have no doubt, took part in the campaigns, as I did, each in our own State or elsewhere. We did not support Mr. McKinley because he did not believe in the principle of protection; and it is perhaps more for that than for any other purpose that I stand here in this hour, and I want to sound this note, that men who are Republicans, or care to call themselves such, have no more right to vote for free hides than they have to vote for free trade in any other schedule.

It is not a question of choice. Your pledge is out; it is out to the party and it is out to the people. To bring up this hobgoblin of the trust is like a great face that you put on every time a schedule comes up that you do not like and you claim that there is a trust behind it. Will you abandon your house because some real or imaginary enemy steps in during your absence and takes possession of it? I guess not. We will not abandon the Republican party, even though it is claimed that a trust has taken possession of a part of it. We will drive the trust out, and we will rehabilitate the Republican party and keep it in the clean and pure atmosphere of government based upon the principles for which it stands. Shall we abandon the Republican party, even though trusts have come in and taken possession of a part of it? I guess not. The Republican party is not made up of that kind of men. We not only can make laws, but we can enforce them, and we can punish those who violate the rights, or any part of the rights, of the people.

Mr. President, there are $50,000,000 worth of hides produced every year in the United States. What are you going to do with them if you buy all the hides you need for tanning abroad? You are going to keep raising the cattle that wear them, because a profit of $2 a head on cattle is all that men who are in the cattle business on a large scale expect. A man with 40,000 head of cattle upon the range who can make $2 a head on them considers that he has made a success of the cattle business.

Talk about the trusts buying hides and tanning them! They buy them if they will pay more for them than somebody else will. In our country—and when I say "our country" I mean that watershed that surrounds us—there are probably 200,000 or 300,000 cattle that die and are skinned. There are 2,000,000 of such cattle in the United States. All that is left of those cattle is the hide. If that has no market and no price and brings nothing, then the cattle are a dead loss—2,000,000 cattle that would have been worth $50,000,000 at $25 a head. That is an item for consideration. The owners get only the price of the hides.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEYBURN. It is always agreeable to be interrupted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Thank you. The Senator from Idaho referred a moment ago to the putting of anything on the free list as though, if one thing were put on, other things should be put on.

Mr. HEYBURN. I think the Senator from Indiana had better abandon that conclusion, and not draw it from anything I said. I did not say that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope not; but I have just turned to our free list, and I want to ask the Senator one or two questions about it. I find here that the hair and horns of cattle and other animals are put on the free list, and so is the hide. Would the Senator have a tariff upon hair? I also find that hoofs are put upon the free list as well as hides. Would the Senator from Idaho have a tariff on hoofs? I also find that horns are put upon the free list. Would he have a tariff on horns as well as on hides? Is it not perfectly logical that, if we have a tariff on hides, we ought also to have a tariff on horns? We make buttons out of horns—a very valuable by-product of the animal. Finally, I find in paragraph 497 that binding twine is put upon the free list. Does the Senator from Idaho think that a Republican House and that a Republican Finance Committee of the Senate, in putting binding twine and the rest of these things on the free list, showed any less Republicanism than John Sherman and McKinley showed when they put hides on the free list?

Mr. HEYBURN. I am appalled by the size of the speech which the Senator has laid out for me. I think I am not going to make it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I beg to remind the Senator from Indiana that in the making of the present tariff Mr. McKinley was President of the United States and had great influence in the Congress which passed the Dingley bill. He could easily have had hides put upon the free list if he had so desired. On the contrary, he did not so desire, and he signed the bill that made the law which put hides upon a dutiable basis.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, with the Senator's permission, I want to simply say that that was a pleasant and interesting reminiscence, but we have a public record as to what McKinley did upon this subject.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator from Indiana will allow me a word, it may possibly assist. I do not object to interruption, but I do not think it is profitable to be drawn off in the consideration of the individual character or the individual views of any other man who is not present and participating in this debate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator began that in his reference to John Sherman.

Mr. HEYBURN. Well, I think I was entirely within my privilege. I spoke of him as being the orator of the day upon a question of sentiment, not as an argument on this tariff question at all, which I think is very clearly within the privilege that a Senator has.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator controls the floor, and, of course, I shall not interrupt the Senator if it is not convenient to him.

Mr. HEYBURN. I make no objections to interruptions upon the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, if the Senator has no objection, would he object, as he has quoted John Sherman——

Mr. HEYBURN. I object to the reading or the injection into my remarks of any speech of anybody. I have no objection to the Senator speaking his speech, but I have objection to bringing in the speeches of other men. I can not submit to it at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; but the Senator does not need to decline to yield in any such terms as that. He was referring to Mr. Sherman, and I wanted to repeat what Mr. Sherman had said.

Mr. HEYBURN. Now, Mr. President, I will ask—and I will ask it argumentatively and not for the purpose at this particular time of having anybody answer it—where would the tanners prefer to buy hides? Would they rather buy them abroad or at home, do you think? If the spirit of patriotism cuts any figure at all, they would rather buy at home.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Where do they buy now?

Mr. HEYBURN. They buy abroad to the extent of our imports. We export nearly as much as we import of this commodity. There is a difference, I think, of about $2,000,000, which is not a very large item.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I see the Senator does not want to be interrupted; but just at that point, if it were not for that fact, I would ask him whether the tanners are not more and more compelled to buy of the packers, who are popularly known as "the beef trust," as a matter of fact, whether that is true or not?

Mr. HEYBURN. No, they are not; but the beef trust is probably just as good a market to buy of, if a man wants to buy, as anybody else, because the beef trust does not steal these hides entirely. They have bought them of somebody, and the ownership could be traced back each step.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Do not the packers fix the price of hides?

Mr. HEYBURN. I suppose they do. I understood the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] to say that he used to stop to see his old friend down in Boston when he would go down there, and say to him, "Do you think we ought to put the price of hides up or down?" Did I misunderstand the Senator?

Mr. PAGE. No.

Mr. HEYBURN. It sounds very nearly like an imaginary conversation that goes along between Mr. Armour and Mr. Cudahy or somebody else—"Shall we put the price up, or shall we put it down?" What does that concede? What does it mean?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not care to go into that. I asked whether the packers fixed the price of hides in this country, and the Senator said "Yes," and I think I will have no more questions to ask.

Mr. HEYBURN. They fix the price, so far as they are concerned. I regard it as more important that the price paid is a satisfactory one.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does not the Senator think that they fix just as low a price as they can?

Mr. HEYBURN. I think they probably do just what the Senator from Indiana would do if he were going to buy this commodity—he would buy it as cheaply as he could.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I would certainly exercise all the advantage that was given to the beef trust.

Mr. HEYBURN. I see no element of original sin in that proposition. The statement that has been made here that the farmer or the owner of the animal does not receive consideration for the hides is absolutely without foundation. I go through the world with my eyes open, and I am surrounded by these conditions as by others. We have a million head of cattle in Idaho. I have checked up on it since the Senator's statement from some ancient record. That is not a very large number; but it means twenty to twenty-five million dollars' worth of stock of that kind; and that is not an item to be overlooked in your bank balance. It means that every one of those cattle wears a skin, which, if it is kept until it is 3 years old, will come within the dutiable class. Skins of animals but 3 years of age seldom weigh 35 pounds. The cheap grades of stock wear heavier skins than fine-bred stock. If you are in doubt about that, the next time you see a herd of high-bred Jerseys, go up and feel the hide and you will find it is comparatively thin. Then go to a herd of mongrel stock, or even Durhams, and you will find that the skin is much heavier.

Mr. President, I hardly think it would be worth while to take time to discuss the question as to whether or not the owner of the animal receives pay for the hide. If he sends his cattle to market at so much a hundred, the hide is worth, and it brings, just as much as a sirloin steak does—every bit. He gets just the same for a hide as he does for a sirloin steak; I do not care whether he sells it to the packer or whether he sells it to the storekeeper. There are millions of hides in this country that go to the country stores. That is the farmer's market in many parts of the country. I have seen it, and I know whereof I speak. In the fall, when the farmer is killing the meat to salt it and put it in barrels for winter use, he slaughters it himself, and he takes the skin, if there is no tannery near, to the grocery store or to some store where the man, being versed in prices, buys it and pays cash for it or gives credit to the farmer for it. When you add all these items throughout this country, you have half, or nearly half, of the product included.

Let us think about them for a moment, rather than about these awful trusts and packing houses that live in reality sometimes, but more often in the imagination of some one who would like to be a trust. I have looked into the faces of men whom I have heard denouncing trusts, and I have seen there the wrinkles of greed that would have made them foreswear all the virtue they ever possessed and become the most tyrannical magnates and trusts on earth. I have no sympathy with trusts that grind the people or violate the law or are guilty of injustice or oppression, and I have just as little with the individual who does those things.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HEYBURN. In a moment. An aggregation of men, as a rule, averages about the same as the units that make up the aggregation. Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. The Senator from Idaho speaks of my statistics being a little old. I have before me a leaflet which says:

> Consider the farmers' and stock raisers' interest in the new tariff law. Why discriminate against them?

On pages 4 and 5 I find this:

> The shoe and leather interests have been persistent in their endeavors to force upon the minds of the people the belief that hide production is very much circumscribed. The fallacy of the contention is at once exploded by consideration of the foregoing tables and figures in connection with the following table taken from the Crop Reporter for February, 1909, published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

February, 1909, is about as late as I can find, and that gives Idaho as having 76,000 cows and 347,000 other cattle. That is not only a late date, but it comes from those who are professing to speak for the Senator's State in this case.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, having been forewarned by the statement of the Senator yesterday, I have ascertained the number of stock of various kinds in Idaho. We have a pretty good government out there. We have a statistician for the State that looks into those things. Idaho ten days ago is not the Idaho of to-day. The Senator probably does not realize that; but when he sees a city, the county seat of a new county, that is not 2 years old, nor a year and a half old, with 11,000 people in it, the Senator probably will begin to understand something about it. I telegraph when I want to know about Idaho. I do not even dare trust to the time elapsing between the mails for fear conditions will change. That is the kind of State to live in. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield further to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. I have heard that the Deity can do almost anything except produce a 2-year-old steer in a minute.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; I have heard that philosophy, too; but we are not called upon to pass upon that question. I do not have to apologize for the figures that I have given. The record will bear them out. I happen to have them before me

classified; but this is not an Idaho bill. It is a bill for all the people of the United States, and the State from which the Senator comes is receiving its fair share of the benefit through this legislation, and it behooves those who speak for such States to be just as generous to our States.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the State of Vermont is ready to be as generous and as just to Idaho as any State in this Union. While I am on my feet I want to correct a statement that I made a moment ago. I said that the average duty upon each hide was 86 cents; I should have said 62 cents.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have those figures here, and I do not think there is much to be gained in discussing a principle by over-illustrating it. It is like filling a book with figures and statistics. When you are reading it you come to the statistics, you read the names on the table, and you turn over to the end of it and go on. I think probably that is true, at least in a very great measure, of the remarks which are made for the puropse, or with the intention at least, of attacking men's minds upon a subject where they have not had occasion to wake up. That is what this is.

I might speak to the Democrats upon this question. If I do not, it is not because I do not appreciate their position or intelligence or support; but I come to a household that I have a right to appeal to on behalf of this question, and that is the Republican party, who sit on this side and to some extent on the other side of the Senate; and I have a right not only to appeal to them, but to remind them of their promises in the past, and in this hour to demand that they keep them. I am here to vote for protection in no mean spirit and in no slight margin; one that shall be protection not only for the large operator and the rich individual, but for the man with the little tannery back in the forest, or the man with the great interest that predominates a neighborhood. Protection has no element of aristocracy represented in it. Protection is for those who need it most; and you should commence the consideration of the question at the bottom of the scale rather than at the top.

When we were discussing the lumber industry, I heard nothing for several days but of mills that cut hundreds of millions of feet. When we were discussing a day or two ago the tariff on hides, nobody mentioned figures under a million dollars; and yet I can take you back into places that are as old as the history of the country and take you to tanneries that had descended from grandfather to father and to son and that to-day tan the hides of a neighborhood. They are entitled to protection in their interests and in their business just as much as the largest tannery in the country; but I would not deny the large one a protection that is sufficient, for the ordinary average will be sufficient for the large one, though of course the large ones could get along with less protection.

I would not discuss this from the standpoint of the National Stockgrowers' Association. That is the reason I did not read from the book, in which I notice they have printed some comments of mine on a former occasion. I do not discuss it, because it speaks for the aggregated interests of the country, which, if you were to wipe out protection, could live. They could live on their capital or go into some other business; but I rather prefer to speak—and I say this in no spirit of demagoguery, but I want to speak for the great mass of the American people, because they are the Government.

Republicans, where would you be without the farmers of the United States? The majority that we had in the last election came to you from the farmers in the country districts. If you do not believe it, look at the statistics and see. I undertake to say that had you eliminated the protective-tariff pledge of the Republican party, for which I am speaking to-day, from the campaign last fall, you would have had scant show, and I know whereof I speak. I went into the campaign, and I was in it from the beginning. I went into it in August and was in it every day and night until election. I found that what the farmers wanted to know was, "What can we rely upon in the way of stability?" They did not want any favors. I said, "You can rely upon the Republican party standing pat." I said, "You can rely upon retaining the duty on wool and hides and cattle and wheat and oats and barley and potatoes." I said, "You can rely upon it that we will furnish you a market for those things in the mines by protecting the products of the mines." I said, "You can rely upon it that when you have raised these things and have them ready for sale, the market will be standing ready to receive them."

You can not strike down industries that employ thousands of men who are consumers without striking down the market of the producer of those things which they consume.

Do not the 10,000,000 consumers engaged in raising hides count at all in this plea for the consumer that we have been hearing about? We hear Senator after Senator stand up here and say, "It is the consumer you are pledged to."

The affections of the party pledged to the consumer! Why, there are 10,000,000 of them raising cattle; there are 10,000,000 of them interested in this schedule on hides. Are they less consumers? They are consumers of shoes; they are consumers of the products of those skins and hides, just as much as the man who treads the marble floor or the halls of this Capitol. Are you going to cut out 10,000,000 consumers merely because, forsooth, they are producers as well and strangle them in their ability to be consumers? Where are you going to get a market for the products of your prosperity if you render these people poverty stricken and out of business? It matters not though the products of the earth were piled around you mountain high, you would starve to death, except to the extent you could eat them, unless there were consumers to purchase them; but if you make other people too poor to purchase your commodity, where are you going to find your market?

Are you going to buy hides from foreign lands and bring them in here, and then send the hides of this country to those foreign lands? Is that the scheme?

Deal at home—just as near home as you can buy, too. Deal with your neighbor and he will deal with you, and the circle will widen as the ripple upon the face of the still water widens to the shores, and come back again and repeat the reverberations of prosperity. This thing of buying skins in Australia and Argentina and Mexico to clothe the American people is a farce, and it is a wicked one, when we have them here. If the prosperity of business is maintained by proper provisions of law and conditions of government, they will increase. Just decrease by discouragement the production of hides and see how quickly you will decrease the production of beef and meat, and see how quickly you will feel it in the advanced price that always follows a decrease of production.

What do you want to do, bury the hides that come from these animals? No. I will tell you what you will do if you discourage cattle raising. The men now engaged in that business will go out of it and overcrowd some other neighboring business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will they go out of the business of raising cattle? You can not raise hides without raising cattle.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is what I am talking about. If you make cattle raising unprofitable, of course they will go out of the business. I saw the flocks of sheep in one of the Western States disappear just as fast as they could give them away. The result was, of course, that the price went up—the price of meat, the price of skins—but nobody had anything to buy it with. Certainly there can be no mistake but that the decrease in the production of cattle would mean an advanced price.

Who wants to buy meat brought from Australia in cold storage? Did you ever see it? I have. I have seen quarters of meat brought from Australia in cold storage that looked beautiful. They looked like wax works. They had a greenish-yellow tint. They had been frozen solid for months, and they were sold as prime beef, or offered as such. I do not want them. I want American beef, and I want to get it from a prosperous American citizen. I want to pay him a fair price for it, and I want to have the money to pay a fair price for it; and I can not have the money to pay a fair price for any commodity unless there is that prosperity surrounding me that enables me to draw to the extent of my credit from the various sources of revenue.

I have not talked figures to you, but I have talked government and the science of government, and I have talked Republican politics, and I have reminded you and myself of the pledges that we are under. Now, let us see what Republican will dare to vote against maintaining the pledges of the party—and they are wrapped up in this item. Retain the present Dingley duty on hides and you have only given them half a loaf, but they will not starve to death on it. They will have to adjust their digestion to the food you give them. When you vote upon this schedule, if you are ever guided in your life by the principles of the Republican party, it should be upon this occasion, and your time should not be frittered away by abstruse reasoning, by far-drawn conclusions. This is a plain principle of the Government that has been written in every Republican platform from its foundation.

I am ready to vote; I have always been ready to vote upon this question. I do not know that my remarks have tended to strengthen the faith of anyone, but I trust to God that men's consciences will be awakened and that they will direct them to

vote, as I believe they must vote, for the protective-tariff policy of the Republican party and a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on hides.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the question of a duty on hides can not be considered exclusively as a tariff proposition. A discussion of the principles of protection will not solve it. The whole course of business relating to the raising of cattle, the tanning of leather, the manufacture of shoes, is involved, and the nature of the organizations or persons who have to do with each of these branches of business must be taken into account.

The first objection to a tariff on hides is one which did not exist in 1872, when they were placed on the free list, nor to any great extent in 1890, when they were again included in the free list. In answer to the defiance of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN], who asked what Republican Senator here will dare to vote against a duty on hides, I have to answer him that I voted with William McKinley in 1890 against a duty on hides, for after that question had received elaborate consideration, no duty was imposed; nor was there any duty in the Dingley bill when I voted for it in the House in 1897, and I feel perfectly free to-day, or whenever the question comes up for a vote, to pursue the same course by voting against a duty.

The first objection to this duty is the manner in which the supply of hides is controlled. It is always dangerous if those who control the raw material are also competitors with the manufacturers who work upon the material. To an extent that is worthy of consideration in the iron and steel trade, in which those who are the largest manufacturers, though they do not manufacture half the total product, are very large owners of iron-ore mines. We might review the whole list. Suppose the owners of cotton were largely engaged in the spinning of cotton, the owners of wool in the manufacture of woolen cloths, and so we might go on indefinitely, it would be evident that those who manufacture and at the same time control the raw material would not only have a very great advantage, but would threaten the very existence of their competitors.

This is true in an unusual degree with the packers. It is conceded that they kill some 40 per cent of the hide-producing animals; and by their associations with butchers, and their hold on the trade, they control a very large additional percentage—perhaps 20 or 30 per cent. I wish to speak within bounds, but I am probably right when I say that the packers control 60 to 70 per cent of the hide product.

There is another point to be considered in that connection, and that is that the domestic supply of hides is not sufficient for the consumption, let alone the export of leather and shoes abroad. This makes the hide an article in the obtaining of which there is necessarily sharp competition. The consumers of hides would gladly obtain their supply at home, if possible. In that competition the packer, already having opportunity for monopoly in the beef trade, has another, an equal and, no doubt, greater opportunity for monopoly in the purchase or obtaining of hides, and if he choose to enter into the business of tanning leather he has a great advantage there. He has chosen to enter into the business of tanning leather; and establishments are being either abandoned or turned over to those interested in the slaughtering of beef, month by month.

So that we have this situation, which we might as well face now as at any time: This very extensive trade in tanning is threatened by the existing conditions or adjustments of business, under which those engaged in another variety of enterprise have so great an advantage that they can hamper, if not destroy, the business of those now engaged in the tanning industry. What would be the result if it were destroyed? Inevitably decreased competition, higher prices, and probably a decrease of foreign exports, but no benefit to any class or element of our people.

The second point against the duty on hides is this——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask this question? Suppose, for instance, we admit that the packers are tanning a large quantity of hides. How will the Senator prevent their having the same advantage in the case of free hides from other countries that other tanners do? What measure of defense have the other tanners, or what deterrent measure will the packers themselves have?

Mr. BURTON. There is a very obvious difference—several of them, in fact. First, a wider market; second, they now have the hides in their possession, belonging to the animals which they slaughter, while they would have to go forth and buy the foreign hides, where others would have just the same opportunity which they would have.

Mr. WARREN. Every hide they own they have to buy somewhere, of somebody, whether they buy meat with it or not, and of course they can send to any country and have the advantage of buying free hides. I fail yet to see the Senator's point.

Mr. BURTON. Not unless they carry on the business on a much larger scale, and not then under ordinary conditions. I may say further, in answer to the Senator from Wyoming and in continuation of what I had commenced to say, that they do not buy the hide as a hide. They buy the beef. I think it requires a great deal of ingenuity to show that the farmer is benefited by this duty on hides. That would be true if a hide were an independent product and the business were conducted for the raising of hides.

But, according to the figures which have been quoted here, the value of the hide is from one-tenth to one-sixth of the value of the animal. Why is it that the raising of cattle has increased in this country? If you will examine the statistics as to prices of food products for a range of thirty years, you will note that the increase in meat products has been greater than in almost any other kind of food. Peoples of the Old World, where the consumption of meat was formerly much smaller and restricted to animals raised at home, are now obtaining frozen meat from New Zealand, or imported meat in some form from Argentina or the United States, or they are bringing in great quantities of cattle to be slaughtered on the hoof in their own countries. This greatly enlarged demand for meat products has increased the supply of cattle, and it has also raised their price. It is this condition which will stimulate the raising of more cattle and not a 15 per cent duty on hides.

Suppose a hide is worth from a tenth to a sixth of the total value of the animal—let us say that it will average an eighth—and a 15 per cent duty is imposed upon the hide. Thus at the best the added price caused by the duty on hides is one-fiftieth of the value of the animal.

Suppose the farmer exposes his herd to the stock buyer, and the stock buyer offers a certain price. "But, sir, I must have an additional price, because there is a duty of 15 per cent on hides." "No," says the stock buyer, "I am buying these cattle for the beef that is in them, according to general prices which are fixed in the domestic market and are affected by the markets of the world. These animals may be exported to a foreign country in which there is no duty on hides. The prices of beef, the prices of cattle on the hoof, sometimes go up while hides go down; and even if it be an added element of value, it is only one-fiftieth, only 2 per cent of the value of this animal that you are offering to me. Can you expect me to take into account so trivial an increase in value as that?"

How much more is it the case when the packer, with his relations with the railway, with the grand scale upon which he does business, with his own choice as to when and where and how he shall ship his meat, absolutely controls the market?

It is not much of an exaggeration to say that the increased price of cattle by reason of a 15 per cent duty on hides is a phantom of the imagination.

There is one thing that seems to have been left out in this discussion, I may say, in this connection, that I doubt very much whether this duty has added to the price of hides. In the ten years from 1898 to 1908, it appears that the dutiable hides imported into the United States fell off from 126,000,000 pounds to 98,000,000 pounds, or 22 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator admit right there that he takes last year, the year of the panic, where about 90,000,000 pounds were imported, whereas if he goes back just one year before that he will find that there has been a regular increase up to that time?

Mr. BURTON. That there had been an increase up to 1897?

Mr. WARREN. An increase up to and including 1907; but in 1908 there was a very large falling off.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Wyoming refers to 1907, instead of 1897, as I at first understood him. For the purpose of the comparison I am making it does not matter what years are selected. Taking the period from 1898 to 1908, there was a falling off of 22 per cent in the imports of dutiable hides, while imports of nondutiable skins increased in the same period from 119,000,000 to 184,000,000 pounds.

The point I wish to make is to be noted in this connection and is this: The price of hides increased in the ten years from an average of $10.79 in 1898 to $12.24 in 1908, or 14 per cent; while the price of nondutiable skins increased from $19.61 to $23.61, or 18 per cent—4 per cent more.

I am entirely aware that this argument perhaps runs in the opposite line from those which many have made against this duty on hides; but in view of those figures it is not safe to rely on any increase in the value by reason of these duties. Why is it that the increase of the nondutiable skins has been greater? There is a perfectly natural explanation. The trade in the latter has grown more, because we have been enabled to buy these skins in any market, and especially without the handicap which attends the purchase of hides; also the tanning has increased and naturally the export trade has increased. Thus, along with the increased facility and volume of business, there has been that rise in price which naturally attends the increased volume.

Mr. President, this discussion has proceeded so long that I do not intend to detain the Senate much longer. I will call attention to a few figures showing by the years 1907 and 1908 that at times when the price of steers went one way the price of hides went the other way.

In the Chicago market in January, 1908, the price of steers was $5.30 per hundred pounds, as against a price of hides of $11.31. In March the price of steers rose from $5.30 to $6 per hundred pounds, while the price of hides fell from $11.31 to $9.36, a decrease of nearly 2 cents per pound. Again, in 1907, taking the change from the spring to the summer months of the year, in March the price of steers was $6.79, while the price of hides was $15.50. In June the price was $6.85, or slightly in excess of the March price, while the price of hides had fallen to $15. In September, with an increase in price to $7.25, there was a falling off from 15 cents a pound to 14 cents a pound. Instances of this kind might be indefinitely multiplied, under which it would be shown that the price of hides is a thing distinct and apart from the price of live cattle. In the adjustment of trade the tanner must have ready access to those markets in which hides are for sale or else he can not profitably conduct his business.

It has been stated here that the packers do not care about this duty. I desire to indulge in no attack upon them. They are conducting their business in the same way in which, I suppose, others would with like opportunities. They are enjoying the advantages they have and are pressing them to the limit. But it is evident that they do care.

In an interview in the Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1909, an official of Swift & Co. says:

> Any reduction in the hide tariff would injure the farmer, because the packers do business on so close a margin that cheaper hides would mean a slightly smaller return per pound to the farmer for beef on the hoof.

This solicitude for the farmer is, of course, extremely touching. Nevertheless, the packers are managing their business in their own way, and looking out for themselves, as anyone else would do.

It has been maintained here that the removal of the duty would make no difference in the price of shoes. There has been a good deal of argument on that point. I take it that if the tariff raises the price of the hides, it raises the price of leather and shoes as well; and if the price of hides will be lowered by a removal of duty, the price of shoes and leather will be similarly affected. The average rise in the price of leather in a pair of shoes ascribed to the tariff on hides would be from 2 to 8 cents. Some say it would be from 6 to 9. If it is true that the tariff does raise the price of hides and of leather, that is an amount sufficient to be taken into account.

There are many who think that a slight difference of that nature will be all absorbed by the retailer; that it will confer no benefit upon the consumer. It is true it is a comparatively small amount; but what would be the inevitable result? If competition is sharp, the great consuming public will get the benefit of that reduction, either in diminished cost or in improved quality. There is no branch of business in the United States in which competition is sharper than in the manufacture of shoes. Massachusetts leads; she is far and away in the lead; but New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Missouri, and many other States have a very well developed shoe-manufacturing industry. There is no indication of any combination. A comparatively small capital, as compared with many other branches of business, will start a shoe-manufacturing establishment, and the personal element has been so extremely important that it is very easy to see that the full benefit of competition will be brought to bear.

In this connection the argument is made that if the duty is taken off hides it ought to be entirely taken off leather. To those who have made this argument, I want to say in this connection that so far as any local interest in my own State is concerned I can speak entirely without partiality. There is in my State a very large farming interest, an extensive raising of cattle; and there is a very considerable tanning as well as shoe-manufacturing industry. This variety of interests leaves the question entirely to my own judgment for decision. As an economic proposition, I have no possible hesitancy in deciding that question—that I should vote for free hides; and also, that a duty on shoes can, with propriety, still be retained.

Some Senators have spoken here as if in case the duty were removed on raw material it ought also to be removed on the finished product. But that is contrary to the principle of every protective tariff that has been framed since the very foundation of the Government.

The raw material costs a certain amount, frequently a somewhat increased amount as compared with other countries, because of the higher cost of labor here and the higher rate of interest on capital as compared with many other countries. Then each branch of the finished product, as well as the flax or the ore or other material, is produced at an increased cost as compared with foreign articles, measured by the ever-present higher wage cost and the higher average rate of interest on capital.

Iron ore is the very best illustration. On that the duty has been reduced from 40 cents to 25 cents per ton. Forty cents was a substantial reduction of the duties which prevailed before that. When that is melted into pig iron there is a duty at present of $4 a ton, reduced to $2.50 a ton. When that is changed still further into steel billets, there is a duty of three-tenths of a cent a pound. So it is, all through, with every process.

Take it in the case of lumber. Logs, I believe, come in free. An expression was used in the Denver platform asking that they be put on the free list. Perhaps it was thought that reiteration could not hurt; that they were already free and the principle of introduction without duty would be still further vindicated by putting a plank of that kind in the platform. But the logs are free. The moment you have the logs cut into a sawed form a duty is imposed. Then if it is planed or finished, there is another duty. Then if it is planed on one side and tongued and grooved, there is a higher duty. If it is planed on both sides and tongued and grooved, there is a still higher duty.

It seems to me it is striking a very discordant note in all the tariff legislation of the country to assert that because it is proposed to take off a duty on a form of raw material, a duty which did not exist during the twenty-five years between 1872 and 1897, the duty should be taken off the finished product.

If Senators will note the changes in the tariff, there is hardly any item in which the reduction has been greater than in this. Under the existing law the duty on sole leather is 20 per cent. It is proposed, if the duty be taken off hides, to reduce that duty to 5 per cent, or a reduction of 75 per cent. As regards upper leather, which is not particularly affected, it is proposed to reduce the duty from 20 per cent to the same on sheep and lamb skins. There is a reduction of one-fourth on these, as against a reduction of three-fourths on sole leather.

When we come to shoes, it is proposed to reduce the duty from the 25 per cent of the existing law to 15 per cent, in view of the reduced cost which it is expected will result from taking off the duty on hides.

I want to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I do not believe there ever was any justification for imposing this duty. I am satisfied that the cattle industry was just as prosperous without it; that the farmer will reap the benefit of the raising of cattle to the fullest measure without it; that if any benefit accrues, it will be to those great establishments which buy and sell for slaughtering; that the continuance of this duty threatens not only a great industry—first the tanning industry and then the shoe and leather industry; also that it is likely, by promoting concentration in the business and even monopoly, to increase the cost of all these articles to the people.

Mr. ROOT. I have been asked to see that the position of the boot and shoe manufacturers is correctly stated to the Senate. It is so well stated in a letter from the National Association of Boot and Shoe Manufacturers, whose headquarters are in New York, that I will ask permission to have the letter read from the desk.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURERS,
New York, June 19, 1909.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Most of the public discussion of the question of free hides has confused the position of the boot and shoe manufacturer with that of the tanner, and I beg of you that you will not permit the discussion to close without bringing before the Senate clearly the reasons which have compelled the shoe manufacturers to press as forcibly as they could for the repeal of this tax. It has been urged that the

sole-leather trust is as great an "octopus" as the beef trust, and that if we, by the removal of this duty, escape the greed of the packer, it will only be to fall into the hands of the Central Leather Company, and that the result to the general public will be all the same. This statement shows complete ignorance of conditions in our trade. The sole-leather trust, while it tans from 40 to 45 per cent of the sole leather used in the country, is to-day and always has been surrounded by active competitors, of whom shoe manufacturers purchase freely, the market for sole leather being perfectly open and the competition fair and on exactly equal terms for both trust and independents. This condition has prevented the introduction of any objectionable trust methods and any unfair percentage of profit. In fact, if the sole-leather trust had not been very fortunate in its investments in bark lands, from which it derived large profits in lumber, it would have earned up to this time very meager dividends for its stockholders.

This condition has been entirely satisfactory to the shoe trade, and as it provided leather at the lowest basis of cost consistent with a living profit, was entirely favorable to the public and to the consumers generally. With free hides this condition will continue and no advantage can be taken by the sole-leather trust of the manufacturers of shoes. One of the largest shoe factories in the country, located in our State, has for years tanned its own sole leather; and if the shoe manufacturers had access to the hide markets of the world on equal terms, neither the beef trust nor the sole-leather trust would have any terrors for them. It is easily possible for any large shoe manufacturer to tan sole leather for his own needs, and so be wholly independent of any trust.

This suggests the entire basis of our opposition to the tax on hides. With this tax in force neither the shoe manufacturer, the independent tanner, or the sole-leather trust itself can secure its hides on equal terms with the packers. Consequently we are wholly unable to protect ourselves against their unjust demands. A discrimination in the cost of its raw material of 15 per cent in favor of one manufacturer and against another, is more than sufficient in any industry to build up the favored individual and destroy the other.

If the packers were compelled to sell their hides as they did when this duty was levied, and were not allowed to become tanners, the only objection to this tax would then be the added cost of the shoes and other leather goods to the people. But as they own the hides as an incident of their business as packers, and as we can not get the hides without becoming packers ourselves—or buying them with the added price caused by the tariff—is it not plain that this duty is taking our business from us and delivering it to them? Results now being rapidly accomplished prove the accuracy of these statements. The tanning industry is not, as has been stated, in a highly prosperous condition at this time. The packers have of late years frequently held hides at such high prices that tanners must face a serious loss or greatly increase the price of leather. Shoe manufacturers could not and would not pay the extortionate prices demanded, and many tanners in consequence of this condition have, after running on a limited production and without profit for a time, made terms with the packers, and either sold their tanneries outright or entered into contract agreements with them.

If this duty is not repealed, the independent tanner is doomed. The machinery for his destruction is now in excellent running order. The absorption will continue at a greatly increased rate, until the packers control the leather business of the country. When this great industry has been properly assimilated, then will come the turn of the shoe manufacturer, who will be entirely at their mercy. Another gigantic trust will be created, and the day of the individual merchant and manufacturer in this line of business will have passed.

Can you wonder that we are seriously in earnest? Is it unreasonable that we desire to deliver to our sons the business we have inherited from our fathers, or have built up by the devotion of our whole lives? Our love of existence as an industry is as strong as our love of existence as individuals. Has our country a right to legislate us out of that existence by a tax which has not in it one single element of protection? A tax which has not and can not cause a single hide, more or less, to be produced. A tax which has not provided employment for a single individual, or increased the wages of a single American workman.

Yours, very respectfully,

JOHN H. HANNAN, *President.*
By CHAS. H. JONES,
Chairman Tariff Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have sat silent during the eternal debate upon this everlasting problem of tariff taxation, but I have been largely compensated by the consciousness that I have not only contributed to the dispatch of the public business, but given rest to the weary.

I have watched with deepest interest the storm which has been raging on the other side of this Chamber, not upon the question of whether high tariff is right or wrong, but upon how high a rate the American people will bear in these piping days of reform, so near to those other days before the last election when the Republican party was a walking petition and a living prayer, and when mellifluous streams of promises and pledges of revision poured from the lips of its orators like molasses from the bunghole of a barrel. [Laughter.]

I have been silent not for the lack of inclination to plunge into the discussion, but because I have been overawed by the fierceness of argument and by the keen flashes of repartee, which have thrilled me and filled me with fantastic terrors no mortal ever felt before.

I have sat speechless in my chair when the matchless Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] rose up, and, standing firm but a little stooped, with the industrial world upon his back, pleaded with suppressed emotion for the wage-earners of our country and demanded that they shall have their 1 per cent of the profits of protection, blissfully indifferent as to who gets the other 99 per cent. [Laughter.] I have dodged behind my desk in mute but uncontrollable agitation as the thunderbolts of Jove rolled from the esophagus of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] in defense of the American hog. [Laughter.]

I have been dumb with admiration as I watched the shepherd Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] drive the wolves from the fold, with wool in their teeth, but without the loss of a single Wyoming sheep. [Laughter.] I have retreated to the cloakroom when the impetuous Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] flaunted his mercerized skirts in the face of the Senate and brandished his German razors in the air. [Laughter.]

I have watched New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, reenforced by Illinois and the Pacific slope, throw out their battle lines and close in on the rebels of the Middle West, and crush the spirit of secession against high tariff, once more letting down the bars of opportunity, and joyously hugging the Goddess of Liberty, as the big fat calf of the East once more bounds forward to the flowing udder of the West, and walls his eyes and wiggles his tail in speechless bliss as he draws his daily tariff bounty. [Laughter.]

All these storms have blown for the honor and glory of protection. All these battles have been fought to preserve the dignity of labor. O labor, labor, how many crimes have been committed in thy name! O protection, how often are thy garments made the cloak of greed!

Sir, I have looked and listened until I have become accustomed to storms, and I am no longer frightened by wind. Therefore I have determined to get on the rear end of this discussion and disturb the atmosphere of the Senate for an hour on general principles, only touching the tariff at the high places, because there are no low places, except on a few raw materials.

The shifting scenes of American politics have been watched with ever-increasing interest by all the civilized nations of the earth for more than a century and a quarter. Our national life began in the throes of revolution against the unjust taxation of the colonies by the mother country. Out of that revolution came the blessings of protection, not to a few, but to all alike, with special privileges to none. Out of it came a written Constitution, establishing our dual form of government, defining the limitations of the federal power, and reserving all power not thus defined to the States forever. And thus the young Republic of civil liberty, bearing in her bosom the precious burdens of human hope and human happiness, appeared in the wilderness of a new continent, clearing the way for a new civilization, and giving a new impulse to the progress of the world.

But, Mr. President, I am only repeating what is known to all, that right in the hour of that great victory for the rights of men another war began, and it was fought out with ever-increasing fury on every stump, in every forum, and in the columns of every newspaper in the land for more than eighty years. It was a war of principles, a clash of ideas, a remorseless struggle between the two great opposing theories of federalism on the one hand and state sovereignty on the other.

When the time came for the formation of a more perfect Union, the two great overshadowing questions of national taxation and the extent and scope of national authority over the States arose. Alexander Hamilton believed in a strong federal government, with the centralization of power at its capital. He believed that the President and the Senators ought to be elected for life, and thus while he did not dare oppose a representative government, he clung to the policy of lifting it above the clamors of ever-shifting public sentiment and removing it as far as possible from the people.

But those stormy times brought forth the genius of Jefferson to give shape and form to the doctrine of the diffusion of power among the people themselves, placing in their own hands their own destiny and the destiny of their country. He believed that every State and every community ought to have the right to control its own domestic affairs unmolested by the federal power or by any other power under the sun. And, sir, he lived to see his ideals enthroned in the hearts of his countrymen and his theory of popular government woven into the very fabric of the Union, and then, in the peaceful shades of private life, with a halo of glory upon his brow, fell asleep on the bosom of old Virginia, the greatest apostle of human liberty who ever lived or died.

Hamilton perished on the field of honor long before his ideal was accepted as the fundamental principle of a tremendous political movement which culminated in the election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency, and, finally, in the submission to the arbitrament of arms the issue of whether the Federal Government was supreme or whether the States were sovereign, with the right to secede from the compact of the fathers.

That question, like some invisible cobra, lay twined in the Constitution, and it was apparent for more than a quarter of a century that it could only be settled by the sword. The collision could not be averted. It was the irrepressible conflict that Webster foreshadowed on this floor in his reply to Hayne. It

was the gathering storm that Clay postponed with his great compromise measures. It was the earthquake shock that Andrew Jackson feared when he held up his bony hand and swore "by the Eternal, the Union must and shall be preserved." Statesmanship and conservatism delayed it, but the hurricane came at last, and the hills of the South were torn with shot and shell, and her streams ran red with fraternal blood, and death stood grim and terrible on a hundred battlefields, beckoning a million men to the opening grave.

Sir, it would be folly to discuss the question now of who was right or who was wrong in that awful struggle. It is enough to know that however evenly divided the reasons were that impelled the flower of our country on both sides to rush to the cannon's mouth, the issue was settled forever.

The theory of Hamilton triumphed. A new system of government was built upon the ashes of the old, and the great national Republican party ascended the throne of power amid the shouts and plaudits of its worshippers. And the sword was beaten into a steel trust, and the canteen was beaten into a tin trust, and that party has been beating the American people ever since in the name of protection to American industry. Mr. President, what good came to us out of the Revolution, and what good came to our country out of the shedding of the blood of brothers in the civil war, if the burdens of taxation laid upon us by our masters at home are tenfold heavier and more oppressive than the burdens laid upon our fathers by their master beyond the sea?

I would rather see my country governed by centralized power on a throne than to see it ruled by concentrated wealth in this Capitol, for money bags are far more cruel than kings.

I have searched in vain the speeches and writings of Hamilton and Clay, the founders of the American System, for the remotest semblance of any purpose akin to this measure. The object of protection then was to create industries where none existed, and to foster them until they could stand alone. And neither of these splendid statesmen ever dreamed of the extremes to which their successors have gone.

America was a wilderness when Hamilton expounded the principle. England had forbidden and suppressed manufactures in the colonies, determined herself to supply everything for American consumption. There was scarcely a smokestack in the whole country. There were but few wage-earners, except in the fields; and it was under these conditions that the prolific brain of Hamilton conceived the plan to call into being a new system of industries which would give remunerative employment to labor and encouragement to the investment of capital and at the same time bring revenue to the Government. This is the principle preached by the leaders of the party now in power, but they can not trace the lineage of this bill back to those mighty men. For, I doubt not if they could have foreseen the prostitution of the doctrine which they unfolded, they would have recoiled in horror from the very word "protection" and sought some other way to uncover the riches of the Republic.

Sir, even the Republican party of to-day, which has slipped the last leash of restraint, did not begin its career with such a policy in its mouth.

In its platform of 1860 there was nothing but the bare mention of incidental protection, and neither in its platform of 1864 nor in its platform of 1868 was protection specifically mentioned.

In its platform of 1872 it still made revenue the purpose and protection the incident. And it was not until 1876 that it threw its loving arms around the wage-earner and pressed him to its bosom.

The wealth of the country has been shifting to a few great centers ever since in the name of the wage-earner, and a few magnates of finance in these few centers are manipulating and controlling all the chief manufactories, all the principal arteries of transportation, and all the banks between the two great oceans that divide the world. And, sir, the danger to our form of government lies in this continuous consolidation of corporate wealth and power, with its ever-increasing tendency to enlarge its demands and force the country to stand and deliver in the name of the wage-earner.

Agriculture is no longer the palladium of our free institutions; contentment no longer sings among the hills; but the restless millions are pouring out of the fields into the city and the town and into the mine and the lumber camp in search of higher wages, and we are building up a stupendous urban civilization, with every city a breeder of crime against God and man and the devil's own hothouse of corruption, under the outstretched wing of protection to the American wage-earner.

The Republican platform of 1908 calls for a tariff sufficient to cover the difference between wages at home and abroad plus a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. If this bill had been squared to the promise of the platform, there would have been no opposition to it by Republican Senators from the West and not many protests by Democratic Senators from any section, except against the tail end of it, promising a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. We could not foresee that when the schedules were made the tail would wag the dog.

But the platform and the bill are as different as the plan of salvation and Sherman's march to the sea; and God knows when Congress will adjourn. [Laughter.] I do not think that coveted event will happen until a few more eulogies are pronounced upon the wage-earner, and not even then until the rebels of the Middle West have been pacified. I think it will be done by the vigorous use of the plank favoring a tax on the incomes of corporations, recently jerked out of the national Democratic platform by our great President for the emergency.

What is the use to keep the country waiting? For the great transaction is almost done, and the "jokers" are still in the bill. Its framers have neither changed the policy nor reduced the average; they have neither heeded the appeals of Republican Senators representing great agricultural States in the Union nor the promises of their platform. They have banished Democratic Senators from their star-chamber councils and forbidden them from participating in the hearings before their committee. They are again about to deliver the masses over to the classes, and sharp-faced and lynx-eyed avarice will still continue to throw mock kisses at the pouting lips of plundered confidence, and the carriage of Dives will still continue to throw contemptuous dust from its glittering wheels on the squalid rags of Lazarus. The sovereign people will soon wake from their iridescent dream of revision downward to find the same old vulture of protection rising far above the Dingley minimum and soaring to the blue cerulean of the Aldrich maximum, with the American consumer by the seat of the pantaloons in his talons. [Laughter.]

The grand old party used to tell us that the foreigner paid the duty, and that we did not pay a dollar of it, and they rode into power on it; but that proposition soon got in the condition of Mark Twain's boat in a storm.

Mark said:

She heaved and sot, and sot and heaved,
And high her rudder flung,
And every time she heaved and sot
A mighty leak she sprung.

[Laughter.]

That proposition soon sprung a leak, and they got in another boat. They solemnly declared that the wall of protection would shut off foreign competition and honeycomb our country with home industries, and that home competition would hold down prices, and then the millennium would be at hand; and they sailed into power on that keel. The results which followed in the wake of this theory were like the fulfillment of a glorious prophecy, and it looked like satan was about to be chained for a thousand years by the Republican party. But when the tariff wall was completed, when they had built it high and strong, our home industries began to combine and our home corporations began to consolidate, and they have combined and consolidated until there is not enough of home competition left to fan the cheek of the trust or make a breeze in the markets; and therefore about 80,000,000 American citizens are at the mercy of their masters.

Protection has run men mad with lust for gold and hunger for power. There is the jingle of gold in the very laughter of modern financiers, the eyes of politicians are jaundiced with it, and I sometimes think that if the great Republic could be lifted up and spread out in the kingdom of heaven the Republican party would dig up the golden streets of the New Jerusalem in three hours, and levy a tariff on the harps of the angels for the protection of American industry. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, when Republican Senators have protested against the high rate of taxation carried in the bill under consideration, and pointed out its inequalities, they have been branded as insurgents, and told to their faces that they shall have to explain their treason in the next campaign. When Democratic Senators have declared their loyalty to the principle of a tariff for revenue, they have been dubbed "free traders." Of course there is not the semblance of truth in it, as they ought to know, for we all agree that a large amount of our national revenue must come from duties on imports. But how can we both tax a foreign article and admit it free? Therefore free trade is an imaginary goblin that haunts the dreams of our overzealous statesmen.

All Democrats agree that the tariff should equal the difference between wages at home and abroad, but we do dispute the proposition that the outstretched wing of measureless love for the

laboring man in this bill is in accord with that doctrine. For it is exacting sometimes ten and sometimes twenty times the difference, and here is where the enormity of the system lies.

We do deny that there is a fair and impartial distribution of the burdens of taxation in the scheme. We cling to the old Democratic doctrine of tariff for revenue, and that the highest tax should be levied on luxuries, the next highest on the comforts, and the lowest of all on the necessities of life. Can any just man find fault with that? Does it not meet every legitimate purpose in laying a tax? Would it not foster manufactures, protect wages, and provide for revenue? Would it not destroy the incentive and the opportunity for monopoly and wipe away the stain of injustice and the stigma of class legislation?

But what is the use to philosophize on what might be the happy condition of our country under a just and equitable system of taxation when there is an overwhelming majority here against it? Why plead for revision when there is no revision?

Sir, there was one last lingering hope left, but I fear it has flickered in the socket. I refer to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], called the "income-tax amendment." The Senators on this side of the Chamber believe it ought to be engrafted upon the system, because it would compel the rich and the near rich to help pay the expenses of a Government which gives them protection of life and property, wherever they may go, in every land and under every sky. They believe that a large number of Senators on the other side agree with them in their hearts, and that most of those who oppose the amendment are fighting it because they fear it would be the entering wedge which would split the present tariff system in twain. They fear it would give a new source of revenue to the Government and revolutionize the whole thing, for they know that the larger the volume of revenue pouring into the Treasury the less excuse there would be for high tariff. And they know that the downfall of high tariff would mean their downfall from power.

Sir, I hold that no better method of raising money to run the Government was ever invented by the ingenuity of man than that which is embodied in the principle of taxing all according to their ability to pay; and any other method is not only unjust, but vicious, and ought to be outlawed by all who love liberty and free government.

Sir, I admire our great President, great in mind and great in heart, but who can follow his changing views of this question? He was one of the foremost exponents of an income tax back yonder when his party was promising things it is now engaged in repudiating. And, now, after the House has followed his recommendation and provided a graduated inheritance tax, he comes with still another measure, emanating from this Chamber, which will defeat the very thing he has hitherto stood for.

I do not criticise the President, for I am sure he believes he is right, and I believe in his wisdom and patriotism and justice. But, sir, for all that, I think this body is absolved from its belief in his infallibility, when in the very measure commended to us as the ripe fruit of his wisdom an error is committed, which shows that sometimes even a great man's mind may slip a cog or miss a goal in the great golf game of politics.

It detracts from the immaculate perfection which lends its charm to a measure originating in such high quarters that the egg was cracked in the laying.

There is a vast amount of misinformation extant about the political origin of the so-called doctrine of "free raw materials." It was never a Democratic doctrine, although, as I have said, the party has in recent years favored it. It is a New England doctrine, because the manufacturers who get the bulk of protection's benefits are there, and they naturally want the raw materials untaxed, as a general rule, and thereby add to their profits.

It certainly can not be a southern doctrine, because the South abounds in raw materials, and it is not to the interest of my people to sell them cheaply for New England to manufacture and then sell back to us at high protective prices.

But, Mr. President, I confess that whenever the great Democratic party espouses a thing I at once become enamored of it. It is the way of all good Democrats, and it has its origin in the universal conviction among them that its doctrines are always conceived in righteousness and patriotism. There are thousands of our people clinging yet to the free-raw-material idea, because it was once espoused by the Democratic party as an expedient, but it was found long ago that the means did not reach the noble and patriotic end.

The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER] has thrown a flood of light upon this question in a recent speech upon this floor, especially as it relates to iron ore.

Sir, I can not conceive how the idea became prevalent that Democratic Senators must now vote against every measure to tax anything. The party has always stood for a tariff for revenue, and yet when we vote in the Senate for a revenue tariff on iron ore and other raw materials, there are some who are ready to decry it as un-Democratic in the face of the record that iron ore has been taxed in every revenue bill since the Government has existed, and that the 25 cents a ton is 15 cents less than it was even in the Wilson bill. It further appears, sir, and it is most astonishing information, that in that very bill every Democrat in the Senate save one voted for it.

The majority of the Senators on this side of the Chamber voted for a revenue tariff on iron ore and lumber, and we are in favor of a revenue tariff on coal and many other raw materials, because we believe it is the best illustration of Democratic principles.

We believe that when the old-time theory was reversed in 1892 it was a departure from the long-established Democratic faith, but that it was done in the hope that free raw materials would bring down the prices of manufactured goods; but prices went up instead of coming down. We believe, further, that it would be contrary to the Democratic creed to give to the manufacturer a tariff on what he sells and free trade on what he buys.

I believe that the true Democratic doctrine is a tariff for revenue on raw materials as well as on the manufactured goods. Sir, we are now almost a half a century beyond the settlement of that other issue which cost the Nation so much blood and treasure, and may God grant that we shall never have another struggle like it for the settlement of any issue. Time has pulled down the forts and leveled the trenches; time has healed and comforted and subdued the passions of men until the Mason and Dixon line is now only the red scar of honor across the breast of the Republic which marks the unity of our once divided country. Our people have been true to the dead and true to the living, and while they have stood by the principles cherished by their fathers, they have not shrunk from their duty as American citizens. They have paid far more than their share of revenue to support the Government with millions piled on millions in bounties to northern manufacturers. They have cheerfully paid millions more in pensions to soften the pillows and smooth the paths of the now aged veterans who defeated them in war. They have done more. Their sons rushed to arms under the old flag when the President called for volunteers in the war with Spain; and, still more, they stopped the panic of 1907. They stopped it with their cotton bales. The credit of the whole country, like Mazeppa of old, was lashed to the back of that wild panic, and but for the cotton crops of 1907 and 1908 the disaster to our commerce and trade would have shocked the world. Therefore, sir, the Senators and Representatives from the South feel that they ought to have had a voice in the legislation which means so much to their people. But we are told that the policies to which we cling once imperiled the industrial life of the Nation. We are told that under the operation of the Wilson revenue-tariff bill our industries were brought to a standstill; that labor was turned out into the world without employment; that business languished everywhere, and that the whole country was on the eve of bankruptcy, knowing, as they do, that these conditions were the result of the panic of 1893, which began before the Wilson bill was passed; that it was a world panic, brought on by overspeculation and overtrading and by the manipulations of the bears in the markets of the earth.

I now ask the Senators on the other side of this Chamber, What brought on the panic of 1907? The Wilson bill did not bring it on, because the Dingley high-tariff law was in full operation. Democratic theories did not bring it on, because the Republicans were intrenched in power.

What precipitated that panic, which again stopped the wheels of industry and left 2,000,000 men with empty dinner pails in their hands and empty stomachs at home, and which plunged so many thousands of the best business men in the land into almost irretrievable ruin? I repeat, Who stopped the clock of our prosperity in 1907? The most distinguished citizen of America, then enthroned in the White House, but now like some spectacled colossus bestriding the jungles of Africa, shouted, through a message to Congress, that the trusts and combines did it to discredit his administration. And the trusts and combines hurled back the answer that the President did it by his unnatural, unwarranted, and imperious efforts to tear down business.

Perhaps both accusations had something in them; but, sir, the country believes that the great aggregations of consolidated wealth, made possible by our tariff system and our financial system, did it. For our great protected industries have the

power to close the doors of the banks and stop the flow of money at will, because they own the banks; and the banks have the power to stop the wheels of industry, because they own the industries. The wild horse of the panic of 1907 has been stopped in its mad career and our credit has been rescued from destruction, but it has been in the hospital ever since. But the conditions which made that panic possible still exist, and more panics will come with greater fury unless these causes are removed.

France and Germany and other foreign powers are not asleep. They are gradually but surely checkmating us with measures of retaliation, and it is reasonable to believe that they will ultimately close their ports to us as long as we close our ports to them. The argument that they can undersell us is in their favor, for if it be true, they have the power to take from us the trade of the world and leave us without a market beyond the seas.

Sir, I warn the party in power now that long before the final judgment day shall come there will be a judgment at the ballot box, and the party so jubilant to-day will lie helpless and disconsolate, as the old Tennesseean who joined a great excursion to the beautiful city of Memphis in the days when the saloon was in flower. The old man, after lingering too long where Bacchus smiles, became hilarious and swore he could whip anybody in Memphis, and the crowd around him laughed. Then he swore he could whip anybody in Shelby County, and the crowd laughed again. Then he swore he could whip anybody in the State, and a stranger jumped him and beat him nearly to death and left him writhing on the floor. But finally he rose in a sitting position and exclaimed: "Gentlemen, I am afraid I kivered a leetle too much territory in that last proposition." [Great laughter.] They gave us the McKinley law, and the people stood it; they gave us the Dingley law, and the people endured it; but the Senator from Rhode Island will discover by and by that he has "kivered a leetle too much territory" in this last proposition.

The indications all point in that direction, for have we not witnessed the spectacle of many eloquent and far-seeing Senators on the other side of the aisle, who have had their ears to the ground, fleeing in the direction of low tariff? The time was, in the recent past, when the guides about the Capitol were pointing out to visiting pilgrims the beetling-browed senior Senator from Iowa and the sun-crowned senior Senator from Indiana as the Elijah and Elisha of protection. But strange things happened in Indiana last fall, and coming events are casting their shadows before them in Iowa and other great agricultural States beyond the Mississippi. It is therefore clear to all who have witnessed the impassioned supplications of many Senators from that region for lighter bounties to the rich and lighter burdens upon the poor that the chariot of fire is about to descend, and some of the prophets are in great danger of being caught up and translated into the heaven of private life where politicians cease from troubling and statesmen are at rest. [Laughter.] Mr. President, southern Senators have not been permitted to take any very prominent part in this legislation, nor in any other legislation affecting the national well-being.

Our people have been in the wilderness of political ostracism for more than forty years, and the children of Israel never encountered more trials and tribulations.

When the first gun at Fort Sumter heralded the approaching storm of war the civilization of the old South was at the zenith of its glory. It was a proud and haughty civilization and sat upon a throne of living ebony. Its wealth and power were unrivaled in the world. But when the last gun at Appomattox heralded the dawn of peace that civilization had fallen. Its cities and towns were in ashes; its wealth and power had departed; and the remnants of the armies who fought to save it, too exhausted to longer pull the trigger, too foot-sore and too proud to run, stacked their old bent and battered muskets in the anguish of defeat and went limping back to their ruined homes. There is nothing left of that civilization now but precious memories and the pathetic story of vanished dreams, lingering among its tombstones and monuments like the fragrance of roses that are faded and gone.

The men of the South did not sulk in their tents, neither did they despair in the midst of desolation. But accepting in good faith the decision of the sword, they volunteered in the armies of enterprise and industry, determined to retrieve in peace the prestige and power they had lost in war. But, sir, scarcely had the clouds of battle lifted when they were confronted with horrors more terrible than war. The dragon of reconstruction crawled into almost every capital and left its slimy trail in every community. The reins of state governments were transferred from the white hands of the master to the black hands of his emancipated slave. Black-hearted usurpation seized our gubernatorial chairs and black-faced ignorance sat in our legislatures. Millions of bogus debts were piled up like Ossa on Pelion; oppression and robbery were unrestrained, and outrage rode on every passing breeze and lurked in every flower. And, sir, but for the unconquerable blood of the Anglo-Saxon that ran in the veins of the clansmen of the South, outlawed as they were, and condemned as assassins, the map of the richest section of this Union would have been converted into a map of darkest Africa, with a carpetbag as the symbol of its degradation.

But those battle-scarred men, desperate in the darkest hour of their history, threw themselves into the breach and broke the neck of negro domination on southern soil and reestablished white supremacy there forever. Bayonets were withdrawn from the polls, deputy marshals were eliminated from elections, and a new star of hope shone through the rifted cloud that hung like a pall of gloom over our stricken country.

The Southern States quickly adjusted themselves to the new conditions consequent upon the abolition of slavery, and our people went to work. We had no industry save agriculture; no protection save the beneficent influences of God's sunshine and showers upon our fields. The negro problem was a barrier to immigration. It shut out enterprise from our borders and turned the streams of commerce to other sections. Capital shunned us, and nothing reached us but the Internal-Revenue Department and the tariff system.

Our mountains of coal and iron slept on, unjarred by the dynamite, undisturbed by the pick and the drill. Our marble and zinc and copper still slumbered in the quarry, and our vast forests of timber still waited for the woodman's ax.

Everything slept and slumbered but taxation. Our country had been decimated by war, humiliated by reconstruction, and weighed down by the highest tariff taxation this world has ever known, and we were in bad plight. We were in the condition of the good old praying member of the church who was afflicted all at once with every disease in the catalogue. He had rheumatism and aneurism and curvature of the spine and was finally stricken with paralysis; but after months of suffering he got better, and went shambling one evening to prayer meeting. The old preacher rose and said: "Now, brethren, I want us to have a good time here to-night. I want every one of you to get up and tell what the Lord has done for you. There is Brother Jones, God bless him; he has been afflicted and hasn't been with us for many months. Brother Jones, get up and tell us what the Lord has done for you." Brother Jones arose and hobbled out in the aisle, and said: "Well, he's about ruint me." [Great laughter.]

But, Mr. President, inspired by an unfaltering faith in the future, our people still marched on toward the summit of prosperity and happiness from which they had fallen.

I do not believe that any country under the heavens ever recovered so rapidly from the devastations of war.

I have gathered a few facts to illustrate our wonderful advancement from almost naked poverty to the very gates of fabulous wealth and glory. In 1870, just five years after peace returned to bless us, the population of the Southern States was 11,250,000 souls. But in 1906 it reached 24,352,000 souls, almost all of whom were native-born southerners, showing that one of our principal products was children [laughter], who had more than doubled the population of the South in thirty-six years, not taking into consideration the thousands of men we have furnished to the professions and to every branch of trade and commerce in the North and West, and the thousands of fair women we have given them to collect a tariff for revenue from their Yankee husbands, and, not counting the large negro population, we have contributed to almost every community north of the Ohio and the Potomac rivers, to give color to their patriotism and odor to their cherished ideals of the universal brotherhood of man. [Great laughter.]

In my travels in the North I have met with sneers at the ignorance of the southern people. And I admit that there is too much of that kind of raw material there; but I have seen more ignorance in a few northern cities than in all the Southern States put together. Our ignorance is not imported, and it speaks the English language. But how could we educate the generation that grew up after the civil war without schools and colleges and universities? Ours were burned to the ground, and we had to begin as the pioneers began, in the woods and without help from any quarter.

We were so poor that even in 1880 all the Southern States expended only $7,183,000 for public schools. But our advancement along educational lines was so rapid that in 1907 the same States expended $56,217,143 for public schools alone, and we have built innumerable colleges. In my State we have noth-

ing under a university or a colonel. We have the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, Grant University at Chattanooga, the University of the South at Sewanee, the Presbyterian University at Clarksville, the Baptist University at Jackson, the Lincoln Memorial University at Cumberland Gap, Cumberland University at Lebanon, and the great Vanderbilt University at Nashville, besides two colored colleges in that city. Of course these universities are not blessed with large endowments, but they are up-to-date and flourishing institutions.

One of the greatest institutions in the whole South is the Peabody Normal, located in the city of Nashville, a monument to the great philanthropist of that name. What State in the Union can make a better showing in universities? But, sir, I wish to present a few figures to prove the progress of the South along industrial lines, especially in agriculture.

In 1870 the Southern States produced 3,010,113 bales of cotton. In 1908 they produced 13,587,506 bales of cotton, the value of which is estimated at $681,230,956, or more than $250,000,000 more than the value of the output of all the gold mines in the world in the same year. In 1870 the South raised, in round numbers, 178,000,000 pounds of tobacco. In 1907 we raised 487,000,000 pounds. In 1870 we raised, in round numbers, 7,000,000 bushels of potatoes. In 1907 we raised over 22,500,000 bushels, and they were still digging potatoes when the reports came in. In 1870 our crop of hay was 903,000 tons. In 1907 it was 4,370,000 tons, and they were still making hay. Our corn crop in 1870 measured, in round numbers, 343,000,000 bushels. In 1907 it measured out 693,000,000 bushels.

In 1870 we garnered 30,000,000 bushels of wheat, and in 1907 nearly 45,000,000 bushels. I have not the figures to show the increase in the output of rice and sugar, but it has been enormous. Mr. President, I despise sectional jealousy, I abhor sectional animosity, but I do believe in sectional pride and sectional patriotism. I do not fall out with the East for believing that the aurora borealis is the reflection of the fires of eastern furnaces and factories, nor with the West for believing the sunset's golden glow is the reflection of western fields of grain; and why should they fall out with me for entertaining the opinion that the milky way is only the picture on the sky of the rice and cotton fields of Dixie?

Why should they fall out with me when I tell them that in spite of the blight of war and the curse of reconstruction, in spite of the discriminations of an unjust tariff system, my section of our common country has steadily climbed up the golden stairs?

We do not claim all the glory for ourselves, for men of thought and men of action in the North discovered long ago that the Chinese wall of the negro problem was only a shadow invented for political and commercial reasons, and they have seized opportunity by the forelock and furnished a large part of the capital to extend our railroad systems from 12,554 miles of track in 1870 to 63,784 miles in 1907; and when the problem of transportation was solved, they began to spend millions for furnaces and factories in our midst, and the result is that North Carolina has 350 cotton mills to-day. South Carolina has more spindles than North Carolina, and Georgia is not far behind either of them. Birmingham is leading the world with her pig iron, and the industry has just begun in the Birmingham district. We are just beginning to hear the shrill notes of the factory whistle and the music of machinery at every point of the compass in the land of cotton and colonels. There was never, in all the history of men, such an industrial awakening as has been rampant in the South. We have a monopoly on climate; the raw materials are at our doors; we have water power enough to run the machinery of the earth, and we can manufacture cheaper than any country this side of that country where raw materials and fuel are free.

Our railroad lines have already brought every section of the Southland in easy reach of the sea, and when the great Isthmian Canal is completed it will bring us by water 10,000 miles closer to the Orient, and thus give us a new outlet for our products. That canal will turn the stream of commerce from the Middle West to southern ports, and it will honeycomb the South and the great Southwest with diversified industries and make them blossom like the rose.

Our farm products have increased in value from $600,000,000 in 1880 to $2,225,000,000, and only about two-fifths of our lands are yet under the plow.

Our cotton crop in the past ten years reaches the enormous aggregate of 112,500,000 bales.

The South has a farm ready for each of 2,000,000 more farmers, and if only half of them were under cultivation the annual value of her crop would be $5,000,000,000.

Her truck crops for the northern market have arisen from inappreciable value to over $100,000,000, and it is progressing by such startling leaps and bounds that the prophets have set the mark at a billion within a few years.

She is making ten times as much pig iron as in 1880.

She has 41 per cent of the total forest area of the United States, and the value of her lumber output last year averaged a million dollars a day.

Her mineral output increased from a valuation of $13,818,000 in 1880 to $287,000,000 last year.

But, Mr. President, I know that our opponents on the other side of this Chamber will exclaim that if all this be true, the Southern Senators ought to vote solidly for the pending tariff measure, and thus insure the realization of our dreams. I answer them in advance that principle and justice are above policy. Our mechanical industries amounted to almost nothing through all the long, weary years when we needed capital to build them, and yet we had to pay the tariff. But we have prospered in spite of all. If we had nothing else but agriculture, we would still be growing rich.

But now that we have accumulated capital of our own, supplemented by the capital of the generous men of other sections who believe in our future, we are going to convert our own raw materials into finished goods, tariff or no tariff. We believe that we can compete with other nations on a revenue basis. We are confident that we can put New England out of business in the years to come under the system you are forcing upon us now. We know the system is wrong, forever wrong, for we have felt its grinding power. I heard the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] say not long ago, on this floor, that the South has paid four thousand millions since the war in tariff bounties to the North. We have been shipping our raw materials to the North for forty years, paying the freight and the bounty to the manufacturer, and then shipping them back in the finished goods, and paying the freight on our mowers and reapers and shovels and hoes and everything from a gang plow to a broom handle, and I am sure the Senator did not overestimate what it has cost our people who toil in the fields for their daily bread.

But let the curtain drop on that. The mill will never grind with the water that is passed.

But we are prepared for the future. And yet I do not believe that the United States will ever reach the high tide of its glory until we apply the golden rule and deal justly not only with our own people at home, but with the people of other nations. We can not hope to defend the principles of free government and to exemplify the blessings which they bring until we apply them impartially under our own flag. We can not hope to lead all the nations of the earth in commerce and trade until we are willing to buy as well as to sell. We can not hope to perpetuate our free institutions and to hand them down to posterity as a priceless heritage until we wipe from our statute books the last vestige of unequal and unjust taxation, the great destroyer of nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that the amendment to the amendment may be read again.

Mr. BURKETT. Let the amendment to the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance the following words:

The word "hides" as used in this paragraph shall be understood to include all skins of any kind and all kinds of cattle and calves of any weight or size of such skins, however small.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will withdraw this amendment, and allow us to vote on the committee's proposition. As I understand the attitude of the Senator from Mississippi, he is in favor of free hides and free shoes and free leather and everything else free; and he takes the unusual method of arriving at that result by taking articles now on the free list that have always been free and putting a duty on them. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. McLAURIN. I can not withdraw my amendment. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I have tried to make myself understood. I am in favor of free hides, free leather, and free shoes; but if there is a tariff on shoes and a tariff on leather I am in favor of a tariff on hides, provided all hides are put under the duty. I am not, though, in favor of a tariff on the big hides and no tariff on the little ones. If there is any protection in this tariff—and, of course, there is

a protection in a tariff for revenue, an incidental protection—the small hides ought to receive the benefit of it just as well as the large hides.

My amendment is that there shall be no discrimination. It merely defines what a hide is; that a hide is understood to be the skin of an animal that weighs not more than 10 pounds or 5 pounds as well as the skin of an animal that weighs 25 pounds. I therefore can not withdraw it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator from Mississippi permit a question?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not see the Senator's amendment until just a little while ago when he brought it to me. May I ask a question along the line of the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island? In case a duty should be voted on hides, at any rate the same kind of a duty as now exists, and the Senator's amendment should first be adopted, then would the result be practically placing that same duty on every kind of hides, and thus taking out from the free list a variety of hides which always under every bill have been put upon the free list? Is that the case?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not agree with the Senator in his construction.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am asking the Senator if that is the case?

Mr. McLAURIN. My idea is, that under the law all hides were subject to the duty, but that the ruling of the Treasury Department, putting on the free list hides weighing less than 25 pounds, was wrong and against the intention of Congress in putting the duty upon hides. I therefore wanted a definition by Congress that all hides of every weight shall be included under the word "hides," and that there shall be no opportunity on the part of the Treasury officials to construe it away.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The question still remains whether that be the method or whether the law is now correctly construed or not. Would the effect of the Senator's amendment for practical purposes be to take off of the free list a number of varieties of skins which have always been on the free list, and specifically place them upon the dutiable list by the language of the law itself? Would that be the practical effect?

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator can read the amendment, and he is as capable of construing it as I am. There could be no question about that. The Senator knows what would be the effect of it.

Mr. BAILEY. As I understand, the whole purpose of the Senator from Mississippi—and I thoroughly sympathize with it—is to equalize the tax. There never was and there never will be any decent excuse given for permitting one man to bring in a hide that weighs 24 pounds without paying a tax and compelling his neighbor who brings in a hide weighing 26 pounds to pay a tax.

One other suggestion, and then I will not detain the Senate. On every one of these hides, which under the House bill are made free, under that same House bill there is a duty imposed on the hide after it passes into the manufacturer's possession and has been subjected to his process. In other words, the tanner or the manufacturer of shoes is permitted to bring in his hides without the payment of a tax.

He tans it and passes it over to the shoemaker. The shoemaker converts it into a shoe, and then has a tariff on that shoe for its full price, equal to 15 per cent. That 15 per cent not only includes the value of the labor employed in converting the hide into a shoe, it not only covers the increase in the value due to the investment of capital and the realization of a profit, but that 15 per cent also covers the value of the hide on which the manufacturer has not paid a cent of duty. In other words, your free-hide proposition is to give the manufacturer a duty on that part of the finished product represented by the value of the free hide and yet charge him no duty on that value itself.

Now analyze it. There never was anything more unjust and more indefensible. The manufacturer, I repeat, imports a hide and pays no duty on it. He converts that hide into a shoe, and then collects a duty on it from the American people, the duty including the value of the hide as well as the value of the labor and the investment, and your whole proposition is to allow the manufacturer to collect a tax from the people that he has never paid to the Government.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I just want to say that while I do not believe under all the circumstances that any duty should be imposed upon hides at all, yet my objection has gone to the proposition that under the proposed amendment the producers of only certain hides would get the benefit of that protection, but it did not go as a general thing to the small farmer of the country.

Now, the House voted for free hides. If the Senate should vote for a tax on hides without the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, it would be limited to the particular class of hides covered by the Senate committee amendment. I for one, therefore, shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, to the end that if in the last analysis we must have a duty on hides, it shall be universal and general in its application.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], it is to place all hides on the dutiable list in the event that any kind of hides whatever are to be placed upon that list.

I desire to say that I shall vote for the amendment offered by that Senator, and then, whether that amendment prevails or not, I shall vote against the entire proposition to place a duty on hides. I vote for his amendment because we have been assured that the duty on hides is necessary to protect the farmers of this country. Of course, I believe in all these protestations of friendship in behalf of the farmer. Everybody is the farmer's friend.

Now, sir, there is no reason why an arbitrary line should be drawn at 25 pounds. If the man who removes a hide of 26 pounds should enjoy protection, if it affords any benefit, on the other hand, the man who removes a hide weighing only 24½ pounds ought equally to enjoy protection, and should not be exposed to the competition of the world.

I have no sympathy with that arbitrary line. The farmers of the country remove the small hides, and if it is the intention of this provision to protect and shield the farmers against the foreigner, then place the small hide on the protected list as well as the heavier hides.

For my own part I am opposed to all duties on all hides whatsoever. I am against a duty on big hides, and I am against a duty on little hides. I am merely opposed to the discrimination. I am not willing to betray the farmer without a kiss. I desire to see the United States leading the contest for commercial supremacy of the earth.

I shall vote for every measure calculated directly or indirectly to promote that consummation so devoutly to be wished.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi owing to the fact which my question to him elicited. I am not prepared to vote for any measure, without any substantial economic reason being shown, which will take off the free list a number of articles which under our laws at all times have been on the free list.

As to the main proposition itself, I will not detain the Senate any further at the present time. When the Senator from Mississippi presented his amendment it looked very attractive to me; but upon thinking it over I find that its net result will be, in case of voting a duty on hides at all, to cover a large range of products with that very duty which never before in our history under any bill passed by any party bore a duty upon them. It is a departure in the way of putting a tariff duty upon such articles that I am not now prepared to take.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I realize that the Senators have heard about all the debate that they care for upon this proposition, and I do not propose to detain you further by a lengthy discussion of this measure. I simply desire to say that I voted for free hides, as all Republicans did, when the Dingley bill passed the House of Representatives. For three-quarters of a century we have had free hides in this country. There is not a great commercial country in the world which imposes a duty upon hides. The entire business world recognizes that there is a great scarcity of this article. The packing houses acquire it as a by-product, and pay the farmer and cattle raiser very little for it, arbitrarily fixing the price. The tanners need the hides, and the leather manufacturer finds great difficulty in obtaining them. I can see no reason for limiting this supply and concentrating it into a few hands.

Mr. Blaine and Mr. McKinley and Mr. Harrison and Mr. Arthur and Mr. Garfield and Mr. Dingley, all good protectionists, saw no wisdom in maintaining this duty. The dependence of our tanners and leather manufacturers upon South America everyone admits. It is the idlest folly to make this item a test of a man's devotion to the principles of protection, and the maintenance of this duty is an economic and political error. The House of Representatives saw no wisdom in it, and the same body in McKinley's administration saw none. Thousands of people protest against it. The multiplied uses of leather call loudly for a world's supply of raw material, and we shall be unfaithful if we do not heed the call.

We know the demands which are made for this necessary product, boots and shoes, harness and saddles, while every woman carries a leather bag. Every factory, with its thousands

of workmen, uses leather belting; every furniture manufacturer uses it as a part of his art and for the convenience of his patron. Our country can not supply the demand, and I see neither wisdom, policy, nor common sense in the extreme position to which some Members of the Senate would lead us in this matter. In perfect harmony with my past record as a protectionist, I intend to cast my vote against the committee amendment; but I do not propose to be led into the error of casting my vote against a duty on the manufactures of that raw material, made by hundreds of thousands of my countrymen, and which I still desire to see converted into the finished product upon our own soil for the benefit of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], who is unavoidably detained. I withhold my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when Mr. KEAN's name was called). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER]. If the Senator from Tennessee were present, I would vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], who is unavoidably absent. I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. BOURNE] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I make the announcement for the balance of the afternoon.

Mr. CLAY. I am requested to state that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] is at home sick, and he is paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. If the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote "yea." I will let this announcement stand for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] is paired with the senior Senator from New Jersey, the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. CLAY. I was informed that the senior Senator from Tennessee was paired with the junior Senator from Delaware. So that he is paired, it does not make any material difference.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Bacon	Crawford	Johnston, Ala.	Overman
Bailey	Culberson	Jones	Shively
Bankhead	Davis	McCumber	Simmons
Borah	Dick	McLaurin	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Fletcher	Martin	Stone
Chamberlain	Foster	Money	Taliaferro
Clapp	Gore	Nelson	Tillman
Clay	Hughes	Newlands	

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Owen
Beveridge	Crane	Gallinger	Page
Brandegee	Cullom	Gamble	Penrose
Briggs	Cummins	Hale	Piles
Bristow	Curtis	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Daniel	Johnson, N. Dak.	Scott
Bulkeley	Dillingham	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dixon	Lodge	Smoot
Burnham	Dolliver	Lorimer	Sutherland
Burrows	du Pont	McEnery	Warner
Burton	Elkins	Nixon	Warren
Carter	Flint	Oliver	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—13.

Bourne	Guggenheim	Rayner	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Richardson	
Depew	Paynter	Smith, S. C.	
Frazier	Perkins	Stephenson	

So Mr. McLAURIN's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on yesterday I gave notice of an amendment that I should offer as soon as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] was disposed of. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all that part of the pending amendment after the word "pickled," in the first line, and in lieu of the matter stricken out to insert the following:

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, saddles, and saddlery, finished or unfinished, made of leather, or of which leather is the component material of chief value; bands and belting, made of leather, for use on machinery; all the foregoing shall be admitted free of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not going to debate this amendment at this time. There are some observations that I wish to make in support of it later on. I voted a little while since for the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], not because I was thoroughly in sympathy with it, but because I thought its adoption would strengthen the proposition I am now making. Other Senators here can debate this amendment if they wish. I shall not; but I give notice now that if the amendment is defeated in the Committee of the Whole, I shall offer it again in the Senate, and then I shall have something to say in support of it.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question with a view of obtaining an accurate understanding of his amendment, as I have it not before me.

Mr. STONE. If the Senator will pardon me, I will say that if the amendment should be adopted, it would put on the free list hides of cattle, leather made from hides of cattle, shoes made of leather, harness made of leather, and bands and belts made of leather for use in machinery.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri why it is that he puts a band or a belt for a machine on the free list and keeps bands and belts that go upon the human body, or a part of it, on the tax list?

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to all leather bands or belts going on the free list; but when we enter upon a band or a belt, such as the Senator from Virginia refers to, we are then dealing with articles of human wearing apparel, an entirely different class of articles, which would bring on a debate upon entirely different lines; and it seemed to me to be advisable to confine the amendment as I have.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. As I understand, the committee amendment proposes a duty of 15 per cent on hides. That is what we are about to vote on.

Mr. STONE. The amendment that I have just offered, if adopted, would put hides on the free list.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I am speaking about the committee amendment, which proposes a duty of 15 per cent on hides. I do not understand that the Senator from Missouri proposes to put leather and shoes on the free list unless hides are put on the free list.

Mr. STONE. The amendment provides for hides going on the free list.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was going to suggest to the Senator, why not permit us to take a vote on the committee amendment, which proposes a duty of 15 per cent on hides, and if, as the result of that vote, hides should be put on the free list, then offer his amendment to put leather, boots, and shoes on the free list?

Mr. CULBERSON. I will ask the Senator from Missouri if his amendment will not accomplish by one vote what the two votes would accomplish, as suggested by the Senator from North Carolina? I do not know that it will, but I am asking for information.

Mr. STONE. The amendment proposed by the Finance Committee in the first line provides that hides of cattle, raw or pickled, shall bear a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem. After the word "pickled," there is a further provision in the committee amendment. The amendment offered by me strikes out all of the committee amendment after the word "pickled," so that, if it should be agreed to, the entire amendment would be "hides of cattle, raw or pickled, leather made," and so on, shall be free. It would cover the whole. The proposition is to strike out all of the committee amendment after the word "pickled" and insert in lieu of the matter stricken out what I have sent to the desk.

It seems to me that the suggestion of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is correct, and if we have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment at this time, it would end the necessity of two yea-and-nay votes. If a majority vote against it, there will be no need of a yea-and-nay vote on the committee amendment, though I really am indifferent as to that.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will not understand me as in any way indicating any opposition to the amendment. I was simply making the suggestion.

Mr. STONE. I will ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, Mr. President.

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

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

Mr. KEAN (when his name was called). As heretofore announced, I am paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that if the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bacon	Culberson	La Follette	Simmons
Bailey	Cummins	McLaurin	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Daniel	Martin	Stone
Chamberlain	Davis	Money	Taliaferro
Clapp	Fletcher	Overman	Tillman
Clay	Gore	Owen	
Crawford	Johnston, Ala.	Shively	

NAYS—48.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Oliver
Beveridge	Crane	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Hale	Penrose
Bradley	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Brandegee	Dick	Johnson, N. Dak.	Root
Brown	Dillingham	Jones	Scott
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Sutherland
Burrows	Elkins	McEnery	Warner
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Carter	Frye	Nixon	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—18.

Bankhead	Foster	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Bourne	Frazier	Paynter	Stephenson
Briggs	Guggenheim	Perkins	Taylor
Clarke, Ark.	Hughes	Rayner	
Depew	Kean	Richardson	

So Mr. STONE's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, before the roll call began upon this amendment I had risen to my feet to say only two sentences as to how I should vote and why, but was prevented from doing so by a circumstance that has occurred only too often in this Senate within the last two or three years, and something which in the early years, when I was in the Senate, was, under my own personal observation, never practiced. Notwithstanding that a Senator was on his feet and the roll call had not actually begun, the roll call was commenced and a response was made. I think, Mr. President, it would not only conduce to that feeling of fairness, which is so essential to the proper conduct of our business, but that it would expedite the bill itself if a spirit of toleration in that regard was more practiced under these peculiar circumstances.

Mr. President, I felt at first very hospitable to this amendment, but this case of shoes and boots happens to be one of those cases where a very substantial reduction from the rate in the existing law has actually been made by the House, and is one of the few instances where the Finance Committee of the Senate have resolved to stand by the reduction of the House.

The reduction on shoes is fully 40 per cent; and when a reduction has been made after full consideration by both committees I feel that, unless reasons are shown against it, it should be sustained.

There is another reason why I am for a very moderate tariff—and the one that is now fixed by the bill is a moderate one; it was 25 per cent before; it is 15 per cent now—and that is this curious circumstance, but for which I certainly would have been for free shoes and free boots, or, to speak more accurately, in favor of putting them on the free list, and that is that our superiority as a boot and shoe manufacturing nation has been due to the great competition that has been built up, and especially to the use of machines. I understand—and I have not heard it disputed—that those machines are not owned, but are leased, and that within the last few years, or perhaps the last year or two, for the first time in the history of this industry since their invention, they are being leased in large quantities to the makers of shoes abroad, and that experts to teach their shoemakers that same skill now exercised by American shoemakers with these machines have been sent there to teach the foreign producers the same methods. That being true, Mr. President, it seems to me that all the facts of the case justify us in supporting the House reduction, which is very considerable—40 per cent—and which the Senate committee has so wisely sustained, and not to go so far in this critical stage of the industry as to put them on the free list altogether.

I will confess that 10 per cent would have suited me better than 15, but yet that comes very near splitting hairs.

That was all, Mr. President, I had intended to say, and, indeed, more than I intended to say when I rose to address the Senate before I voted.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, as a substitute for the committee amendment, I offer what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to insert:

Notwithstanding anything in this bill contained, all shoes, boots, leather, and hides, when imported into this country, shall be exempt from the payment of a duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senate has just voted upon that proposition.

Mr. McLAURIN. Not exactly. There is this difference: The other amendment included belts and harness, and this does not. That is the only difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move to strike out from the amendment offered by the committee the word "fifteen" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "ten," so that the duty levied will be 10 per cent instead of 15 per cent.

I have listened to the long debate upon this subject with a good deal of interest, because I happen to represent in part a State which produces more cattle, at least in value, than any other State in the Union, and therefore it may be assumed that our people are somewhat interested in this matter. I have not heard a single word suggested that could lead me—I was about to say "or any reasonable man"—to the conclusion that there should not be a duty on hides that would not apply with equal force to every article or commodity in this bill which we do not produce in sufficient quantities for our own use; and there are a great many such things that fall within the principle, I think, of protection. Therefore it seems to me that there ought to be a reasonable duty on hides. Nor have I any doubt whatsoever that the producer of hides derives a fair advantage and a fair benefit from the increased price which this duty creates. But I believe that the whole scale of duties of the Dingley law, or substantially all the duties of the Dingley law, were higher than they should have been; and I am from time to time endeavoring to impress upon the Senate the duty, as I view it, of reducing these taxes. I think the farmer should bear his fair share of the reduction.

We have already reduced the duty on shoes; we have already reduced the duty on sole leather; and we have reduced somewhat the duties upon other manufactured forms of leather.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senate has not yet acted either upon the duty upon shoes or the duty upon sole leather. The Senator is mistaken in that regard. They have been passed over for the reason that those duties ought not to be acted upon by the Senate until it is decided what duties, if any, shall be placed upon hides.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I beg the pardon of the Senator from Rhode Island. I have come to be so sure that anything that the Senator from Rhode Island favors has been or will be the action of the Senate that I confused those two things; and, being advised by much debate here that there either has been or will be reported a reduction of the duty on these things, I spoke somewhat hastily and somewhat incorrectly. But I simply revise my statement, to the effect that I know that there will be a reduction of the duty on shoes and the duty on leather; and I for one am not going to stand here and insist that the producer of hides shall not share in this general reduction. Therefore I have made the motion to substitute 10 per cent duty in the stead of 15 per cent duty, and I hope that it will receive the favor of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will include in his motion the finished products of hides, I shall be very glad to vote for the 10 per cent duty on both; but I shall not vote to give the man who makes shoes out of hides a higher tariff on his finished product than he pays on the material out of which he makes it.

Of course I understand that there is a kind of argument that the shoe represents labor. According to its cost, the shoe does not represent as much labor as the hide. It does not represent as much investment as the hide; because, it must be remembered, that in this day of the general breaking up of the great ranches practically all of our cattle, or, at least, a larger part of our cattle, are produced on the farm. The farms where

those cattle are bred represent a greater investment, according to the value of the hide, than the factory represents, according to the value of the shoe. It represents more labor, according to value, because there are no machines employed in producing the hides, whereas practically all of the work on the shoe is the work of a machine—operated, it is true, by a man. I shall be very glad to take the duty off of any raw material, when I can also take it off the finished product. I shall be glad to reduce any duty in the bill on a raw material, if I can also make the same reduction on the finished product.

But it is incomprehensible to me why a man who invests his money in brick buildings and machines shall have a different rate of taxation applied to his products from that which is applied to the man who invests his money in cattle and land, and hires men made out of flesh and blood to attend them instead of machines. I hope the Senator from Iowa will couple or follow his motion to reduce the duty on hides to 10 per cent with a motion to reduce the duty on shoes and all other leather products. I will vote even for that reduction if he will adopt the course I mention.

The people of the United States do not wear hides; they wear shoes. They will derive no benefit whatever from a reduction in the duty on hides that is not followed by a reduction in the duty on shoes; because, with this 15 per cent duty levied on his shoes, the manufacturer will charge just as much as he would if he paid 15 per cent duty on his hides. He will charge just as much as he would if he paid no duty on his hides; and the 5 per cent reduction on his hides is a pure gratuity that amounts annually, under the present importation, to something more than $700,000, taken out of the Public Treasury and given to the tanners and the shoemakers of this country without any compensating reduction in the price of shoes.

We collected in 1907 something more than $3,000,000 in duties on hides, notwithstanding the Treasury ruling which exempted a large part of the importations. Of that three million and something like one hundred thousand dollars, we remitted in drawbacks $900,000, leaving a total net revenue of over $2,200,000 in the fiscal year 1907. To reduce that from 15 to 10 per cent is simply to give the shoemakers of the country $700,000 a year.

I do not forget that this bill has also reduced the duty on shoes from 25 to 15 per cent. But there can be no good reason given why a man shall buy his raw material with a lower rate of duty than he has on his finished product; because if he buys a hide and pays 15 per cent duty on it, he manufactures that hide into a given number of shoes and still has 15 per cent duty on those shoes. That 15 per cent covers the value of the hide, including tariff and original cost, just as it includes all the added value that comes through land and through capital and through machinery. And thus what he pays in the first place he has paid to him in the next place, because this 15 per cent duty, as I have already stated, is 15 per cent on the entire value of the product—the shoe, as it were.

Here is your trouble, and it is utterly indefensible and unavoidable: You charge the shoe manufacturer 10 per cent on his hides; and when he takes that 10 per cent duty-paid hide and manufactures it into shoes, he has 15 per cent on the shoe. That 15 per cent includes the original cost of the raw material, the labor bestowed upon it, the capital invested in it—in other words, it covers the entire value of the shoe; and that value includes the raw material on which he has paid only 10 per cent, where you now propose to give him 15 per cent, out of the consumer, for the 10 per cent he has paid to the Government. It is absolutely indefensible.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the conclusions of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in this particular case. I have just voted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri, which put, or sought to put, upon the free list hides, leather, boots, and shoes. With the Senator's course of reasoning in the abstract I should be unable to always agree. It is sound in this particular instance, because I believe that the shoemakers of the United States turn their leather into shoes as cheaply as the shoemakers of any country in the world. But I can easily imagine a process of manufacture in which the difference between the cost of production or manufacture here and abroad would not be met by the application of the duty to the increased cost or price of the finished product. It is therefore unnecessary to enter into any discussion of that abstract question, for I agree with him with regard to boots and shoes. The 10 per cent which is added to the cost of the material by this duty and is carried forward into the ultimate price of the finished product, in my opinion, amply compensates the boot and shoe manufacturer and puts him upon a fair equality with his competitors throughout the world. Therefore I shall do what I can, in the further progress of this matter, to reduce the duty upon boots and shoes to 10 per cent, just as it has now been reduced, or proposed to be reduced, to 5 per cent upon sole leather. But it seemed to me, in the orderly progress of the bill, knowing that I would be beaten, anyhow, and desiring to preserve a certain sort of consistency, that it would be better to limit my amendment to the immediate paragraph under consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Idaho——

Mr. CUMMINS. Iowa; do not charge my brother here with any sins that do not belong to him.

Mr. BAILEY. Neither Senator need resent being taken for the other. The Senator from Iowa and I would, of course, view this or any similar question from different standpoints. As a consistent Republican, the Senator would of course take into consideration the difference of the labor cost, and he would supply that difference by a tariff. I did not have that phase of the matter in my mind, nor is it applicable to this, because whatever may be the difference in the labor cost, if you take the ad valorem and apply it from the ground up, it equalizes it all. In other words, if the manufacturer takes a hide worth $3 and manufactures it into 30 pairs of shoes, he has his ad valorem followed from the hide to the shoe; and, of course, whatever value he adds to the hide in the process of manufacture he finds represented in the ad valorem duty. Whether a given ad valorem is sufficient to cover the difference in the labor cost between this and other countries might be important to Senators holding the view of the Senator from Iowa; but even if that is important, still common justice and fair dealing require that the manufacturer shall pay the same duty on his raw material that he receives back on his finished product.

In other words, Mr. President, I will illustrate my point in this way: Take the case of wool, which the manufacturer imports free of duty. He manufactures it into woolen goods, on which, we will say, there is a duty of 50 per cent. That 50 per cent is expressed on the total value of the woolen cloth. That total value of the woolen cloth is made up by the cost of the wool, by the labor cost, and by a fair return upon the capital invested. Obviously, therefore, the woolen manufacturer has 50 per cent on the wool, the original value, as well as 50 per cent on all the value that he adds by fabricating the wool into woolen goods. Yet, according to this free raw material doctrine, this manufacturer, who pays nothing on the wool when he imports it, is given the benefit of a 50 per cent duty on it when he sells it. Or, in other words, if a farmer sells his wool to the manufacturer without any duty and then buys the manufacturer's woolen goods, he pays a 50 per cent bounty on wool which the manufacturer bought from him without the payment of a farthing.

As long as we must levy duties to raise money to support the Government, let us levy them justly and equally. Let us say to the woolen manufacturer and to the shoe manufacturer, "The same duty that you pay on your raw materials you shall have on your finished product." And let us say to the man who sells shoes, hides, wool, and other raw material, "When you buy back your raw material in the shape of a finished product, you shall pay no more to the manufacturer than he paid to you."

That is the way to minimize and equalize the unavoidable and regrettable incidents of protection; and that is the only way in this world that it can be done.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I can very readily see how the Senator from Texas reaches his conclusion, and it is in entire harmony with his economic belief. But from the standpoint of one who believes in equalizing the cost of production here and abroad, his argument fails at this point; and I think I can very easily point out to him and to the Senate why.

We will assume for the moment that 10 per cent equalizes the domestic cattle raiser with his competitor in South America. There is, of course, no parallel between the conditions which surround the cattle raisers of those two countries and the conditions which might surround the boot and shoe manufacturers of the United States and Great Britain.

I want the Senator from Texas to hear what I have to say, and therefore I will suspend.

Mr. BAILEY. I hear the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope to convert him.

The boot and shoe manufacturer of the United States buys the hide—the finished product of the cattle raiser—and pays 10 per cent more than he would otherwise pay by reason of the imposition of the duty. If it were true that 10 per cent upon the process of reducing hides into shoes would measure the difference between the cost of doing that work in the United States and in Great Britain or Germany or France, the argument of the Senator from Texas would be unanswerable, namely, that the 10 per cent ad valorem, carried through the additional cost of manufacture, would completely protect the American

boot and shoe manufacturers. But assume for a moment—and it is a purely hypothetical case, because it is not here at the present moment—that the difference between the cost of making leather into shoes in the United States is 50 per cent higher than in Great Britain or any other competing country. Then the 10 per cent added to the cost of the material would not equalize the American manufacturer with his competitor across the sea. That must be perfectly obvious.

I understand how inconclusive that would be with anyone who believed simply in levying duties for the purpose of producing revenue; but from the standpoint of the protectionist it seems to me that the argument is sound.

In this particular case I repeat that I do not believe that it costs us any more to make shoes, or as much to make shoes, as it does our competitors elsewhere, and therefore I think 10 per cent duty would be abundant protection to the boot and shoe manufacturers. I know enough about the spirit that prevails in the Senate—I have heard enough suggested from time to time in an informal way—to be sure that if the duty on hides is reduced to 10 per cent the duty on shoes will also be reduced to 10 per cent. And therefore I hope that no one who believes in a fair reduction of duties, as we reach those duties, will be prevented from voting for my motion on that account, for I can not, without offering a substitute for the entire amendment, include in it other forms or any forms of manufactured leather.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, if I had any reasonable expectation that the duty on shoes would be reduced to 10 per cent, I should very cheerfully vote to reduce the duty on hides.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator, I think, that no protectionist Senator will vote to reduce the duty on shoes to 10 per cent ad valorem, especially with a duty of 10 per cent on hides.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from Iowa has just declared that leather can be converted into shoes as cheaply in this country as in any other, and I think that is true. Therefore that aggravates the equality. That does not even give a protectionist—I mean a moderate protectionist—ground to stand on.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas will agree with me that the Senator from Iowa has not at all times represented the views of this side of the Chamber.

Mr. BAILEY. Well, I think more is the pity. I think that the country would have been somewhat better off if the more moderate views of the Senator from Iowa had prevailed. Understand, Mr. President, I have small choice between evils, but I still take the lesser evil whenever I am forced to choose. And as between high protection, as represented by the chairman of the Finance Committee—and he is the embodiment of the high-protection idea in this country—and the more moderate protection of the Senator from Iowa, I would take the moderate protection of the Senator from Iowa as approaching more nearly to my own view.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. HALE. In line with the thought just suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, I wish to say that one reason why I will vote for the duty on hides as a part of the great policy of protection of home industries is that I will with equal satisfaction and earnestness oppose the reduction of the duty on boots and shoes.

I do not agree in any way with the sentiment that you will give free hides and follow that up by cutting down the duty on boots and shoes, which are an advanced stage, a manufacture involving labor, involving in my State great industries. While I will vote for the duty on hides, I will as earnestly and helpfully as in me lies oppose any reduction of the duty on boots and shoes, the finished product.

Mr. BAILEY. That is tantamount to a notice that if I help to reduce the duty on hides to 10 per cent the Republican majority will still maintain the duty on boots and shoes at 15 per cent. I am ready now to not only give a bounty of 15 per cent to the shoe manufacturer and supplement that by taking 5 per cent off of what they now have to pay to the Government.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, just one word. I think that the tanners have come here to the Senate asking for relief upon the theory that the Armours and Swifts and the other great producers of beef are about to depart, or have departed, from their legitimate business and have entered upon the business of buying hides and making leather, and that they are soon, in all probability, to reach that point where they will control such a large percentage of the hides of the country that the independent tanner will be forced out of business unless we relieve him. We can relieve him by saying that he can have the markets of the world to go to.

But I believe I state the feeling of the tanners at this moment when I say that they would just as soon have a duty of 15 per cent as 10 per cent. We have either got to give the tanner a free, fair field, without handicap, that he may compete with that great monopoly, if you may so call it—the beef trust—or he has got to go to work for and turn his business over to them and do business for them.

So I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that, in my judgment, he is doing no favor to the great industry for which I have spoken, the tanning industry, by suggesting a reduction from 15 to 10 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if I understood him to make the argument that this is an effort to relieve the tanners of the country from the operations of a trust?

Mr. President, perhaps I would agree to relieve them if the Senator from Vermont and his friends will agree to relieve the balance of the people from the operation of other and greater trusts. In other words, I will vote to put hides on the free list, and everything made out of them, if you will join me in putting steel products of every kind on the free list. I can not understand why one class is to be relieved from the operation of a trust any more than another class. As to the Senator's statement that the tanners will have to go to work unless we give them free hides, I think it is a good deal better that the tanners should go to work for themselves than to make the balance of us work for them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I intended when I was on my feet before to refer to the suggestion I heard the Senator from Vermont make, for I listened with not only interest, but great pleasure, to his very delightful and instructive speech. There is one point of view, however, which he did not assume through his entire discourse. He seemed to think that we were here for the purpose of checking the ravages of the beef trust and to sustain the languishing energies of the tanner. I believe with him that the packers will annihilate the tanners. I have no doubt about it, for they have an advantage which it is impossible for the independent or the trust tanner to acquire, for they have access naturally to the hides of the country.

But I have not attempted during the course of this debate to settle the trust question by attaching or refusing to attach tariff duties. I know, and the Senator from Vermont knows, that nearly every important field of industry in the United States—possibly I am stating it a little strong, but I am certainly within the limits, and very conservatively, when I say that a majority of all the fields of industry are occupied by just such dominant and controlling and overwhelming power as the beef packers now occupy with regard to hides. We will be compelled to find some other way of dealing with the beef trust. I hope it will be found. But this duty, if it is due at all to anybody, is due for the benefit and advantage of the farmer——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. CUMMINS. Because it adds something to the price of his product, I look at it squarely and fairly. I allow no mist to obscure my vision with regard to that. It is being asked simply to add to the price of a thing that he has to sell.

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just for one or two questions, and those brief ones.

The Senator from Idaho this afternoon said, in answer to a question from me, that the packers fix the price of hides. That is true, is it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think it is generally conceded that they do. If they do——

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator is not referring to me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I refer to you.

Mr. HEYBURN. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will answer further: If they do not now, I have no doubt they soon will.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; if they do, or if they will, then they pay no more to the farmer or cattle raiser for the hides than they have to pay. Is not that true?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not accept that statement as broadly as the Senator from Indiana puts it. I think even in the case of a monopoly the price the monopoly is willing to pay is graduated somewhat by the price at which the monopoly can sell.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But naturally a monopoly or everybody else gets it just as cheap as it can. I understood the Senator the other day, in the course of his very lucid address, to lay down two principles under which the tariff might be added to the price, and only two. One was where we did not produce enough for ourselves, and the other was where there was a combination controlling the price.

Mr. CUMMINS. You are quite right there.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, then, does not that exist in this case in both instances in the case of hides; and, on the contrary, is there not an entire absence of either of these elements in the case of the manufacture of shoes? In the case of shoes the competition is very strong. The competition between them prevents the tariff from being added to the price of shoes, whereas it is added in the price that the packer pays the farmer for the hides and to the price which the farmer himself can get for the hides.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Indiana——

Mr. BAILEY. If the tariff is not added to the price of shoes, then why leave it on? The fact that the shoemakers want it left on is proof that they know they are going to collect it from the people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That involves the whole theory of the protective principle, which is, as stated from Hamilton up to now, that a duty is not necessarily added to the price; but, on the contrary, it may reduce the price by creating so much of the industry here that competition here will reduce the price. But where there is a combination or where, as in the case of hides, we do not produce enough for our own supply, then it may be added.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question. There is a reduction in this bill on shoes from 25 per cent to 15 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill as it came from the House——

Mr. TILLMAN. I say the Senate committee accepted that.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senate committee has not acted on that. We are waiting to see what would happen about the duties on hides, and then will report some proposition to the Senate for a duty on shoes and upon the products of leather.

Mr. TILLMAN. If there is no change in the duty on hides and it is maintained at 15 per cent, is it the purpose of the committee to put the duty on shoes back to 25 per cent?

Mr. ALDRICH. In the House hides were put on the free list and the duty on sole leather was reduced to 5 per cent ad valorem, it now being 15 per cent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Has not the Senator kept hides on the free list thus far in the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to hear what is going on over there.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not finish my inquiry of the Senator from Rhode Island. It is this: If we are going to have a reduction of 10 per cent—from 25 per cent to 15 per cent—on shoes, why can we not agree to have a reduction on hides from 15 per cent to 10 per cent? That is about a relative reduction.

Mr. HALE. Suppose the Senator puts it the other way.

Mr. TILLMAN. I never can see the other way. I am incapable of seeing it that way.

Mr. HALE. Suppose the Senator puts it the other way, that if we put a duty on hides of 15 per cent——

Mr. TILLMAN. There is already a duty on hides of 15 per cent, and if that is just, then the compensating duty on shoes of 20 per cent ought to remain, according to the Senator's theory.

Mr. HALE. Let me finish my sentence. If we put a duty on hides, thereby changing the action of the House, which made hides free, then we naturally will protect boots and shoes and restore the old rate, because it follows that the one goes with the other. That is why I take it that the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, stated that the committee has not fixed its action and recommendation upon boots and shoes, the finished product, because the Senate has not yet determined what it will do on the raw material, the hides. The one will follow the other.

Mr. TILLMAN. Suppose by accident the Senate should put hides on the free list. What would then happen?

Mr. HALE. Suppose it does not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I just wanted to know what was the Senator's idea.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I will yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Maine said a moment ago he was going to vote for a duty on hides, although the industry of his State would like to have free hides. It is stated that if we vote a duty on hides, then there ought to be an increased differential upon shoes; that is to say, if we retain the present duty on hides as it is, at 15 per cent, then we ought not to stand by the House reduction on shoes, but ought to increase it to what the present duty is on shoes, 25 per cent. So that is the basis for the action.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from South Carolina evidently misunderstood the situation. When the Senate committee reported the bill to the Senate they stated they had not acted upon the question of what duty should be placed on hides, if any, and they also stated when we reached the leather schedule that that ought to be passed over until the Senate decided whether they would put a duty on hides or not. The House bill put hides on the free list, put sole leather at 5 per cent ad valorem, and put shoes at 15 per cent ad valorem. Now, if we restore the duty upon hides at 15 per cent or reduce it to 10 per cent, then the question will arise, properly, whether we shall keep the duty on shoes at 15 per cent or increase it; that is, what would be a proper relation between the two duties. I am sure if we put a duty on hides the duty on sole leather ought to be increased. It is now 15 per cent, and was reduced by the House to 5 per cent with free hides.

Of course, all these leather paragraphs depend more or less upon what is done with hides, as being the basis of raw material.

It seems to be a favorite assumption here that the duty on shoes ought to be reduced anyhow. The boot and shoe interest, which is a very large interest in the country, seem to be suffering between the people who want a duty on hides and the people who do not want a duty on hides. It looks to me very much as though they were liable to be slaughtered in the house of their friends by the advocacy on this floor of Senators for free hides.

Mr. BAILEY. They are responsible for that. They said themselves they did not need any duty on shoes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have never heard that said, and I want to put in the RECORD, when I can, when I get the floor——

Mr. CUMMINS. Before the Senator from Rhode Island sits down I want to ask him a question. It is substantially understood, is it not, by members of the committee that if the duty on hides is restored to 15 per cent, the duty on shoes shall be restored to 25 per cent; and if we have free hides, then the duty on shoes would be reduced to 15 per cent?

Mr. ALDRICH. That question has never been considered by the committee. I think it will be considered the minute this matter is disposed of one way or the other. Then the committee will take up the question as to what ought to be the relative duty upon leather or upon boots and shoes.

Mr. CUMMINS. If we reduce the duty on hides to 10 per cent, we might be able to adopt the duty on shoes as reported by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At 15 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not think that would follow. I will say to the Senator from Iowa that the committee considered this question of the duty on hides very carefully. We heard the representatives of the boot and shoe people and of the tanners and of the farmers, who are interested in maintaining the duty on hides. The committee decided, as protectionists, that we ought to look out for the interests of the cattle raisers of Iowa and of the other States, and we believed if any duty was to be put on hides at all that 15 per cent was not too high. That seems to me perfectly plain. It is a revenue duty. It is not a high duty at all. If as a matter of policy we ought to put hides on the free list, that is one thing; but if we are going to give protection to the men who raise the cattle in various parts of the country, I think the revenue duty, or the protection duty—whatever you call it—of 15 per cent is not too high. That is the view of the committee. What may be done beyond that——

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

Mr. ALDRICH Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The question is this: Is it, then, to be understood that the view of the chairman of the Finance Committee that if a duty of 15 per cent should be put on hides, which is the existing duty, therefore, when it comes to shoes and products of hides, the rate should be raised to 25 per cent? Is that where we are coming to?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have already stated that the committee have not considered that question. I hold in my hand a letter——

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope——

Mr. ALDRICH. I will make a statement in my own time.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then I should like to hear what the Senator from Rhode Island has to say in regard to hides. I want to protect the farmer.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

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

Mr. CUMMINS. I see both Senators from Oklahoma on their feet. Which one?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Rhode Island has just stated that he has not heard anyone say that he was willing that boots and shoes should go on the free list. I think that I have here such a statement coming from Governor Douglas, of Massachusetts, in a personal letter written to me on the 7th of April last. I think there have been no new inventions of machinery since that time. I send the letter to the desk and ask that the marked portion be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator from Oklahoma defer the reading of the letter until I have finished?

Mr. GORE. I will of course observe the wishes of the Senator from Iowa, but I think it should follow the statement of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is it an extract of some length?

Mr. GORE. No, sir; it is very brief.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

I might say in a few words that I have seen no reason since those speeches were made to change my position in the slightest. On the contrary, I am more strongly convinced now than ever before on those subjects. We have more competition among manufacturers of boots and shoes in our own country than we could possibly have at the hands of foreign competitors.

I am strongly of the opinion that a tariff on boots and shoes with the idea of "protection" is a farce in every respect. Give us free hides and free sole leather, and we will capture the markets of the whole world for our boots and shoes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I now recur to the suggestion made to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] with regard to the due measure of protection for the farmers of my State. I reiterate what I said the other day, that the farmers receive very little direct benefit from protection, but they do receive vast benefits indirectly. The duty on hides is one of the instances, and one of the few instances, in which they receive a direct benefit, in my opinion. It is only a question with respect to the extent to which they ought to ask the Government of the United States to increase the value of their product by levying a duty upon it. I will not stand here to ask for the farmers of my State what I am unwilling to grant to the manufacturers of another State. I believe they are sufficiently protected in a duty levied upon the imports of animals, a duty levied upon every product of their animals, and a duty of 10 per cent levied upon their hides. I think that if the affairs of the farmers in this country were examined, it would be found that they are and have been fairly prosperous. They are not the mendicants of the earth, and they rarely appeal for aid.

Furthermore, if I know anything about their temper, they are willing that their duties shall be lowered in harmony with the general plan that I supposed we were here to carry out. It is for that reason—and not because I do not believe they are entitled to a duty, for I do—that I shall vote for a duty on hides. When it comes to a question of free hides and taxed leather and shoes, I intend to vote for a duty on hides; but I could not content myself to allow that time to come without expressing fairly and openly the opinion that, in my judgment, a duty of 10 per cent is sufficient to give them the advantage to which they are fairly entitled; but when we go but a step further, I intend to do whatsoever I can to see that the duties on shoes and upon leather are not advanced beyond a rational and reasonable point. I may fail. I have failed a good many times as we have passed along through these schedules, but that does not in the least dismay me. Therefore I have offered this amendment to reduce the duty to 10 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, a good deal of talk—I was about to say "loose talk," but I think I shall not use that expression—about the putting of hides and of the products of leather upon the free list has been indulged in by Senators on both sides. I take it for granted that the Senate is not going to do either of those things. I assume that.

I stated that I knew of no boot and shoe manufacturer who was desirous of having boots and shoes put upon the free list. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] sent to the desk a letter from an ex-governor of Massachusetts, who states that if hides and leather were put upon the free list, he would be in favor of shoes being put on the free list. It is not likely that hides and leather will be put on the free list. So Governor Douglas's suggestion will not be carried out. It is possible that there may be one manufacturer in a great number who, if certain impossible conditions were secured, would agree to having boots and shoes put upon the free list, but that the boot and shoe manufacturers of the United States are willing to go into a compact with anybody for the purpose of destroying any other industry, and that they would consent to put boots and shoes upon the free list, I do not believe. To show that that is not so as to most of them, I ask that a letter which I send to the desk may be read. It is somewhat long, but it is a good letter, and I should like to have all of our friends who contemplate the putting of these articles upon the free list give some attention to it, so that they may discover where they are going.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

NATIONAL BOOT AND SHOE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES.

President's Office.

To the Senators of the United States:

I would consider myself derelict in my duty as the official representative of one of the largest industries of the United States if I did not again call your attention to the great jeopardy in which the boot and shoe industry of the United States would be placed if a reduction be made in the tariff on shoes and the tariff on hides retained.

If only to secure revenue be the object of the tariff laws of the United States, then that object will be achieved—unquestionably achieved—by the lowering of the duty on shoes and retaining the duty on hides. The reason is very obvious. The reduced tariff on shoes viz, 15 per cent, would not cover the difference in wages paid by the American shoe manufacturer over the foreign, and the American manufacturers would still be handicapped by the tariff on hides. Accordingly the foreign shoe manufacturer would and could exploit the American market.

I again make the statement that the wages paid by the foreign manufacturer will not average 50 per cent of the wages paid by the American shoe manufacturer for the same grade of shoe. In other words, the American shoe manufacturer is paying more than twice the wage paid by the foreign manufacturer for similar work, and the efficiency of the foreign workman is almost equal to that of the American.

That my fears are not groundless for the future of the American shoe manufacturing industry if a reduction be made in the tariff on shoes without some compensatory reduction on raw materials, I submit the following, taken from No. 3499 of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, published by the Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of Manufactures, under date of Saturday, June 5, 1909:

ERFURT SHOE INDUSTRY—GERMAN MANUFACTURERS WILL SEEK AMERICAN TRADE.

Consul Will L. Lowrie writes that three of the largest German shoe-manufacturing establishments in Erfurt are now in charge of experts from the United States. He also tells of their industrial operations:

All these factories are producing American-shaped shoes, which are meeting with ready sale in Germany. Certainly one, and perhaps all, of these concerns will make a display at the forthcoming shoe exposition in Boston (in September, 1909) and will try to secure a foothold in the American market.

The average wages paid are shown in the following table:

Class of employees.	Average weekly wages.
Females:	
Apprentices	$1.42 to $1.90
Closers on	3.33 to 3.57
Sewers	[a] 4.28
Males:	
Apprentices	1.42 to 2.85
Upper cutters (hand)	5.23 to 6.42
Upper cutters (machine)	6.42 to 7.14
Machine hands:	
Edge trimmers	6.42 to 7.14
Heel trimmers	6.42 to 7.14
Edge finishers	6.42 to 7.14
Bottom finishers	4.28 to 4.76
Die cutters	[a] 5.71
Eyeleting hands	[a] 7.14
Heel builders	4.76 to 5.71

As against the wages therein noted I will not offer any statement, but would ask the Senators to secure from the statistics obtainable, or from their constituents, shoe manufacturers, the average wages paid in America, for comparison with those above set forth.

It can therefore readily be appreciated that the only balance which could be resorted to for the protection of the industry would be the reduction of the wages of the American shoemaker. Let us hope that this exigency may not occur. Let our tariff legislative policy continue as in the past, protective to American workmen.

Yours, truly,

JOHN H. HANAN.
SOL WILE, *Secretary.*

JUNE 8, 1909.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance reported in favor of a duty on hides. They are in favor of a reasonable duty upon boots and shoes, upon leather, and upon every other article produced in the United States; and they have no sympathy whatever with this battle between different industries, one trying to put the materials of the other upon the free list or trying to reduce the duties unduly upon any of these articles.

I hope there will be no continuance of this battle between protectionists to see which will get the better of the other upon any of these propositions. We ought to give fair and decent treatment to them all; and that is what the committee has tried to do in their recommendations.

Mr. OWEN obtained the floor.

[a] Average.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question before he takes his seat?

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

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I believe I heard the Senator from Rhode Island say that he was in favor of putting a protective duty upon everything produced in the United States. Is it not true that the Senator has left binding twine on the free list in this bill; and is not that produced in the United States?

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there are certain anomalies in this bill and in every other tariff bill for which neither the Senator from Indiana nor myself are responsible. I have never yet been able to vote for a bill or help construct a bill that did not have some things in it of which I did not approve.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not complain of that, but I merely wanted to point out to the Senator that if it be true that he has evidently left binding twine, where I think it should be, on the free list, then he was not accurate when he said he proposed to put a protective duty on everything produced in the United States. Here is the whole free list with many things so produced.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator probably did not understand my remarks, or, in any event, did not appreciate them. I say—and I will repeat it, if the Senator desires to have me—that there are things in this bill which I do not approve of, and I presume there will be when it becomes a law. I imagine there will be some things, when the Senator from Indiana finally votes for it, that he will not approve of—I judge so from his remarks in the past—but neither he nor I can construct a tariff bill that will not have some items in it which do not meet with universal approval.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not intend to interrupt the Senator except to say——

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me just a moment?

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

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island will find it in the RECORD that he said he proposed to put a duty on everything produced in the United States. The free list which he reported and proposes to support contains many things which we produce in the United States and upon which he does not propose to put a protective-tariff duty. So that the statement which he first made, and which is in the RECORD, is not quite accurate. I do not complain of the Senator for that, but I merely called attention to the exceptions.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, there are many things put upon the free list——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. In every tariff bill there are put upon the free list many things not produced in the United States, but which are used by our manufacturers or by our consumers, which free traders and protectionists alike agree ought to be on the free list. There is no question about that at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does everybody agree on binding twine?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is one article which the Senator says is on the free list, which is a manufactured article, and there may be others, but they are very few in number. There may be some articles that will be put by the Senate upon the free list before we get through with the bill, but that does not change the character of the bill at all and does not change my statement as to the principle which governed the committee in the construction of this bill. If the Senator will follow the action of the committee carefully, intelligently, and industriously, he will find that that principle has governed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In just turning over the pages of the bill at random I find that bolting cloth is on the free list, and it is produced in the United States.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not produced in the United States and has never been.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I find on the free list hair of the horse. That is produced in the United States.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor. He declines to yield further.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, ex-Governor Douglas is one of the greatest shoe manufacturers in the world. He says, in a public article relative to this matter, in the National Monthly:

> I am not afraid of free shoes if I can have free hides and free leather. I would gladly swap any doubtful benefit from the duty on shoes for the certain benefits of free hides and leather.

I do not wish to detain the Senate at this late hour. The matter has been the subject of prolonged debate. If I believed that it would yield any substantial benefit to the cattlemen of this country to place this duty upon hides, I should support it. I do not believe anything of the kind; and while I do not think that these great monopolies can be altogether controlled by tariff schedules, I do believe that competition can be promoted by making many of these articles free.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. OWEN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. FLINT. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question. I judge from the statement he has read from the letter of Governor Douglas that Mr. Douglas, who is a very large shoe manufacturer, is of the opinion that, if we made the duty 10 per cent on hides, we should not make it any greater on shoes. That would be, I understand, his position. He is a very large manufacturer, as I have said, and from his statement I judge, if we have free hides, that he would be willing to have free shoes, and that if we had a 10 per cent duty on hides, he would be willing to accept a 10 per cent duty on shoes.

Mr. OWEN. I have no authority to speak for Governor Douglas. I will let him speak for himself, and will ask that his statement go into the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question?

Mr. OWEN. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator seems to speak with authority for one of the shoe manufacturers. Can he tell us whether the tanners, who seem to be the principal people interested upon one side of this question, are willing to have leather put upon the free list?

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Rhode Island, in the first place, I deny that I speak for any manufacturer, but I offer to let the manufacturer speak for himself. I ask that the article from which I read be printed in the RECORD. I do not care to have it read, but should merely like to have it go into the RECORD. I do not think it would change a vote one way or the other if it were read; and I do not think it is necessary to take the time of the Senate to have it read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From National Monthly, June, 1909.]

IS THE BEEF TRUST AIMING TO GOBBLE UP THE SHOE-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES.

By ex-Governor W. L. Douglas, of Massachusetts.

The boot and shoe manufacturers of this country are facing a crisis even greater than many of them realize.

Under present conditions—that is, with present duties on hides and leather—it does not take a prophet to foretell in a general way what will happen. The logic of tariff events has already proceeded far enough to indicate clearly the goal toward which we are rapidly traveling. This is no less than a gigantic trust controlling the beef packing, leather tanning, and shoe-manufacturing industries of this country.

This trust will, of course, be built around the present beef trust.

Such a trust is inevitable, providing the present duty of 15 per cent remains on hides. The advantage given by this duty to the beef trust, as the original owner of hides, is so great that competition with it will be hopeless as soon as it can establish itself in the leather-tanning and shoe-manufacturing industries.

Under the monopolistic influence of the tariff on hides, the beef packers' trust has already made great headway. It now controls directly about 55 per cent of the hides of this country. Indirectly, it is reasonably certain that it controls a large part of the 45 per cent of hides which it does not take off of cattle. To make its monopoly of the raw material of leather still more complete, it has recently gone into the hide-buying business. Thus the independent tanner is left with only a very restricted supply of raw material. If he could buy foreign hides without the payment of the 15 per cent duty, he would have some chance to compete with the packer tanners and the price of leather would be more likely to be reasonable. There is, however, no certainty of fair and reasonable prices for leather unless both hides and leather are put on the free list. The beef packers' monopoly has already gone so far that it is only a question of a very short time when free hides, without free leather, would be of little or no avail to shoe manufacturers and other users of leather.

By ownership and control, through community of interest, and by tanning contracts, the beef packers' trust has already become so dominant in the sole-leather tanning business that it is difficult to locate independent tanneries. More than 30 tanneries are now said to be under Armour-Swift-Morris control. To a less extent, the beef packers' trust is also connected with the tanning of upper leather.

Recently we have heard reports that the beef packers were becoming interested in the shoe-manufacturing business. To what extent, if any,

the packers have become manufacturers of shoes, I do not know. It seems clear to me, however, that the almost inevitable result of continuing the present policy of taxed hides and leather is to throw the entire leather-tanning and shoe-manufacturing business into the hands of the beef trust, which has, through its slaughtering interests, control of the country's hide supply and can dictate prices.

The New York Journal of Commerce of May 12 says:

"The strength of the hide market is giving tanners cause for anxiety, as they can figure out little profit at the prevailing prices of the raw material. Packers have the situation well in hand, it is said, and propose to get their asking figure, in the meantime not pressing offerings."

Under these conditions we see that the fight for free hides is a fight for existence on the part of the independent tanners. I predict that, if the duties on hides and leather are continued ten years longer, not only will the monopoly of the tanning industry by the beef trust be complete, but the boot and shoe industry will then be a part of the tariff-fostered and tariff-nourished beef trust. Independent shoe manufacturers can not pay 20 per cent more for leather than will its trust competitors and live. The handicap is too great. Then there will be a monopoly in the production of shoes and, as soon as the independents are killed, the 25 per cent duty on shoes will become effective and the prices of shoes in this country will be advanced to 20 or 25 per cent above foreign prices and, probably, above export prices. To-day there is no trust in the boot and shoe industry and prices are lower, quality considered, in this than in any country. This is true notwithstanding that we pay more for leather and for other tariff-taxed materials than is paid by our foreign competitors and notwithstanding that we pay, by far, the highest daily and hourly wages in any country. If the American people want to continue to wear the best and cheapest shoes on earth, they must see that their Senators and Representatives vote for free hides and free leather. There is no other road to cheap footwear.

About all that we can hope to get from the present Congress is free hides and reduced duties on leather. Why Congress hesitates to give us free hides I can not understand, unless our Senators and Representatives have ceased to think of the welfare of our 87,000,000 consumers and are concerned only about the few producers who constitute our great trusts. The facts and arguments are all against taxed hides. There is no sound reason, under any theory of protection, for continuing the burdensome and monopoly-producing duty on hides. Not only does the duty not protect the cattle raisers, but, if it did, there are so few of them, comparatively, that they should not be permitted to dictate the prices of hides, leather, and shoes to all of our citizens.

According to the census of 1890 there were 37,629 stock raisers and 5,483,618 farmers in this country; that is, the stock raisers constitute less than 1 per cent of our farming population and only about one-fifth of 1 per cent of our total population. Thus, assuming that the stock raisers are protected by the duty on hides, we see that for each stock raiser thus protected 500 consumers must pay higher prices for shoes. This ratio is not a proper one, even from the standpoint of a protectionist. But even this is much too high, according to Boyd's City Dispatch. This great agency for circular advertising said, on May 13, that it could find only 22,000 names of persons who can fairly be called stock or cattle raisers. On the assumption that the cattle raiser is protected, then 800 consumers of shoes are being taxed for the benefit of one stock raiser.

As our grazing lands are growing less and less each year and as we now have to import one-third of the hides consumed, we must either increase the taxes on the masses for the benefit of an almost insignificant few or see this few decline. No civilized country can raise enough cattle to furnish hides and leather for domestic use. Adequate grazing lands do not exist in highly populated and civilized countries. A tax on hides in this country, therefore, necessarily means a tax on footwear for 87,000,000 people. It can never mean anything else.

It is a mistake, however, to assume that the cattle raisers benefit appreciably by the duty on hides. Both the facts and the logic of conditions are against such an assumption.

A comparison of the prices of cattle, hides, and leather for the last twelve years indicates that there is practically no relation or connection between the prices of cattle and hides and not a close connection between the prices of hides and leather. Such a comparison is made in the following table:

Year.	Date.	Top prices, native steers, on hoof, Chicago, per 100 pounds.	Heavy native steer hides, Chicago, per pound.	Sole leather, Union No. 1, middling, per pound.
1897	Apr. 3	$5.40	$0.09	$0.29
1898	July 2	5.35	.12½	.29
1899	Jan. 7	5.95	.11½	.28
1900	Apr. 7	5.80	.13½	.35
1901	Apr. 6	6.25	.10½	.33
1902	July 5	8.50	.13	.35
1903	Apr. 4	5.60	.11½	.34
1904	Oct. 1	6.55	.10½	.32
1905	Jan. 7	6.00	.13⅝	.35
	Aug. 5	5.90	.15½	.36
	Jan. 6	6.25	.15¾	.37
	Feb. 3	5.85	.15¼	.37
1906	Apr. 7	6.35	.14¼	.35
	Sept. 1	6.85	.16½	.36
1907	Apr. 6	6.60	.14½	.38
	Sept. 7	7.25	.14	.36
1908	Apr. 4	7.50	.09½	.34
	July 4	8.40	.14½	.34
	Dec. 5	8.00	.16	.36
1909	Jan. 9	7.50	.16	.36
	Feb. 6	7.15	.16	.36
	Mar. 6	7.25	.14¾	.36
	Apr. 3	7.35	.14	.36

The above prices of cattle are taken from Monthly Summaries of United States Department of Commerce and Labor and are for the specific dates mentioned. The prices of leather and hides are from a table of "Comparative prices of leather and hides for ten years," published in the Shoe and Leather Reporter of August 10, 1905, and later numbers.

Thus we see that the prices of hides are often high when the prices of cattle are low, and often low when the prices of cattle are high.

In 1905 and 1906 hides were selling above 15 cents when cattle were below 6 cents, while in 1902 hides were selling at 13 cents when cattle were selling at 8½ cents. In 1906 hides were selling at 16 cents when cattle were selling at 6.85 cents, while in 1908 hides were selling at 9½ cents when cattle were selling at 7½ cents. From April, 1908, to April, 1909, the price of cattle declined 2 per cent, while the price of hides advanced 47 cents. From February, 1906, to April, 1909, the price of cattle advanced 26 per cent, while the price of hides declined 8 per cent.

These figures disprove the claims of the beef packers that the cattle raisers are protected by the duty on hides. The Wall Street Journal of April 20, 1909, quotes "an official of Swift & Co." as follows:

"Any reduction in the hide tariff would injure the farmer, because the packers do business on so close a margin that cheaper hides would mean a slightly smaller return per pound to the farmer for beef on the hoof."

Is not this clear? Is not it beautiful—this solicitude of the packers for the farmers? The packers want the hide duty retained so that they will have to pay higher prices for cattle. How they do love the farmer!

As a matter of logic as well as of fact, the beef packers pay as little as possible for cattle and get as much as possible for hides. The price of cattle depends mainly upon the demand for beef, and the price of hides depends mainly upon the demand for leather. Hides, being an incidental or by-product of the butchering business and cattle being slaughtered primarily for beef, it is absurd to suppose that a duty on hides will materially change the prices paid for cattle. We may be certain that the packers would favor free hides if they thought that free hides would appreciably lower the prices of cattle.

The cattle raisers get nothing, or next to nothing, from the duties on hides and leather. They are, however, by these duties, compelled to pay materially higher prices for shoes, harness, saddles, and other leather goods.

In view of all the facts, there is no sound reason for retaining the duty on hides in order to protect cattle raisers or farmers. There is sound reason in favor of free hides in order to provide as cheap raw material as possible to the tanning and shoe-manufacturing industries, both of which are of great importance to all of our people. If the duty on hides is retained, it will be retained at the behest of the beef trust and for the purpose of enabling it to hold and extend its already great and harmful monopoly. Congress will not do its duty to our 87,000,000 shoe-wearing people unless it repeals the duty on hides. In my opinion, it should also put leather on the free list.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hold somewhat different opinions from those held by some other shoe manufacturers. I am not afraid of free shoes if I can have free hides and free leather. I would gladly swap any doubtful benefit from the duty on shoes for the certain benefits of free hides and leather.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from California?

Mr. OWEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from California made a suggestion just now, and I was curious to know whether or not we may expect that that will represent the view of the Finance Committee and the majority of this side rather than the expectation put forward by the Senator from Rhode Island, to wit, that if we have a 10 per cent duty on hides, then the Senator will be content with a 10 per cent duty on shoes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from California was not speaking for the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say that the Senator from California was speaking for the committee.

Mr. FLINT. I was not speaking for myself even.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator was very unfortunate in the way he presented it.

Mr. FLINT. I simply presented the question whether the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] thought the shoe manufacturer to whom he referred would be willing to accept a 10 per cent duty on shoes if the duty on hides was put at 10 per cent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then we get it very clearly. I did not say, I will say to the Senator from Maine—and he will not find it in the RECORD—that the Senator from California spoke for the committee, or assumed to do so.

Mr. HALE. I did not understand that the Senator undertook to speak for the committee at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all; but I was curious to know—because I think it is important and a new phase of this thing that I had not thought of at all is developing here—whether it is the intention, in case 15 per cent is put upon hides on that ground, that a differential of 10 per cent shall immediately be placed upon shoes. It is only our right to know and to have the thing cleared up as we go along.

Mr. HALE. I am very impatient at the persistence of the Senator from Indiana, who is continually urging upon the committee to tell beforehand what it intends to do. The chairman has stated with great plainness and distinctness, after his fashion, that when this fundamental question is considered and passed upon by the Senate the committee will take up the other subjects of manufacture, the advanced stages of this product. And for the Senator from Indiana to continually urge the chairman or the members of the committee to state for his satisfaction beforehand what they will do is not, it seems to me, a fitting thing to be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. And, Mr. President, when the committee do make their report they will not be governed by the opinion of

a single manufacturer of shoes of a particular kind that he has spent millions of dollars in advertising all over the world and which he sells on a trade-mark. I suppose, of course, the merits of the shoes have something to do with it; but he has spent a large amount of money in advertising his shoes. He was elected governor of Massachusetts once, I think; and I have been told that that was a part of his advertising scheme. I suppose that is not true. I assume it is not true. But it was stated commonly in the newspapers at the time that he was willing to pay large amounts for advertising in any direction. He occupies this peculiar situation by himself; and I am sure that he does not in any sense represent the boot and shoe manufacturers of the United States, and that he is not trying to remove the duties upon hides and upon leather with any idea except that of advertising his own views and his own shoes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, it was not the Senator from Indiana who called attention in the first place to what might hereafter be done in case we put a duty of 15 per cent on hides. That did not come from me. In the little time that I have listened to this debate I had supposed, up to the time the Senator from Maine himself called attention to the fact, that we were going to vote upon the question of hides—free hides or no free hides—merely as that matter affected the whole industry, not only of cattle raising, but of shoemaking, of tanning, of harness making, and so forth.

Mr. HALE. And leather.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and leather. It had not occurred to me that there might be an aftermath to this. That was because I was not familiar with the subject, of course; and I think it is true of a good many of the Senators. Therefore, it did become very interesting and, I think, entirely within the proprieties that we should now understand—those of us who are not so familiar with these things as other and older Senators—that this is to be followed by an effort to increase the duty in the bill as it came from the House upon shoes and the products of hides.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In a moment I will; I am almost through. That will no doubt become, when it arises, in its time, the subject of a difference of opinion between us. But, more than that, it interjects that question into this question of free hides as well. I think it quite a pity; but, so far as that is concerned, every Senator must judge for himself. He represents absolutely his State and the people of his State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would the answer of the committee to the question which the Senator from Indiana puts make the slightest difference as to the vote which the Senator from Indiana would cast on this question? In other words, allow me to say, further——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It would make a good deal of difference as to the vigor of my vote. I would vote with a little more emphasis.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the committee should answer the Senator from Indiana that the duties on shoes and on leather will remain just as they are in the House bill, would not the Senator from Indiana vote for free hides notwithstanding?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think it is quite likely, Mr. President, that I would; but not at all with that degree of enthusiasm with which I shall cast that same vote in case I know what the intention of the members of the committee is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then the Senator is not asking for his own information?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I was asking for my own information. It had not occurred to me that perhaps the Senator is familiar with what is to follow after the duty on hides is restored.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire—if it is a parliamentary inquiry that the Chair can answer—what difference there is between the effect of an enthusiastic vote and a vote lacking in enthusiasm?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is unable to decide.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to say a word.

I am indifferent—measurably so, at least—as to the result of the vote to be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I am in favor of free hides, free leather, and free shoes. I am not in favor of free hides without free manufactured products of hides—leather, shoes, boots, and so forth—and I will not vote to put hides on the free list unless these manufactured products in common use are put on the free list.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] stated a moment ago that Governor Douglas seemed to be the only shoe manufacturer who was willing, or who had expressed himself as willing, to have shoes and boots on the free list if hides and leather are put upon the free list.

Mr. President, the State from which I come ranks next to Massachusetts in the volume of its boot and shoe production. I have letters here on my desk from shoe manufacturers in that State, and have had repeated personal assurances from them, and I have been authorized by several of them, representing the largest concerns in the State, or among the largest, to say on the floor of the Senate, as I do now, that they are willing to put boots and shoes, their production, upon the free list if hides are put upon the free list.

Mr. ALDRICH. Would it be inconvenient for the Senator to give us the names of those men?

Mr. STONE. I can give you the names of some of the men, if you wish them. The Brown Shoe Company——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, is it true that Mr. Brown has a large property in Mexico, where he raises cattle?

Mr. STONE. I know nothing about that. Does the Senator say that is so?

Mr. ALDRICH. I have been so informed.

Mr. STONE. I know nothing of that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. By whom?

Mr. ALDRICH. By a reputable gentleman.

Mr. STONE. Who informed you? From whom did you get that information?

Mr. ALDRICH. It came to the committee from a gentleman who, I think, knows the facts in the case.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Who was it?

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator give the name of his informant? He has asked me for the name of mine.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Utah is my informant.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am sure the Senator from Utah can furnish the information.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to ask the Senator whether he refers to the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company?

Mr. STONE. No, sir; the Brown Shoe Company.

Mr. SMOOT. I had reference to Mr. Hamilton Brown, of the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company.

Mr. STONE. Well, I did not.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought, of course, that that was the Mr. Brown that was referred to when I spoke of Mr. Brown to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. It was Mr. Brown who told me this.

Mr. SMOOT. But I say the mistake came in this way: I thought it was Mr. Brown, of the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company.

Mr. STONE. But, Mr. President, there is a Hamilton Brown Shoe Company in St. Louis, which is the largest shoe manufacturing concern in the State.

Mr. SMOOT. And I know that they are in favor of free shoes. I have also been informed, and have a letter in the office stating, that they are cattle owners in Mexico.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Who is the Senator's informant?

Mr. SMOOT. I can give the Senator the letter, if he wants to know.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But you did not give the name.

Mr. SMOOT. I am giving the only names I have here, as far as the letter is concerned. If it is the Brown Shoe Company, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. STONE. It is a very large concern.

Mr. SMOOT. But I do know that I have a letter in my possession which refers to the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Stating that they raise cattle in Texas?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not in Texas—in Mexico. I know nothing, as I say, about the Brown Shoe Company. I referred to the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company, which is mentioned in the letter I received.

Mr. STONE. Do I understand the Senator to say that in that letter his confidential correspondent informs him that the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company as a corporation owns a ranch in Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I did not say as a corporation—I did not say that. I said a member of the firm of the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company owns cattle in Mexico.

Mr. STONE. Oh! A member of the firm?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. There are quite a good many stockholders in that corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that Mr. Brown owns a great part of it, and he is the gentleman who owns the cattle in Mexico.

Mr. STONE. For what purpose is he raising cattle in Mexico?

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose, like any other cattle raiser, he would be interested in having his hides come over. I should think he certainly would.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, here is one letter that I will read from Hannibal, Mo., from the Hannibal Shoe Company, manufacturers of soft-sole shoes, infants' shoes, and so forth:

HANNIBAL SHOE COMPANY,
Hannibal, Mo., April 24, 1909.

Hon. W. J. STONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 15th and note your question as to placing shoes on the free list. We see no reason why shoes should not be placed on the free list if hides are, as we are certain that America can compete with any other nation in any line.

Thanking you for the consideration you have given our letter and trusting you will be able to vote as we have suggested, we remain,

Yours, truly,

HANNIBAL SHOE COMPANY,
THOS. J. COUSINS, *President.*

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that when I state here on the floor of the Senate, responsible as I am to my own constituency, that the manufacturers of St. Louis—I do not say all of them, but many of them—and their representatives, and those in other cities in Missouri, have written and stated this thing to me, it is rather an impertinence on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island to call my statement in question and ask me to furnish him the proofs. I assume responsibility for my statements, not to the Senator from Rhode Island, but to my constituents in Missouri.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is a little rapid in his conclusions. I did not ask him for his authority. I asked him for the names of the manufacturers in Missouri who wanted to have shoes put upon the free list if they could get free leather. I hope it did not interfere with the good nature of the Senator to have that question asked. It was not an unusual one.

Mr. STONE. I undertake to assert, Mr. President, as a matter of absolute conviction—although I have not had communication with every one of the many manufacturers in Missouri—that there is not one within the borders of that Commonwealth making shoes who will not indorse the statement I make here, viz: That the manufacturers of boots and shoes in Missouri are willing to put boots and shoes on the free list if hides and leather are put on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STONE. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator understands that, personally, I know nothing as to whether Mr. Brown owns cattle in Mexico or not. I simply say that the information that was sent to me was that he is a cattle owner in Mexico, and is interested in having free hides, and that that is the reason the Hamilton Brown Shoe Company desires to have shoes on the free list providing hides are put upon the free list.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that is not all I rose to say. What I rose especially to say is that while I stand for free hides, I stand for that proposition conditionally; and the condition is that boots and shoes and leather and the other products of hides shall go on the free list. And if my distinguished friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who made such an interesting speech here the other day upon this subject, and my friend from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], who made a very interesting and instructive speech on the subject, are very anxious for free hides, I advise the Senator from Massachusetts, who is a new Richmond on the field of the insurgents, to rally his associates for free shoes as well as free hides; for he will never get them otherwise.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will ask to have read the dozen lines that I have underlined in the book which I send to the desk. It is the testimony of a tanner and shoe manufacturer who testified before the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. WARREN. It is simply what I have underlined on the page.

The Secretary read as follows:

JANNEY & BURROUGH, PHILADELPHIA, PA., THINK DUTY SHOULD BE RETAINED ON HIDES, LEATHER, AND SHOES.

220–230 WOOD STREET,
Philadelphia, February 11, 1909.

Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully solicit your further consideration concerning the duties on hides, tanning materials, leather, and shoes.

Several months ago we were cordially invited by a number of our trade to join in an effort to have the duty removed from hides. We declined to accept on the ground that we could not consistently do so, being strong believers in a good tariff, both for revenue and protection.

Until now, we have presented nothing for the consideration of your committee, but so much having been said by others with which we can not concur, and which we feel may give you a wrong impression, we now wish to go on record as being heartily in sympathy with you in your efforts to so regulate the tariff that it will amply protect our American industries, produce ample revenue for our Government, and afford the best opportunity to our whole people to buy American-made products at as low a price as is possible, consistent with good quality and well-paid labor.

While we have all our means, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars, invested in the business of tanning heavy hides into sole leather, and are just as much in need of making a living as the gentlemen you have heard from, we would emphasize our belief that it would be far better that no change whatever be made in the duty on hides and extracts than allow any lowering whatever in the duty on leather and shoes. We would rather see the duties on hides and extracts as they are and the duty on leather doubled, rather than to sacrifice any of the duty on leather and shoes. We have now in our country tanning capacity in excess both of the supply of hides and the home demand for sole leather.

REGARDING THE DUTY ON HIDES.

The best possible protection to the industry of raising cattle, with the view of increasing the country's supply of both beef and hides, will, we believe, be productive of the most good to the tanners and shoe manufacturers, and help to make our country independent in time of war and at all times.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Senator from Wyoming has, at the last moment, introduced that letter. Of the several hundred important tanners of this country, the men who produce probably more than 90 per cent of all the leather made, not one, so far as I know, but this single concern, has asked for a duty on hides.

Mr. GORE. I have a telegram here from A. B. Goodbar which I ask to have printed in the RECORD. Mr. Goodbar is one of the leading shoe manufacturers of the entire country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 21.*

Hon. T. P. GORE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of the 19th received to-day. Price of heavy beef steers, September, 1907, just before panic, $7 per hundred; price to-day, $6.90, a decline of 1.7 per cent. Hides from same cattle, same dates, 14 and 17 cents per pound, respectively; an advance of 20.3 per cent. On to-day's market packers pay cattle growers $3.45 cents for 50-pound hide and sell same for $8.50, a gain of 146 per cent. What stronger evidence is needed that beef cattle do not advance with hides and that packers absolutely control both beef and hides? A vote in favor of hide tariff is a vote in favor of the most grasping monopoly existing to-day, not excepting Standard Oil.

A. B. GOODBAR,
President Goodbar Shoe Manufacturing Company.

Mr. GORE. I merely wish to add that the telegram shows that cattle are selling lower to-day than they were selling in September, 1907, just prior to the panic. The telegram further shows that notwithstanding the slight decrease in the price of cattle there has been a marked increase in the price of hides. The price of hides has advanced more than 20 per cent. My impression is that the price of dressed meat has advanced during this time.

I wish to say, further, that this telegram would indicate that there has been an artificial and arbitrary influence manipulating to some extent even the law of supply and demand; that there has been a strong hand, I might almost say a black hand, manipulating the markets of the country against the interest of the farmer, against the interest of the shoe manufacturers, and against the interest of the consumers of dressed meats. I presume that influence would not be far to seek. It is the packers; it is the beef trust of the country. And that evil genius has sentenced the shoe manufacturers to death.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is mistaken, but I do not care to go on with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish that the vote may be taken on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, at this late hour I shall detain the Senate but a few minutes. I feel it my duty briefly to give some of the reasons for the vote I shall cast.

In the first place, this is one of the cases that was outlined the other day by the Senator from Iowa where the duty might be added. In this case it was admitted by the Senator from Idaho that the duty is added. Where we do not ourselves produce all that we need, or where a combination exists so great that it fixes the price, the tariff may be added to the price.

The tariff on hides comes within both these rules. In the first place, we do not produce enough for ourselves and have to appeal to all the markets of the world for enough leather with which our feet may be clad, enough leather for our harness, and our belting, and so forth; and, in the second place, Mr. President, there is no question about the fact, and it has been twice admitted on this floor, that the packers fix the price.

If that is true, Mr. President, it is also inevitably true that they pay as low a price as they possibly can. They would violate a higher than any statute law if they did otherwise; they would violate the natural laws of trade. Therefore it appears, Mr. President, that the people who have the benefit of this duty is not the farmer, in whose name we hear similar appeals so often made, but it is the packers who have such a monopoly of hides that they fix the price.

Now, Mr. President, another curious thing. A strange situation has arisen here this afternoon. We have deliberately voted to keep horsehides and calfskins and all other hides, except those of grown cattle, on the free list. I thought when that question was being argued that there was no reason then, and there is no reason now, why, if you leave other hides on the free list, you should exclude from the free list those hides out of which the shoes of the people are made. Yet that is what we are asked to do.

It has been stated here that if we have a duty on hides we must also have a duty on shoes, and if the duty is to be taken off of hides, it must be taken off of shoes.

But, Mr. President, we have already seen that in the case of hides it is one of those instances where the duty may be added, whereas in the question of shoes by reason of the immense competition which exists the duty is not added. I do not know that a better illustration could have been selected than that of hides and leather and the finished products—of the fact that the duty may be added where we do not produce enough for ourselves or where a trust fixes the price, on the one hand, and that the duty is not added where there is domestic competition, on the other hand.

Mr. President, another thing has come out of this debate quite clearly, and it is not denied, and that is that the life of the tanning industry of this country is absolutely at stake.

The other day, in response to a question by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I related an instance which was related to me by another Senator on this floor within his own observation, where a great tanning industry in his State had been compelled to go out of business because it had exercised the liberty of the market place, as the Senator from Iowa usually says, and had gotten their hides where they could pick them up, and when they went back to the packer the packer said, "Well, you go on getting them there, we have none to sell you." So that old established business, which had been conducted by this man and his father before him, and was one of the independent industries of this country, preparing leather for the people, was extinguished by this trust. And that was only last year.

Another curious situation is this: We have a tariff upon the cattle itself. We have a tariff upon the meat product of the cattle. Now you propose to put a tariff upon the hides of that cattle. Why do you not be consistent and put it on horns? That is not a negligible quantity; that is not an indifferent subject—buttons and a great many other things are made out of horns. Yet we find horns retained on the free list. There is the subject of hair. Why not put a tariff on hair and horns and hoofs as well as hides? Yet all these are on the free list. There is a large number of other subjects. So if you are going to be consistent and not only protect the cattle itself, not only protect the meat product, but also if you are going to protect hides, why not protect the horns and the hoofs and the hair and everything else which is valuable, and all of which you propose to have on the free list?

Mr. President, the packers can export their beef. They do export it. I suppose we are the largest exporting nation of dressed beef. But we must import our hides, because we have not enough hides for our own use. We have not enough hides with which to make the shoes of the people, the harness that the farmer needs.

It is said, Mr. President, that the farmer will benefit from this, that the cattle raiser will benefit from this, but the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] demonstrated by actual figures that the farmer or cattle raiser, conceding that he gets any of the increase of price which the Senator did not concede, and which as a matter of fact is not true, because the farmer or cattle raiser gets just what the packers are willing to pay him and not more; but for the sake of argument, conceding that the farmer or cattle raiser did get more for his hides because of this duty, then the Senator from Vermont demonstrated by figures, which no one has attempted to answer here, that more than that duty is added to the price of his shoes, or the price of his harness, or the price of any leather which he buys.

Now, Mr. President, just one final thing. If it be true that the tariff duty is added in this case to the hides, nothing is clearer than that it is carried on to the final finished product. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] the other day in response to a question by me, said "Yes, it was added to the price of hides." If that is true, certainly the packer does not lose it as it passes through his hands, nor the tanner as it passes through his, nor the shoemaker as it passes through his, but in that instance it is added to the price of everything made from those hides.

So we perceive on the one hand we are not doing the producer of hides any good, but, on the other hand, Mr. President, we are adding to the price of every shoe that is bought by that farmer, of every trace, of every bit of leather he must use in his business.

One thing more: Of the hundreds of letters I have received from my State not a single farmer wrote for a duty on hides, and the only letter I received asking for a tariff on hides was from the packers.

Now, finally, Mr. President, I have heard two or three times during this debate an appeal for this duty upon the ground of protection. It was a very natural argument to make. I blame no Senator for making it, but I have heard an expression with reference to "protectionist Senators." Well, that is becoming an old question in this debate. Those of us who are insisting that no greater duty than is actually protective, in our opinion, should be put in the bill think that we are even the better—certainly the more rational and safer—protectionists; we think that we are the sounder and truer protectionists.

But upon this specific duty on hides, I call the attention of the Senate and the country to the fact that John Sherman was a protectionist, and he was for free hides; McKinley was a protectionist, and he was for free hides; James G. Blaine was a protectionist, and he, perhaps, performed greater labor for the great cause of protection than any other man in this Republic since the day of Clay—and Blaine was for free hides.

If it is suggested that those men are of the past and that that would not be their opinion now, it must be conceded that Mr. PAYNE, the present chairman of the House committee, is a protectionist of protectionists, and as such he is for free hides.

And, Mr. President, with such credentials of the protectionism of those of us who are for free hides, I think I shall conclude these brief remarks and ask permission to put into the RECORD that portion of Chairman PAYNE'S very exhaustive speech in explanation of the bill which relates to the subject of hides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Mr. PAYNE, chairman Ways and Means Committee, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 23, 1909.]

A duty was put on hides soon after the civil war, when the country was anxious and looking for revenue in every direction in order to pay the interest on our war debt and reduce it. They put a duty on hides, and in 1871 they took it off, regarding it as a war-revenue duty which should not be continued. And why? Hides are a by-product of the animal. Now, I know there are half a hundred people here who will say, "Yes; but it is a sixth or a tenth of the value of the steer." Well, it is. But it is a by-product. People do not raise animals for hides. They raise them for their meat, and the meat is the principal item when they come to sell the cattle. Not only that, but it is the foundation for half a dozen industries; and every time you put a duty on what is called sometimes the "raw material"—and, as far as hides are concerned, they are raw material—you have got to go all up along the line of goods made from that raw material and increase the duty. That is well recognized. No use in keeping hides out of this country in order to sell the domestic hides. If you have got to send them abroad to be tanned, to be made into shoes, to be made into harness, to be made into carriage leather, you want a duty on the manufactured goods, you gentlemen that are clamoring for a duty on hides.

The question came up under the McKinley bill. An amendment was offered in the House for a duty on hides. Gentlemen agonized for it as loudly as some of you gentlemen are agonizing for it now, but not quite as loudly as my friend from Texas is agonizing for a revenue duty. It was voted down in the House, and it was kept out of the McKinley bill, and they were left on the free list. When the Dingley bill came before the House, reported by the committee, it was reported with free hides, and I saw a number of gentlemen on this side of the House and a number of gentlemen on the other side of the House, led by the late Jeremiah Simpson, of Kansas, voting for a duty on hides. He was a little more frank than some of these modern-day tariff-for-revenue people. He said he wanted to get his share. He did not believe in a duty on hides, but he wanted to get his share; his people wanted it, and it had something to do with the Populist vote out in Kansas. Marching under his banner and leadership, some of our friends on the other side and some on this voted for it, but the House voted it down. It went over into the Senate. We did not have a Republican majority in the Senate in those days, but we did have a majority of those who claimed to be protectionists, and one of these protectionists of Populistic tendencies would not vote for the bill unless it carried a duty on hides, and the Senate accommodated him.

That is one of the courtesies of the Senate when any Member wants something done. They put a duty on hides, and the bill came over here. It was in conference for six weeks. The House conferees struggled against it as a duty that should not go into the bill. The Senate conferees said they could not pass the bill through the Senate unless it contained a duty on hides, and in order to get a bill we were finally forced to yield this duty on hides, and it has been in operation now for twelve years. And while numberless gentlemen have come before the committee, not a single witness has been able to trace a dollar into the hands of the owner of a single steer that came because of this increased duty on hides. But it appeared before the committee that the price of hides was fixed by the "Big Four;" that they controlled the market in the United States. They control the markets in the United States; they control whatever benefit goes to anybody because of this duty on hides. No man would risk his reputation for veracity by standing up here and saying that the "Big Four" were ever known to give up a single cent which got into their coffers unless they were forced to do so. So we have this duty; but the packers all contend that they care nothing about it, and still when brought before the committee they make an argument to continue it.

Mr. REEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I suppose so.

Mr. REEDER. I would like to ask you if you think that the "Big Four" would be generous enough to turn this tariff over to the consumers of hides when they will not turn it over to the producers of hides?

Mr. PAYNE. They will not turn over anything to anybody until they are compelled to.

Mr. REEDER. I do not understand what your argument is for, if they keep it from the producer of hides, unless the people who are making this fight for free hides think the people who are making the fight will give it to the consumer of those hides.

Mr. PAYNE. Who are making the fight?

Mr. REEDER. The manufacturers of boots and shoes have had a lobby here urging free hides for several years to my personal knowledge.

Mr. PAYNE. We will come to that point later. The trouble is that the gentleman anticipates my argument and I can not reach the point that I desire to do.

Mr. REEDER. My query is on the question you are talking about. It seems to me that it is clearly on the point that you are discussing.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will wait, I will get to it, but I can not state everything at once. Will the gentleman wait and give me an opportunity?

Mr. REEDER. I will.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to give gentlemen full liberty to ask questions, but there is a proper time for all things and I can not discuss everything at once.

Mr. REEDER. I am afraid I will lose out as to the proper time if this is not such a time.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, under this duty on hides a large proportion of the tanning business formerly done in the United States is done in Germany and other foreign countries. Why? Because this 15 per cent of duty turns away the hides from the South American countries from the ports of the United States and drives them into the ports of Germany and other countries.

Mr. REEDER. I want to make a suggestion right there.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman wait until I get through this point?

Mr. REEDER. You are right at the point now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that I be not interrupted until I get through with this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. PAYNE. And the result has been that they have taken away the tanning business, and we have to import their leather instead of importing the raw hides and tanning them in the United States. The domestic production of hides is not anywhere near sufficient for the supply of leather which we need in this country. It lacks about 40 per cent of it. Why, we raise a steer, not quite a steer, to each inhabitant in the United States. It falls far short of that. In Argentina they raise six steers to one inhabitant. We can not get that way. Tanning people can not get the hides to run their factories. They can not get them anywhere, from the packers or anywhere else, and they are obliged in some instances to close down there tanneries because of the scarcity of hides and yield up their business to those on the other side. Why? All because of this tariff on raw material, a by-product of the animal. A product of labor? Whose labor or what product? What labor is there in raising steers? There is none in Argentina. Why, our farmers have the advantage. If the hides sold for nothing, still they have the advantage in raising steers. Where is meat so high in the world as in the zone of manufactures in the United States, north of the Potomac and east of the Mississippi River?

Take the statistics of the States, take the prices of agricultural products, and they will average more than 20 per cent higher where consumed in a manufacturing district than in the agricultural States of the Union. The home market for farming products, which go directly there, those towns are teeming with countless thousands of men earning American wages, living at the American rates, eating American meat, not once a week, but every day; and if the hides had no value, still our farmers would be in the front rank with the price of meat.

Now, we have created this magnificent market under our magnificent tariff laws. We have created it for the farmer and everything he raises, because of the fact that the consumer of this country is ready, willing, and able to buy at the best prices in the world. I said "everything." No; not everything. Our farmers raise a surplus for exportation; but they do not raise a surplus of hides for export. Doing their best, we still have to have 40 per cent of hides imported in order to carry on our manufacturing industries.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to ask the gentleman if any evidence was brought before the committee tending to show what proportion of the hides that go into the market from the United States go through the packing houses and how many come from individuals?

Mr. PAYNE. The statement was made by Judge Cowan, of Texas, that 6,000,000 or 8,000,000 cattle went through the packing houses out of 14,000,000 cattle in the United States of all grades; but of course the grade of cattle that goes through the packing houses are the cattle with the thicker hides, the larger steers, the best beef, and the duty being on that class of hides does not affect the others.

Mr. SCOTT. I asked the question because the argument is commonly made that any advantage reaped from the tariff on hides goes to the packer rather than to the farmer, and I wanted the opinion of the gentleman on that question.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose I will have to, although I should like to discuss the question.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I will not interrupt the gentleman unless he wants me to, but his statement is erroneous, and I am sure he wants to give the House the benefit of a correct statement. Did not Judge Cowan say that out of about 14,000,000 hides produced in the United States each year about 5,000,000 came through the packing houses?

Mr. PAYNE. I think he said 6,000,000, to be strictly accurate, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I think the gentleman will find that it was 5,000,000; he said that 11,000,000 came under the duty provision, and 5,000,000 went through the packing houses, and about 6,000,000 came from individuals.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to the gentleman that I accepted Judge Cowan's statement with some degree of allowance.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The gentleman does not undertake to say that Judge Cowan was not stating the facts so far as he knew them?

Mr. PAYNE. No; but he had the enthusiasm of an attorney.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to think, from what I heard and my observation before the Ways and Means Committee, that there were a good many witnesses whom the gentleman puts a good deal of confidence in who were enthusiastic by reason of their business in their testimony before the committee.

Mr. PAYNE. There is no doubt about that, but that does not lessen my criticism of Judge Cowan.

Mr. WEISSE. Will the gentleman allow me to answer that question in regard to hides?

Mr. PAYNE. I will pause for the gentleman's reply, if it will not take more than a minute.

Mr. WEISSE. He states that of 14,000,000 hides used by the tanners—under the Dingley bill the tariff classifies hides of 25 pounds and over as being dutiable. Eighty per cent of the hides of 25 pounds and over are taken off by the packers and city butchers controlled by the packers, and only 20 per cent are marketed directly by the farmer. Eighty per cent of the hides of less than 25 pounds, which come in duty free, are produced by the farmers, and only 20 per cent are taken off by the packers or the butchers controlled by the packers. Further, we have an invoice of hides from the South containing 7,000 hides, and out of the 7,000 there were only 92 hides that would have to pay a duty to get into this country. Over 6,000 would have come in free, and they were all taken off by the farmers.

Mr. PAYNE. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who knows about the tanning business, is not the gentleman from Texas a little bit sorry he brought in Judge Cowan?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Not at all. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WEISSE] made a statement that I think attention ought to be called to—that the Dingley law provided that only hides weighing 25 pounds and over were dutiable. The Dingley law does not do that, but the gentleman from Wisconsin and a few importers of his kind induced the Secretary of the Treasury to make that ruling, and that is the reason that hides weighing less than that are not on the protected list.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say a word in reply to my friend from Texas first, if I am allowed to do so. The Dingley law provided a duty on hides of cattle. The question came up on the construction of that language, which was put into the bill not in the House, but elsewhere, as to what "hides of cattle" were; and after consideration of the question, the Secretary of the Treasury drew the dividing line at 25 pounds, and so far as I know no importer of hides has ever questioned that decision. Now I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from New York will permit me, he will generally find me on the protective side of these questions. But cattle hides are largely used in my district, and I want to say that I am inclined to agree with him in the matter of free hides. Of the production of cattle hides in the United States, I am informed, 60 per cent is sole leather; of that 60 per cent, the packers control 70 per cent of the hides, and tan 65 per cent of the 70 per cent.

I want to ask the chairman—being inclined to agree with him—whether the removal of the duty, as proposed in the Payne bill, will protect the independent tanner against the packer, or whether he will be inevitably pushed to the wall, duty or no duty?

Mr. PAYNE. I believe it will protect the tanner. Tanners can not get hides because the importation has gone to Europe, and they are unable to get the raw material to run the tanneries.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the effect will be to protect the independent tanners?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; and it will not hurt anybody in the United States except the middlemen and the packers.

Mr. REEDER. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I will now yield to the gentleman from Kansas, although I am coming to his question. I would have been there long ago if I had not been interrupted.

Mr. REEDER. Would it not be the proper thing to put a higher tariff on leather, and thus bring the manufacturers to the United States rather than remove the tariff from the farmers' finished product?

Mr. PAYNE. I will answer the gentleman's question when he gets through.

Mr. REEDER. I am through.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not know but that the gentleman was ready to put another question in the middle of my answer. I have just reached the point in discussion. I reached it some time ago when I designed to talk about leather, but was interrupted by a question. So far as I am able I am willing to answer all sorts of questions as long as the House can stand it.

Now, about leather. These heavy hides are used in making sole leather, belting leather, and split leather for uppers of coarse boots and shoes, and carriage leather, and some harness leather. The committee cut the duty on sole leather and belting leather from 20 to 5 per cent. I have been asked why they did not cut it more. That may be a fair question. It is easily answered. The duty on the finished article must be higher than the duty on raw material from which it was made because it involves more labor. There is always to every tariff schedule, even a tariff schedule for revenue, a graduation of the duties from raw material up, according to the degrees of manufacture.

Now, some gentlemen came before the committee and stated that if we would take the duty off from hides they would be satisfied to have the duty taken off from sole leather and belting leather. My friends on the other side, some of them, cross-examined these witnesses about it. These men did not say so right out loud, but they squinted in that direction. I do not know but that some of them said so. One of them said:

"If you will make hides free and tanning extracts free, we could get along with free leather, provided you would take care of the labor unions in this country."

Some man had said broadly that on even terms he could compete with any manufacturer beneath the sun, but when he came to examine into it under the skillful examination of some gentlemen of the minority it was conditioned on free hides, free tanning extracts, and no labor unions. Well, the committee had no jurisdiction over labor unions, and they would not exercise it if they could.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not attempt to discuss this question, but in illustration of the subject I ask that the following extract of a letter from one of my constituents—Mr. J. C. Parker, of J. C. Parker & Son Company, of Middletown, Del.—be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

J. C. PARKER & SON COMPANY (INCORPORATED),
Middletown, Del., March 2, 1909.

Senator H. A. DU PONT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been engaged in manufacturing articles made of leather for the last thirty years, we feel we are in position to know that the present tariff of 15 per cent on hides is no advantage to the manufacturers of leather products or to the consumers, and having familiarized ourselves with the agitation that is now being given the question, both pro and con, we have seen nothing to change our views, that are based upon experience, and a large part of the thirty years the said business was conducted under free hides.

The United States does not, nor does any other civilized country, produce enough hides to supply their demands. It is therefore absolutely necessary to import hides from other countries, and when we can do this we then are on a footing with our finished products with other countries that admit hides free. With the increasing population and many new uses for leather, we are not as well able to supply our own demands now as we have been in the past. As the hide industry is confined, comparatively speaking, to such a few, they are in a position to control the price, and when the market will not take what they produce at their price, they simply turn it over to their own tanneries. There is no question, in my mind, but that they are retarding returning prosperity in our line, for the reason hides and leather to-day are higher than they have been before since the war. Not only do they control the hides they take from their own cattle, but by skillful organization are controlling the hides taken from the cattle in small towns and small areas, as in Delaware, as the hides that are taken from carcasses in this section of the country are shipped to a central point, and the price fixed, which the tanners have got to pay or the hides will be shipped to their own tanneries. These facts are given to you from our own knowledge and experience, and we therefore hope that you will see your way clear to render your influence to the restoration of hides to the free list, believing you will be conferring a favor upon manufacturers as well as consumers.

I am taking the liberty of sending you a marked copy of Hide and Leather, to which we are subscribers. This is a standard paper, and I hope you will find what is said on this topic of interest, and I will thank you to pass it to Senator RICHARDSON, and we would like very much if he will pass it to Mr. HEALD. I do not wish to encumber you, but I have a feeling that all three of you will be interested in what we have said to you.

Hoping you will give this your careful consideration, and with kind regards, we are,

Yours, very truly, JOS. C. PARKER,
Treasurer.

MARCH 5, 1909.

Mr. J. C. PARKER,
Secretary and Treasurer J. C. Parker & Son Company,
Middletown, Del.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 2d instant, I will say that while I am heartily in favor of placing hides on the free list in the new tariff, I recognize the fact that it will be extremely difficult to effect this, for the reason that there is very strong opposition to it on the part of the cattle-raising interests in the West.

If we could have a tariff constructed on what I consider to be the proper lines, we would have maximum and minimum tariffs, the maximum tariff to be the ordinary tariff, and the minimum tariff, which would chiefly include articles of luxury and raw materials, and which would be applied by the President, under such enactments as Congress might frame, to those countries who give us in return the advantages of their minimum tariffs. Under this state of affairs I think it would be feasible to have hides placed on the free list in the minimum tariff, which would be in the nature of a compromise, as hides would only come in free from those countries who gave us markets for our fresh meats, or other substantial advantages in return.

As requested, I have sent a copy of Hides and Leather to Senator RICHARDSON, and have asked him that when he has read the marked article to turn it over to Congressman HEALD.

I will say, in conclusion, that when the tariff bill comes before the Senate I shall make every effort to look out for your interests.

Yours, very truly, ——— ———.

MARCH 6, 1909.

Hon. HARRY A. RICHARDSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sending you, under separate cover, a copy of Hide and Leather containing a marked article. Mr. J. C. Parker, of Middletown, Del., asks that when you have perused it that you send the same to Representative HEALD.

Yours, very truly, ——— ———.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. DAVIS demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOURNE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a pair for the afternoon with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who has been called from the Chamber on account of indisposition. If he were present, he should vote "yea" and I should vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (when Mr. KEAN's name was called). The present occupant of the chair is paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER]. If he were present, I would vote "nay."

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when Mr. RAYNER's name was called). The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] is unavoidably absent. If he were here, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON].

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 46, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Aldrich	Culberson	Guggenheim	Piles
Bailey	Cummins	Hale	Scott
Borah	Curtis	Heyburn	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Dick	Hughes	Smoot
Brandegee	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Stone
Bristow	Dolliver	Jones	Sutherland
Brown	Elkins	Lorimer	Taliaferro
Bulkeley	Fletcher	McCumber	Warner
Burkett	Flint	McEnery	Warren
Carter	Foster	Newlands	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Nixon	
Crawford	Gamble	Penrose	

NAYS—30.

Bacon	Clapp	Gore	Page
Bankhead	Clay	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter
Beveridge	Crane	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	Shively
Burnham	Daniel	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Burrows	Davis	Nelson	Tillman
Burton	du Pont	Overman	
Chamberlain	Frye	Owen	

NOT VOTING—16.

Bourne	Frazier	Oliver	Simmons
Clarke, Ark.	Kean	Perkins	Smith, S. C.
Depew	McLaurin	Rayner	Stephenson
Dillingham	Money	Richardson	Taylor

So the amendment of the Committee on Finance was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask——

Mr. STONE. Just a moment. I wish to now give notice that when the bill reaches the Senate I shall offer the amendment which I offered to-day in place of the amendment just adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask that paragraph 581 of the free list be taken up, and I move that it be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The paragraph to which the Senator from Rhode Island refers will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

581. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island moves that the paragraph be stricken out. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to offer an amendment to a preceding paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Iowa has an amendment to paragraph 448, which I hope may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 448, page 179, it is proposed to strike out lines 24 and 25 and to insert:

Pay a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem in addition to the duty imposed by this paragraph on leather of the same character as that from which they are cut.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, for many years there has been carried in that paragraph a proviso making vamps, uppers, and other forms of cut leather suitable for manufacturing into boots and shoes bear a duty at the rate provided for manufactures of leather not otherwise enumerated. That would put sole leather cut in the form of soles at 40 per cent ad valorem, whereas the duty on sole leather itself, as we provide in this bill, is only 5 per cent ad valorem, and the duty on these cut forms, counted at the rate of manufactures of leather, is evidently exorbitant and unnecessary.

I have simply proposed that the duty on vamps, uppers, and other cut forms of leather shall be at a rate of 15 per cent in addition to the rate on the kind of leather out of which they are cut.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the amendment is a very proper one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the committee will, as soon as possible, report their views upon the duties on sole leather, which is included in this paragraph; but, in the meantime, I ask that the paragraph may go over, including the provision as to boots and shoes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph will go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I report from the Committee on Finance a substitute for paragraph 197, which is the lumber schedule. I ask that it may be read, printed as an amendment, and also printed in the RECORD. I give notice that to-morrow morning I shall ask the Senate to proceed to its consideration. I do not ask for a vote on it to-night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to substitute for paragraph 197, on page 69, the following:

197. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of whitewood, sycamore, and basswood, 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; sawed lumber, not specially provided for in this section, $1.50 per thousand feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, there shall be levied in addition to the rates herein provided, the following:

For one side so planed or finished, 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; for planing or finishing on one side and tonguing and grooving, or for planing or finishing on two sides, 75 cents per thousand feet board measure; for planing or finishing on three sides, $1.12½ per thousand feet board measure; for planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving or planing and finishing on four sides, $1.50 per thousand feet board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I will say with reference to this amendment that it is a reduction of 25 per cent on rough and finished lumber of all kinds from the Dingley rates, the existing rates, with the exception that lumber planed on one side retains the same rate of duty—50 cents a thousand. There is the same differential; but otherwise there is a plain 25 per cent reduction upon all the rates on finished and rough lumber, making the duty on rough lumber a dollar and a half a thousand, and reducing the duty on finished lumber varying from 37½ to 50 cents a thousand feet, according to the number of sides upon which it is planed.

Mr. HALE. Are all the rates on finished lumber in addition to those on sawed lumber?

Mr. ALDRICH. They are, as under the present law. They are cumulative rates.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator whether he does not propose, before the lumber schedule is concluded, to report certain amendments for other kinds of shorter lumber, like shingles and laths?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; the committee have an amendment in regard to the duty on shingles which, I suppose, they could report now. It is the intention of the committee to report an amendment to paragraph 205, increasing the rate on shingles from 30 to 50 cents per thousand.

Mr. HALE. And also, I believe, with reference to laths and some other kinds of short lumber. I think that is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; that is the understanding.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to say that neither of these reports is the unanimous report of the Republican members of the Finance Committee. While no vote was taken upon it, there is no question but the majority favored the statement which has been made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. I do not make any other report; but I shall submit amendments to this bill keeping down the duties, and give my reasons for the amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator from Rhode Island, while on the subject of hides and skins, to return to paragraph 672, and to allow an amendment to be made there. It now reads:

Skins of all kinds, raw (except sheepskins with the wool on).

After those words I move to add the words "and alligator skins."

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then, I propose that amendment, Mr. President. I also ask that paragraph 672 be reconsidered, if it has already been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which paragraph 672 was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. FLETCHER. I now move, Mr. President, that there be added after the words "wool on," in line 5, and within the parentheses, the words "and alligator skins." The effect is to except alligator skins along with sheepskins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 672, page 217, line 5, after the words "wool on," and within the parentheses, it is proposed to insert "and alligator skins," so that the words within the parentheses will be "except sheepskins with the wool on, and alligator skins."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask that paragraph 343 may be taken up. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to this amendment; and I ask that it may be read.

Mr. CUMMINS. To what paragraph is the amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. The oilcloth paragraph, No. 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 119, in lieu of paragraph 343, the committee reports the following:

343. Oilcloth for floors, plain, stamped, painted, or printed only, and linoleum, corticene, and all other floor oilcloth and fabrics or coverings for floors made in part of oil or any similar product, if 9 feet or less in width, and not specially provided for herein, 8 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem; over 9 feet in width, 12 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem; any of the foregoing of whatever width, the composition of which forms designs or patterns whether inlaid or otherwise, by whatever name known, and cork carpets, 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem; mats for floors, composed of any of the foregoing, shall be subject to the rate of duty herein provided for oilcloth, linoleum, corticene, or other floor oilcloth; waterproof cloth, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, whether composed in part of india rubber or otherwise, 10 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, of course we can not tell from the reading whether the amendment proposes an increase or a decrease.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the only change from the Dingley law on floor linoleum is as to the width. We propose to change the present law by providing that floor oilcloth and linoleum 9 feet and under shall carry the same rate of duty as oilcloth under 12 feet in the Dingley law. The reason for that is this: Under the Dingley law it was required that oilcloth should be 12 feet wide in order to carry the higher rate of duty; but the foreign manufacturers began to ship oilcloth 11 feet 11 inches, or, in other words, they manufactured it 1 inch under 12 feet, and by so doing secured the rate of 8 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem instead of 12 cents and 20 per cent ad valorem. I sent to Baltimore to find out just how many yards of this oilcloth 11 feet 11 inches had been imported into that port, and I ascertained that the importations of oilcloth of that width were a large percentage of importations. The regular widths in the trade are 6 feet, 9 feet, and 12 feet. So in reducing the width from 12 feet to 9 feet we still allow the 9 feet, which is the regular width in the trade, to come in at the low rate and all over 9 feet wide will take the higher rate of duty. So far as trade widths are concerned, there is no increase over the Dingley rate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have a substitute that I intend to offer for the proposition of the committee. I was very much opposed to the original report of the committee, and I am just as much opposed to the present report of the committee. I desire to be heard with regard to the matter, but I do not believe the chairman will think it proper to go on with that hearing at the present time.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I will consult the convenience of the Senator from Iowa. I should like to have the Senator from Iowa, if he will, present his amendment, in order that it may be printed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; I will do so; but I desire to say a word with regard to it.

The difficulty with respect to this paragraph is the utter impossibility of attaching specific rates to materials differing so widely in cost and price, and I have not found it possible to reduce the specific duty to weight as it should be. Linoleum should be admitted to our custom-houses under a specific duty upon weight, but it is not practicable to secure the information

that is necessary to compose that kind of duty. Therefore I intend to offer an amendment attaching a general ad valorem duty to all these articles of 40 per cent. I now send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the amendment offered by myself for the committee may be printed as an amendment and also in the RECORD, and I also ask that the same course be taken with the amendment presented by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is very satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. CUMMINS is as follows:

Substitute for paragraph 343 the following:

343. Oilcloth for floors, linoleum, corticene, and all the fabrics or covering for floors made in part of oil or any similar product, whether plain, stamped, painted, or printed, or the composition of which forms designs or patterns, whether inlaid or otherwise, by whatever name known, and cork carpets, cork mats, and linoleum mats, waterproof cloth composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, whether composed in part of india rubber or otherwise, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CUMMINS. I assume that the matter will not come up until after the——

Mr. ALDRICH. Not until after the lumber schedule is disposed of, and I will see that the Senator from Iowa is present when it is taken up.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, to paragraph 39, on page 11, I desire to offer an amendment, to which I am sure there will be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 39, on page 11, line 7, after the word "thereof" and the comma, insert "cocaine, ectonine, and all other salts and derivatives of the same;" and in line 8, after the word "ounce," insert "and coca leaves, 5 cents per pound."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the existing duty on cocaine, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. LODGE. The present duty on cocaine is very low. It comes in as a medicinal preparation. The duty proposed will be almost prohibitive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a desire on the part of some Senators to have a short executive session. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 23, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 22, 1909.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Samuel G. Mortimer, of Bellefourche, S. Dak., to be receiver of public moneys at Bellefourche, a newly created office by act of Congress approved February 6, 1909.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Frank R. Lang, Second Infantry, to be judge-advocate with the rank of major from June 18, 1909, vice Maj. Milton F. Davis, who was retired from active service on June 16, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. Albert A. King, Eighth Cavalry, to be captain from June 16, 1909, vice Capt. Milton F. Davis, Tenth Cavalry, whose resignation as a captain of cavalry was accepted to take effect on that date, having previously accepted an appointment as judge-advocate with the rank of major.

Second Lieut. Milton G. Holliday, Fifteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from June 16, 1909, vice First Lieut. Albert A. King, Eighth Cavalry, promoted.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Walter W. Merrill, First Field Artillery, to be first lieutenant from June 16, 1909, vice First Lieut. Henry L. Harris, jr., Third Field Artillery, retired from active service on that date.

CHAPLAIN.

Rev. Dennis Brendan O'Sullivan, of Rhode Island, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant from June 19, 1909, vice Chaplain Joseph Casey, First Infantry, whose resignation was accepted to take effect January 26, 1909.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Albert G. Berry to be a rear-admiral in the navy from the 18th day of June, 1909, vice Rear-Admiral Joseph N. Hemphill, retired.

Commander William S. Hogg to be a captain in the navy from the 18th day of June, 1909, vice Capt. Albert G. Berry, promoted.

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

Second Lieut. Edward A. Ostermann to be a first lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 23d day of April, 1909, vice Second Lieut. James R. N. Boyd, who was due for promotion, but failed to qualify and was suspended.

Lester S. Wass to be a second lieutenant in the United States Marine Corps from the 23d day of April, 1909, to correct his middle initial as confirmed on May 7, 1909.

POSTMASTERS.

IDAHO.

Claude H. Duval to be postmaster at Nampa, Idaho, in place of Austin G. Nettleton, resigned.

IOWA.

W. G. Haskell to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in place of William R. Boyd, resigned.

Oswell Z. Wellman to be postmaster at Arlington, Iowa, in place of Oswell Z. Wellman. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1909.

MARYLAND.

Mary W. Tise to be postmaster at Hyattsville, Md., in place of George Tise, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George C. Look to be postmaster at Woods Hole, Mass. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

Elisha Peterson to be postmaster at Duxbury, Mass. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

MICHIGAN.

Alonzo B. Hyatt to be postmaster at Linden, Mich. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

NEW JERSEY.

Charles G. Melick to be postmaster at Milford, N. J. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

George Phillips to be postmaster at Branchville, N. J. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

NEW YORK.

John L. McKinney to be postmaster at Pine Bush, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

Josiah S. Remington to be postmaster at Fort Ann, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1909.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. Wells Brinton to be postmaster at Beach, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1908.

OKLAHOMA.

James L. Gray to be postmaster at Tuttle, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1909.

Charles N. Martin to be postmaster at Haileyville, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1908.

Albert R. Phillips to be postmaster at Waynoka, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1909.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22, 1909.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Capt. Frank R. Lang to be judge-advocate with rank of major.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Leonard H. Forbes, at Burnside, Conn.

INDIANA.

Samuel E. Nicoles, at Medaryville, Ind.

NEW JERSEY.

Ralph M. Collins, at Barnegat, N. J.

OHIO.

Charles B. Morris, at Columbus Grove, Ohio.

Alva G. Sutton, at Attica, Ohio.

PENNSYLVANIA.

C. Penrose Hipple, at Marietta, Pa.