SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June 23, 1909.*

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

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BROWN. I present a short telegram in the nature of a petition. The telegram is addressed to myself and dated Omaha, June 22, and reads as follows:

OMAHA, NEBR., *June 22, 1909.*

NORRIS BROWN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, in convention assembled, consisting of 22,000 pressmen vitally interested in the use of white paper, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the secretary be incited to wire Finance Committee of United States Senate, requesting that wood pulp and white paper be admitted free.

PATRICK J. MCMULLEN,
Secretary.

I call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Finance to this telegram, and hope it may have some good effect when we come to adjust finally the wood schedule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The telegram will lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of 653 retail grocers of Pittsburg, Pa., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on tea and coffee, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the retention of the present duty on raw sugar, which were ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BURROWS:

A bill (S. 2649) granting a pension to Elizabeth Barker (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2650) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin C. Flanders (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2651) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2652) granting an increase of pension to James H. Lewis; and

A bill (S. 2653) granting an increase of pension to Alice I. Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALIAFERRO:

A bill (S. 2654) granting an increase of pension to Richard W. Brooks (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to Mary Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 2656) to provide for the defense of Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina, and the inland waters of the State tributary thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2657) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Rockingham, N. C.;

A bill (S. 2658) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Tarboro, N. C.; and

A bill (S. 2659) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Rocky Mount, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 2660) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah C. Rice;

A bill (S. 2661) granting a pension to James Carroll;

A bill (S. 2662) granting an increase of pension to Jacob C. Ramsey;

A bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Miles Goforth;

A bill (S. 2664) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Revis;

A bill (S. 2665) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sams;

A bill (S. 2666) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Madison Pruitt;

A bill (S. 2667) granting an increase of pension to John Clark;

A bill (S. 2668) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Freeman;

A bill (S. 2669) granting an increase of pension to Silas A. Carpenter; and

A bill (S. 2670) granting a pension to Henry Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2671) for the relief of Jacob W. Brower and John M. Brower, heirs of Thomas M. Brower, deceased (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2672) to refund the cotton tax to the States wherein collected;

A bill (S. 2673) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Everitt, deceased;

A bill (S. 2674) for the relief of the heirs of Nancy Barfield, deceased;

A bill (S. 2675) for the relief of Franklin Foy;

A bill (S. 2676) for the relief of the heirs of Dr. J. B. Owen;

A bill (S. 2677) for the relief of W. J. Craddock;

A bill (S. 2678) for the relief of W. T. Dixon;

A bill (S. 2679) for the relief of J. A. Denny;

A bill (S. 2680) for the relief of James F. White;

A bill (S. 2681) for the relief of I. F. Hill, executor of W. E. Hill;

A bill (S. 2682) for the relief of Joseph B. Banks;

A bill (S. 2683) for the relief of the heirs of Lemuel Freeman, deceased;

A bill (S. 2684) for the relief of Mrs. A. M. Bacon;

A bill (S. 2685) for the relief of the estate of John Henry Jackson, deceased;

A bill (S. 2686) for the relief of David J. Middleton;

A bill (S. 2687) for the relief of E. M. Felts;

A bill (S. 2688) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Howard, deceased;

A bill (S. 2689) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Thomas A. Hendricks, deceased;

A bill (S. 2690) for the relief of the estate of Hardy H. Waters, deceased;

A bill (S. 2691) for the relief of John L. Brown and the estates of A. T. Redditt and William G. Judkins;

A bill (S. 2692) for the relief of K. H. Lewis and W. F. Lewis;

A bill (S. 2693) for the relief of the estate of H. D. Coley, deceased;

A bill (S. 2694) for the relief of Thomas D. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased;

(By request) a bill (S. 2695) for the relief of William C. Staples;

A bill (S. 2696) for the relief of the heirs at law of Robert D. McCombs, deceased;

A bill (S. 2697) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton;

A bill (S. 2698) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Askin, Arthur Ipock, and John T. Ipock;

A bill (S. 2699) for the relief of the estate of George S. De Bruhl, deceased;

A bill (S. 2700) for the relief of the widow of R. D. Hay;

A bill (S. 2701) for the relief of C. G. Perkins;

A bill (S. 2702) for the relief of the heirs of Cicero M. Davis;

A bill (S. 2703) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Richardson, deceased;

A bill (S. 2704) for the relief of the estate of D. L. Pritchard, deceased;

A bill (S. 2705) for the relief of Thomas Monteith;

A bill (S. 2706) for the relief of Sidney Maxwell;

A bill (S. 2707) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles;

A bill (S. 2708) for the relief of Walter T. Dough;

A bill (S. 2709) for the relief of the estate of Thomas A. Dough, deceased;

A bill (S. 2710) for the relief of Martha A. Moffitt, widow of Eli A. Moffitt;

A bill (S. 2711) for the relief of John Wise;

A bill (S. 2712) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Everitt, deceased;

A bill (S. 2713) for the relief of John G. Young;

A bill (S. 2714) for the relief of the heirs of D. W. Morton;

A bill (S. 2715) for the relief of William Foy and H. B. Lane, executor of Mrs. H. B. Lane, of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 2716) for the relief of W. B. Whitfield;

A bill (S. 2717) for the relief of John Burke Morris;

A bill (S. 2718) for the relief of the heirs and distributees of H. W. Hargrove;

A bill (S. 2719) for the relief of the estate of William C. Lewis;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A bill (S. 2720) for the relief of Sidney T. Dupuy and George R. Dupuy, the only surviving heirs of George R. Dupuy, deceased;

A bill (S. 2721) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Harriet Andrews;

A bill (S. 2722) for the relief of George A. Russell, administrator of Stephen Chadwick, deceased;

A bill (S. 2723) for the relief of the estate of W. F. Sanderson; and

A bill (S. 2724) for the relief of Mary J. Tatham, heir of Robert D. McCombs, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 2725) granting an increase of pension to John Wharton;

A bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Sizer;

A bill (S. 2727) granting an increase of pension to George W. Van Tassel;

A bill (S. 2728) granting an increase of pension to Marion Jacobs;

A bill (S. 2729) granting an increase of pension to William C. Lauscher;

A bill (S. 2730) granting an increase of pension to James McNeill (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2731) granting an increase of pension to James N. Hubbard (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2732) granting an increase of pension to James P. Albee (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2733) granting an increase of pension to James Connor (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2734) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. French (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2735) authorizing the adjudication and payment of the claim of Charles Dupre; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

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

MISSOURI TROOPS IN THE CIVIL WAR.

On motion of Mr. SMOOT, it was

Ordered, That 200 copies of Senate document No. 412, Fifty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "Missouri Troops in the Civil War" be reprinted.

THE TARIFF.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the amendment of the committee to paragraph 197, page 69, which will be read.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I suggest the want of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Crane	Guggenheim	Paynter
Bacon	Crawford	Hale	Perkins
Beveridge	Culberson	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Cullom	Hughes	Root
Bradley	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Scott
Brandegee	Curtis	Jones	Simmons
Bristow	Davis	Kean	Smith, Md.
Brown	Depew	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Bulkeley	Dick	Lodge	Smoot
Burkett	Dillingham	McCumber	Sutherland
Burnham	Dolliver	McLaurin	Taliaferro
Burrows	Fletcher	Martin	Tillman
Burton	Flint	Nelson	Warren
Chamberlain	Frye	Oliver	
Clapp	Gallinger	Overman	
Clay	Gamble	Page	

Mr. CLAY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] on account of sickness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-one Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the pending amendment.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of paragraph 197, on page 69, the Committee on Finance proposes to insert:

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 finished 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. McCUMBER. I move to amend the substitute of the committee by striking out the words "and 50 cents," in line 4, of the amendment, so that it will read:

Sawed lumber, not specially provided in this section, $1 per thousand feet board measure.

Mr. President, the duty fixed by the bill as passed by the House is $1 per thousand feet board measure on rough lumber. I am not going to take one moment's time in going over the question whether the duty ought to be lowered, whether it ought to be raised, or whether rough lumber ought to be upon the free list. That has already been discussed.

I simply submit to the Senate this one proposition, that there has been no evidence to establish the fact that it costs any more to produce the lumber upon this side of the Canadian line than it costs to produce it on the other side. In the mountainous sections of Canada it costs more to produce the lumber. Along the Lakes in several sections, on account of the roughness of the land, it costs more.

Mr. President, I do not see certainly any necessity for raising the House rate of $1 from any standpoint whatever. I ask for the yeas and nays upon agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4 of the amendment proposed by the committee, strike out the words "and 50 cents," so as to read:

Not specially provided for in this section, $1 per thousand feet board measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota demands the yeas and nays on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT (when Mr. ELKINS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. ELKINS] has not yet arrived in the Senate. I am sure that if he were here, he would vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. FRYE's name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is not present. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FLINT. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] and vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I notice that that Senator has not voted. I therefore transfer my pair to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Bankhead	Clapp	Gamble	Nelson
Beveridge	Clay	Gore	Overman
Bristow	Crawford	Hughes	Paynter
Brown	Cummins	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Curtis	La Follette	Tillman
Burton	Davis	McCumber	
Carter	Dolliver	McLaurin	

NAYS—44.

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins
Bacon	Crane	Hale	Piles
Bailey	Cullom	Heyburn	Root
Borah	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bradley	Dick	Kean	Simmons
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Dixon	Martin	Smoot
Bulkeley	Fletcher	Money	Sutherland
Burnham	Flint	Oliver	Taliaferro
Burrows	Foster	Page	Taylor
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren

NOT VOTING—22.

Bourne	Frazier	Nixon	Stephenson
Clarke, Ark.	Frye	Owen	Stone
Culberson	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rayner	Warner
Daniel	Lorimer	Richardson	Wetmore
du Pont	McEnery	Shively	
Elkins	Newlands	Smith, S. C.	

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

Mr. McCUMBER. I now offer the following amendment to the amendment. In line 8, I move to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five," so as to read:

For one side so planed or finished, 25 cents per 1,000 feet board measure.

In line 11, I move to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty," so as to read, "50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure;" in line 12, and line 1, on page 2, I move to strike out the words "one dollar and twelve and a half cents," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "seventy-five cents;" and after the word "grooving," in line 2, page 2, to strike out the word "or" and insert "75 cents; for;" and in line 3, to strike out the words "fifty cents," so as to read "$1 per 1,000 feet," so as to make the amendment read:

For one side so planed or finished, 25 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on one side and tonguing and grooving or for planing or finishing on two sides, 50 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on three sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet board measure; for planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving, 75 cents; for planing and finishing on four sides, $1 per 1,000 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. President, I should like the attention of the Senate for just a few moments upon what this change means. The committee amendment for $1.50 per thousand on rough lumber has now passed. That makes very little difference to the American people. The amount of rough lumber that is purchased for consumption is very inconsiderable. Almost all of the purchases are of the finished product; and what I want to do is to make the differential bear as near a relation to the finished product as is possible.

Under the amendment which I have given here I am still placing the differential at least 50 per cent greater than the actual cost of the difference in the planing and finishing of the rough lumber. I now call attention to what the House provision means with the present differential and as amended by the committee. The House rate on rough lumber was $1. The committee amendment places that at $1.50. My amendment now leaves this at $1.50. Planed on one side, the House rate would be $1.50; the committee amendment is $2, and my amendment would be $1.75, or midway between the two propositions of the House and the committee. Planed on one side, tongued and grooved, the House bill is $2; the committee amendment is $2.25, and my amendment would place that at $2. Planed on two sides, the House fixed $2; the committee amendment is $2.25, and my amendment would bring it back to $2. Planed on three sides, the House fixed $2.50; the committee amendment is $2.62½, and my amendment would be $2.25. Planed on two sides, tongued and grooved, the House provision is $2.50; the committee amendment is $3, and my amendment would be $2.25. Planed on four sides, the House bill is $3; the committee amendment is $3, and my amendment would be $2.50.

Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this fact: The chairman stated yesterday that his proposed amendment reduced the Dingley differential 25 per cent; in other words, that it fixed 75 per cent of the Dingley differential as the differential in this proposed amendment. I think he has made an error in one of these differentials. For instance, we will take——

Mr. ALDRICH. I said with the exception of lumber planed on one side.

Mr. McCUMBER. I call the Senator's attention to lumber planed on two sides, tongued and grooved. The original Dingley law was $3.50 for that. In other words, it was $2 on rough and $1.50 for the differential. The House reports $2.50, or $1 less. I notice the committee amendment here, if I read it rightly, is $3. You place that exactly upon the same basis as planed on four sides. When planed on four sides the differential of the Dingley is $2, and therefore it would make the proper differential 50 per cent less than that $2, or 25 per cent on $2.50. In other words, you have $3 for that on which the Dingley rate was $3.50, and you also have $3 for that upon which the Dingley rate was $4.

Mr. ALDRICH. What I stated was that the reductions on finished lumber were 25 per cent of the Dingley rate, with the exception of lumber planed on one side, and I think the Senator will find that the statement is correct.

Mr. McCUMBER. That can not be, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is taking the gross amount of the duty. Instead of taking the duty fixed by the Dingley rate, he is taking the gross amount.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know; but the difference would be $1.50 for the differential on those planed on two sides, tongued and grooved. The Senator must bear in mind that while a half dollar is allowed for each side of planing under the Dingley law a half dollar is not allowed for tonguing and grooving on each side.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Dingley law reads:

If planed on two sides, tongued and grooved, $1.50 per thousand feet board measure.

Mr. McCUMBER. That would make $3.50.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about the gross amount. The differential under this amendment is $1.12½, or 25 per cent reduction from that.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator has $3.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about the combined duty. I am talking about the differential. I said the differential on finished lumber was reduced 25 per cent from the Dingley rate except in the case of lumber planed on one side. I think the Senator will find that that is correct.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, just turn to this amendment. The Senator has left the Dingley differential. That is the point. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that upon planed on two sides, tongued and grooved, he has placed the duty at $1.50, and his own statement is that it is $1.12½. I ask the Senator to turn to the last page of the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, or planed and finished on four sides, $1.50. That is $1 under the present law.

Mr. McCUMBER. You see that is not the differential.

Mr. ALDRICH. Twenty-five per cent of $2 is 50 cents, and 50 cents off of $2 is $1.50.

Mr. McCUMBER. But your difference is $1.50 on the Dingley rate.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator has added them together.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I am adding nothing. The differential on the Dingley is $1.50, and you have added $1.50 instead of 75 per cent of $1.50 on the next but the last bracket. On your last bracket it is all right. If you turn to line 11 of the amendment, you will see:

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, $1.50.

That is the point. There is only $1.50 on the Dingley rate. If the Senator will look at it, he will see that it is a clerical error in making the calculation.

Mr. ALDRICH. It should be $1.12½.

Mr. McCUMBER. It should be $1.12½.

I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island, if it does not cost over 75 cents for any kind of work, for the highest on the differential, what reason there is for making it a dollar and a half, or double the amount.

Mr. ALDRICH. As the Senator is aware, there is a great difference of opinion among people who ought to know as to the cost of finishing lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. But I have found none of them go above that.

Mr. ALDRICH. The planing-mill men of northern New York and of Vermont—in fact, all along the Canadian border—insisted that the present rates were barely protective, and they were opposed to any reduction whatever.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator if any of them insisted that it costs even $1 extra per thousand for the finished lumber—that is, for finishing the four sides, tonguing or grooving?

Mr. ALDRICH. They insisted that the cumulative rate of $2 was hardly sufficient to enable them to make any profit at all when they were near the Canadian border.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. And those people are very much opposed to the proposition of the committee as reported. If you would take their opinion upon the subject, no reduction at all should be made. Of course other planing mills, located farther away from the border and not subjected to so much immediate competition with the Canadian mills, are not objecting strenuously to this reduction, although I think all of them would prefer that the present rate should be maintained.

When you come to discuss the question as to the actual cost or the relative cost, it is one of those questions regarding which

the committee certainly have not been able to reconcile the different statements which have been made by the different people in the trade.

Mr. McLAURIN. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question.

Mr. McCUMBER. In one moment. I want to have this answered first. That does not answer the question. The question was whether or not there is evidence enough to satisfy our committee, or any member of it, that it costs more on an average than 75 cents per thousand for finishing all of the lumber.

I admit that some claim that they need this protection, not because there should be that much of a differential, but because it would raise the duty on the imported article, and have the same result, whether it was in a differential or on the rough lumber.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will yield, as I promised, first to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and then I will yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if "sawed lumber," in line 3 of the amendment, would include pine lumber?

Mr. ALDRICH. It certainly would. It includes all lumber except whitewood, sycamore, and basswood.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, replying to the question which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has just asked, I would say it looks as if lumber could be dressed very cheaply on four sides and that it would not cost to exceed a dollar, which I believe the Senator mentions as the cost of that work. That might be so, but the lumber that is dressed on four sides has to go through manipulations before it is dressed.

Mr. McCUMBER. I include that manipulation in my estimate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then I say to the Senator that lumber can not be carried through planing mills of the various kinds through which it is carried at $1. The labor itself will cost more. It will cost more money to dress lumber of the various kinds. Some lumber can be dressed at very much less than a dollar. You have, however, got to take into consideration not only the dressing of this lumber, but the moving of the lumber from the pile, the putting of it on the wagon, the carrying of it to the mill, and putting it upon the machines. I talked to a gentleman the other day who is thoroughly conversant with the dressing of lumber, the manipulation which is required in its dressing, and the manipulation which is required in the bringing of the wider boards down to narrow boards. For instance, in flooring you may take a 12-inch board and run it through a planer and dress it on one side much more cheaply than you can take a piece of flooring 3 inches wide and run it through a planer. When you manipulate this lumber, resaw it, and put it into widths for flooring, you have to dress four pieces instead of one; and in the end you have not got any more lumber than if you dressed one piece on one side.

Aside from that, in the manipulation of lumber, in cutting it into strips, it will lose at least 5 per cent. All these things have to be taken into consideration. I make the assertion here that if you take into consideration all the expense attending the dressing and manipulation of lumber, including the mills, the supplies, the interest on the money, and the insurance, you can not do it for less than $2 or $2.50 a thousand. It is very easy to say that you can run a board through a mill at a very low price, but there are other things to be taken into consideration when you take the cost of the entire year through. I am basing these facts upon the balance sheets at the end of the year, when the entire cost has been taken into consideration and when you ascertain what it has cost the year around; and I say it will cost from $2 to $2.50 to get the planing-mill figures.

I do not mean to say that there is not lumber that can be dressed for less than a dollar; but the lumber that is dressed on four sides has to be manipulated; it has to be put into a condition where it is suitable for the purchaser. In doing that you increase the expense every time you touch it. I assert that you can not do the manipulating and planing part of the business for less than $2 or $2.50, taking all of the cost into consideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I will take the evidence given by the Senator from Maryland and will place that against all of the evidence in all of the hearings that have been had upon this case, and there is not a single person, even amongst those who are demanding the highest tariffs, who has ever claimed that it cost anything like that; and we have their admission over and over again, in letters and otherwise, that a dollar would more than cover all these manipulations of which the Senator speaks.

I am going to present this from the millers' standpoint, from the standpoint of those who manufacture the lumber, and I purpose to show that, upon the average, it does not cost to exceed about 60 cents for any kind of finishings, whether on two sides, three sides, or four sides, or for the tonguing and the grooving. I will not take my own guess at all, but I will take the statements of the lumbermen in their letters and the propositions which have been submitted to them. I do not intend that the Senate shall vote upon this question with any mistaken idea of what it really costs to finish the lumber after it has been sawed. I am going to read some letters. I should like to ask the attention of those Senators who care anything about this matter to the letters. Here is a letter written by the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Company. It states:

BROOKS-SCANLON LUMBER COMPANY,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 23, 1909.

Hon. NELSON W. ALDRICH,
United States Senate, Washington.

DEAR SIR: We understand the lumber schedule is to be considered by the Senate, and that the Payne measure provides for a very heavy duty on finishing lumber coming into this country on the presumption that it is a protection to American labor. This is a very erroneous idea and is practically without foundation. We are operating one large sawmill in Minnesota and two in Louisiana.

I call attention to the fact that I am reaching now the northern section of the country as well as the southern section.

The cost of finishing lumber in the planing mill at the Minnesota plant for the year 1908 was $0.487 per thousand feet and $0.58 per thousand feet at the Louisiana plants. This cost includes repairs—

I want to call the Senators' attention to this—

and supplies, and covers all lumber sent through the planing mill, but does not include lumber shipped in the rough. Our Minnesota cost is higher than the average cost for mills in that territory, due to the fact that our trade is a special one, which requires a large amount of work on the high-grade stock put through the planing mill. Our common grades, which could be put through the planing mill at a low cost, are practically all sold "rough" to the cargo trade, which accounts for the high average cost of finishing our lumber at that plant. You will observe that our cost in Louisiana is lower than in Minnesota, but this cost is higher than the average northwestern plant, for the reason that 45 per cent of the southern yellow pine lumber is cut into 4-inch strips in order to command higher prices, while the reverse is true in the North. In the Northwestern States lumbermen make it a practice to saw their lumber as wide as possible, because the wider widths command higher prices. The cost of planing this narrow lumber is much greater than the wider widths, as usually only one piece is put through the machine at a time.

Our object in giving you these figures is to show that even a duty of 50 cents per thousand on finished lumber would not only protect American labor, but would also cover the entire cost of putting the stock through the planing mill. Why the duty should be higher on lumber, whether surfaced one, two, three, or four sides, is a mystery to us, and it seems ridiculous to increase the duty on that account. Many years ago, with the old-style planing-mill machinery, it was necessary to put a piece of lumber through the machine as many times as you had sides to dress; but that type of machine is obsolete, and we do not think they are used to any extent in the mills of this country at present.

We are large, well-known manufacturers of lumber in this country, and if you desire to inquire as to our standing, the Senators or Representatives from this State can probably give you the necessary information. If any of the lumber manufacturers of this country were to be injured by a reduction in the tariff, we certainly would be; and still we are heartily in favor of a reduction in the tariff on lumber, particularly finished stock. If you desire any additional information on this subject, we will be glad to furnish it.

Very respectfully, yours,

BROOKS-SCANLON LUMBER COMPANY,
M. J. SCANLON, *Vice-President.*

Mr. President, this lumber company states that the finishing, including all of the work, does not exceed 50 cents per thousand.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that all along the northern border of this country there are cities the great percentage of whose business it is to dress lumber. Tonawanda is built on the dressing of lumber. Ogdensburg is dependent, I think, for more than half its business upon the dressing of lumber. The largest city in Vermont, Burlington, is dependent upon the lumber business. The letter which has just been read says that 50 cents ought to cover this differential. I want to say that 50 cents would absolutely drive all those classes of business dependent upon lumber out of business.

Mr. McCUMBER. My amendment proposes to give a dollar. It is to double the duty. I am giving your operatives there the benefit of another half dollar beyond the cost of their product.

Mr. PAGE. That is undoubtedly correct so far as covering the difference in the cost in the manufacture is concerned; but I want to mention just two other items. When you take a thousand feet of rough spruce at Ottawa, for instance, you find you

have 2,500 pounds of freight. The freight from Ottawa to Providence or to New Haven or to other New England points is about 16 cents per hundred. When you dress it on two sides and match it, as is provided in the schedule we are discussing, you take off fully 700 pounds. So the Canadian who wishes to do his own business has the advantage of the 700 pounds at 16 cents per hundred freight, or $1.12 a thousand.

Mr. McCUMBER. But your freight is covered by your differential upon the rough, which is $1.50. That will cover the extra amount upon the freight.

Mr. PAGE. That has nothing to do with the differential. As I understand, the differential is the amount of protection given to the man who dresses lumber, and that differential is affected, first, by the 700 pounds in excess freight, and, second, the lumber must be taken off at Burlington or at Tonawanda or Ogdensburg, and if you do not figure one additional cent for the difference in the cost of labor, you can not take a thousand feet of lumber from the car and put it in front of the machine and take it back and put it onto the car for less than $1. But even if you figure it at 75 cents, you start with $1.12 handicap on your freight and the 75 cents that it costs to take the lumber out of the car and put it in front of the machine and take it back to the car. There is $1.87, without mentioning any other item.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is assumed that it costs a dollar. I am assuming that it does not cost a dollar. It does not cost on an average more than half a dollar to do this extra work. But to follow this out, I ask that the letter to Senator NELSON which I send to the desk may be read by the Secretary.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. RAYNER. I merely desire to state that I was out of the Chamber when the vote was taken this morning on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], reducing the duty on lumber. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of the amendment.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. STONE. I desire to make exactly the same statement as that made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the secretary to read the letter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, *April 21, 1909.*

Hon. KNUTE NELSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to protest at what I consider the unjust and unfair discrimination in the lumber schedule in the bill as passed recently by the House of Representatives. You are no doubt aware that though rough lumber comes in at $1 duty, that there is an additional charge of 50 cents for each side that is dressed. As a matter of fact it costs no more to surface three sides of a board than one side, and the actual cost as shown by our concerns in the shipping of several hundred million feet of lumber for surfacing lumber has never exceeded 50 cents per thousand.

I do not believe there is a lumberman in the Northwest who will say that my statement in this regard is not true, and I can further say that the cost of planing millwork in the State of Minnesota generally averages about 40 cents per thousand.

Respectfully, yours,

D. N. WINTON,
President Thief River Falls Lumber Company, Minnesota,
Secretary Bemidji Lumber Company, Minnesota, and
Vice-President Northwest Lumber Company, Kalispell, Mont.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have a letter here from A. R. Rogers, of the Rogers Lumber Company. I ask that the Secretary read that letter for the purpose of showing the actual cost of the planing on one, two, three, and four sides, and what percentage it bears to the rates that are proposed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

ROGERS LUMBER COMPANY,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 23, 1909.

DEAR SIR:

* * * * * * *

Regarding the milling or planing of lumber. In the early days of the sawmill industry it was necessary to put a board through the planer as many times as there were sides to dress. In other words, if you were going to dress it four sides it was necessary to put it through the planer four different times. At the present time, however, a person can dress a board one, two, three or four sides with one process. A planer can be set for dressing four sides just as cheaply as for dressing one side. A board goes through the mill a trifle slower with four sides than it does with one side, but not enough to materially increase the cost of the labor. The average cost of planing lumber is approximately 50 cents per thousand for the mill-run stock, which includes one, two, three, or four sides, making to flooring, siding, and in fact all of the different processes necessary to make the finished product. You will see, therefore, that a charge of $1 or more in the tariff for protection is from 100 to 500 per cent more than the cost of the performance of the work. For instance, $2.50 per thousand protection on flooring dressed on two sides is just $2 per thousand more than it costs the manufacturer to make it in connection with his other lumber. If one saws nothing but flooring dressed two sides, it would probably cost from 60 cents to 75 cents to manufacture it. Any statements to the contrary are misleading and a mistake.

Yours, truly,

A. R. ROGERS.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, will it interrupt the Senator if I should put a statement in the RECORD from one of the leading planing mills in Vermont as to the cost of dressing lumber?

Mr. McCUMBER. Not at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for that purpose?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; if there are two sides to this matter, I want to hear them.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have before me the statement of the Robinson-Edwards Lumber Company, of Burlington, Vt., and I desire to put into the RECORD part of their statement. They say:

We are getting ourselves for dressing lumber as follows:
Planed one side, 62½ cents per thousand feet.
Planed two sides, 87½ cents per thousand feet.

* * * * * * *

Planed two sides and jointed or matched and beaded, $2.50 per thousand feet.

Any mill that does first-class work can not afford to do it at any less price.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the Senator will observe that is their charge. It does not say that is the cost of planing and grooving, and that is what we are discussing.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; it does; that is exactly what the letter says:

Any mill that does first-class work can not afford to do it at any less price.

Mr. McCUMBER. They can not afford to do it and get their profit.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can draw his own conclusion.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is only one conclusion to draw. Their statement is what their charges are and not what the work costs.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from North Dakota supposes that it is possible in Vermont, or anywhere else in the United States, to secure $2.50 for doing work that does not cost 50 cents, he is very much mistaken in the character of the people of New England, anyhow, who are engaged in any kind of manufacturing.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that dressing and tonguing and grooving is done by a machine, and that that is fed by people. The labor cost, with a little expenditure for the steam or power to run the machine, is all there is to it. It does not cost a scintilla more to dress lumber on one side, and tongue and groove it at the same time, than it does to dress it, because it simply has to be fed into the machine, and that does all the work at one operation. Therefore any pretense on anybody's part that it costs more to tongue and groove and dress than it does to dress is absurd to any man who has ever been in a planing mill.

Mr. ALDRICH. That question has been discussed here for two or three days.

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not propose to discuss it any longer. The Senator from Rhode Island is the Senate on this subject; he and his committee govern and control everything here. Whatever he says goes, and why does he not make haste and hurry it? For the third time, I ask him why he does not hurry up?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am extremely anxious to get votes taken on this and every paragraph in this bill as rapidly as possible, and I do not intend to delay the Senate for one second.

Mr. TILLMAN. But when the Senator gets up and makes a statement like that, I can not sit here and make an ass of myself by agreeing to it when I know it is not true. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALDRICH. I was answering the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] that it did not cost over 50 cents a thousand to do any of this planing or finishing, and I put into the RECORD a statement by a reputable planing mill man in Vermont, showing that it costs from 62½ cents to $2.50 a thousand.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I want simply to say, referring to the letter quoted by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], the letter from the Robinson-Edwards Lumber Company, which is one of the best of this class of concerns along the border, that the prices given by Mr. Robinson are prices which he says his company are receiving for lumber, and that they are as low as they can possibly do the work for.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask the Senator if that is not the same letter that the Senator from Rhode Island just now read?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes. If the Senator will allow me, the writer says:

Our own associates in Ottawa have just put up planing mills at an expense of probably over half a million dollars, equipped with the very best of American machinery, and they can ship through here and beat us every time, as much is saved in the stopping off of lumber and resorting it here as we do. Business would be simply moved the other side of the line.

If the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me further for a moment——

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly I yield.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have in my hand also a letter, which has been in the hands of the committee, from our present governor, Governor Prouty, who is engaged in the lumber business. Speaking of the same subject, he uses this language:

The situation is just this: During the last twenty years many mills have been built along the Canadian border for the sole purpose of dressing lumber coming in from Canada. These mills have been enabled to run because of the duty on dressing, and for no other reason. We are the owners of two mills here that were built for this purpose, and for no other. The mills at Burlington are the same. In my judgment, these mills will have to close if the duty on dressing is removed. Even with the present duty, it is a very close proposition to carry on business at a profit. The large mill at St. Johnsbury and those at West Burke have had to close up because the margin of profit was too small.

I know of those mills of my own personal knowledge. They are perhaps 50 miles from the border. Then he says:

Burlington would lose its great industry; Newport would lose its largest; Island Pond would suffer; Barton Landing would suffer a serious setback; on the other hand, no benefit would accrue to anyone in this country by removing the duty. Theoretically this might seem to be true; but in actual practice I am very sure it is, and the consumer who finally pays for the lumber which he uses will pay no more with the duty than without it.

This is the opinion of a man whose judgment I respect very much, and whose business ability I know is very good.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, Senators seem to avoid the real issue here, which is the question of what the differential should be; in other words, whether a differential of 50 cents should be allowed for planing the first side, when the average is only from about 15 to 25 cents. But, assuming that 50 cents is the right amount that they are entitled to for planing the first side, then is there any reason for giving 300 per cent for planing the other side and the two edges, or 200 per cent or 150 per cent, when, as all the evidence shows, it costs only a very slight amount more, scarcely an appreciable amount more, to put it through and finish all four sides than it costs to finish the single side, and that it is all done in the same handling?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator will indulge me, this is not a matter of which I have personal and special knowledge; but in regard to the figures referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, which are contained in the letter from Mr. Robinson, I find that the figures are 62½ cents per thousand feet for lumber planed on one side; 87½ cents where it is planed on two sides; where it is planed on one side and jointed or matched and is 8 inches or over in width, it is $1; where it is planed on two sides and jointed or matched, 8 inches and over, it is $1.25; planed on one side, jointed or matched and beaded, under 8 inches, it is $1.50; where it is planed on one side and jointed or matched and beaded, and under 5 inches, it is $2.25; and where it is planed on two sides and jointed or matched and beaded, under 8 inches, it is $1.75; and under 5 inches, it is $2.50.

So the cost is different, according to the width of the board, the number of times it has to be sided, and so forth.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; I understand that. It furnishes very little information. The charge is one thing; the cost is another; and in order to determine what the proper differential should be, we should have them state what the cost is and then allow them sufficient to make up the differential, so that the work may be done on this side of the line and give them a reasonable profit. I have given them in my amendment about just double the amount; in other words, where the work would only cost 50 cents, I have allowed a dollar for the differential, giving them another 50 cents. This includes, I want to say to the Senator, all the handling that has been spoken of.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I simply wanted to make the point that the representative manufacturers along the border claim that even with the present rates they can not conduct a really profitable business, and that any reduction of those rates will be very detrimental to them.

Mr. McCUMBER. The very fact, Mr. President, that they have recently put up another mill for this work at a cost of about half a million dollars, as I understand, indicates that the business is so prosperous that they are willing to take their chances in another very heavy investment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator suggested a moment ago that he is anxious to get both sides of the question, and I have no doubt the Senator is anxious to do so. I will therefore ask his permission to have read a letter from the president of the Amalgamated Woodworkers' International Union of America, in which this matter is discussed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested, in the absence of objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

AMALGAMATED WOODWORKERS'
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1909.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to statements made by several Senators in speeches advocating the elimination of that portion of the tariff schedule pertaining to dressed lumber, wherein it was asserted that it costs only 15 cents per thousand for dressing lumber. Speaking from many years' experience in operating woodworking machinery and an intimate practical knowledge of the subject—representing, as I do, the employees of all the larger planing mills in this country as president of the Amalgamated Woodworkers' International Union of America—I know it to be a fact that no lumber could be dressed at the low cost mentioned, not even surfaced on one side.

In the first place, it takes at least two men to operate the machine; one to feed it, receiving an average wage of 22 cents per hour; and the other to receive the lumber from the machine or offbear, at an average wage of at least 15 cents per hour, making a total cost of 37 cents per hour wages for actual labor performed in handling the lumber.

It would take approximately one hour's time to grind the ordinary knives for surfacing and from twenty to thirty minutes' time to set the knives and get the machine ready to start. Each different pattern of lumber run through the machine requires a change of the knives or cutters, depending on the type, width, and thickness of the pattern. In filling orders for various kinds of lumber it is necessary to make frequent changes in the knives. It is also necessary to sharpen them three or four times a day, depending on the character of the material run, thus increasing the cost of labor above the 37 cents per hour paid to the men who actually operate the machine.

In addition to this there is a general expense entailed of repairs to machines during the year, rebabbitting, supplies, cost of power, depreciation, general administration expense, insurance, taxes, etc.

I would consider, from my practical experience, that 1,000 feet of lumber of average width, dressed per hour, on the modern machine, to be a reasonable, conservative amount, therefore proving conclusively that it would be utterly impossible to dress lumber with the most modern machinery at the low cost per thousand stated, and I would consider a cost of at least 75 cents per hour to be a fair estimate on the general run of lumber. On the complicated patterns of dressing, like ceiling, partition, drop siding, and on the more narrow lumber like 6-inch and 4-inch strips—of which a large amount is dressed—the cost would increase proportionately.

I have attended many conferences in endeavoring to fix the wage scale between the owners of planing mills and the various members of our union, during which I have heard discussion as to the cost of dressing, and I know from my intimate and personal knowledge that the above figures are conservative as to the actual cost submitted to me at these different conferences.

Very truly, yours, D. D. MULCAHY,
President Amalgamated Woodworkers' International Union of America.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, that letter was read before during the discussion of the lumber schedule. It adds nothing to what has already been said. The writer states, in substance, that lumber can not be surfaced even on one side, in his opinion, for 15 cents per thousand; and he seems to assume that somebody has stated that the entire finishing can be done for 15

cents. There has been no such claim. There has been a claim that, taken directly from the mill, the surfacing of one side can be done for 15 cents per thousand; and that, taking all the surfacing, with the work of removing it from the kiln, piling it outside, and taking it back to the planing mill, the cost will not run over from 60 cents to 75 cents an hour on the outside for all the planing that is done on any of the finished product.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no knowledge as to the qualifications of the author of that letter to speak with authority; but it would seem as though he were speaking with knowledge. He asserts, from actual observation and experience, that running the lumber of the lower grades through the mill costs 75 cents per hour; and he cites the fact that higher-grade lumber costs more. That does not include the cost of transportation to and from the mill nor the profit to the manufacturer. So that if he is right in the assertion that it costs 75 cents per hour to simply run the lumber through the mill, and in the case of some grades a larger amount, it would seem to me that the Senator's proposed amendment is below the point at which it ought to be fixed.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, when this matter was first under discussion, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] denied that in any instance was the planing done directly from the saw. The next day I received telegrams and statements, and within a week letters, and so forth, from many mills, showing that this is the custom. I take the first telegram and ask that it may be read, and then the substance of what the others contain as to how the surfacing is generally done. I ask that these may be read simply that we may get an understanding of the method of handling the lumber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

RALEIGH HOTEL, *Washington, D. C.*

Manager Bowman Lumber Company, Hattersburg and Summerland, Miss., advises me to-day they dress all common lumber direct from the saw. Scanlon does same. Common practice among southern and western mills. Lumber only is handled this way.

F. B. LYNCH.

In the Elk River lumber mill, at Fernie, British Columbia, logs are drawn from the water, taken to the first saw, which will saw off a plank, say, 6 inches thick the length of the log. This plank, with a slight push of the workmen, falls of its own weight on to another carriage, is automatically jacked into position, goes to another saw of 40 or 50 saws, is there sawed into boards of 1 inch in thickness, and goes from there immediately to the planer, and is planed on one, two, three, or four sides, as the case may be. About 50 per cent of the product of this mill is not sawed at that time, but it is piled in the rough in the yard and stored. The reason for not planing it is that it would become weatherbeaten if planed, and storage room is a proposition. This constitutes the surplus stock of the mill. When orders are received, the rough lumber is taken from these piles to the planers and planed on one, two, three, or four sides at one operation, the only extra expense for planing more than one side is the slight cost for the additional power and the cost of setting and keeping the planing tools sharp.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] discussed this question some time ago, and I ask to have read a letter received by him in reference to the method of planing and handling lumber. I ask that it may be read from the word "There," on line 8, down to and including the marked portion on the second page.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

There is one custom adopted by the lumber dealers of which I believe you are perhaps unacquainted. They are robbing the people daily by sawing their lumber thin, especially the dimension lumber. A contractor took me onto a job yesterday and showed me joists, several hundred of them, and there was not a 2-inch plank upon the premises; they are sawed 1¾ inches thick and then sold for 2-inch stuff. The architect's specifications on this job called for joists 2 by 14 inches; and every one of them measured 1¾ inches thick by 13 inches high. It is the same with all kinds of dimension lumber: 2 by 4, 2 by 6, 2 by 8, 2 by 10, and 2 by 12 inches are now sawed 1¾ inches thick, and when such lumber is surfaced on both sides it finishes about 1½ inches thick. Unless you order bridge timber or other dimension timber very large, you will find that nothing is as large either way as ordered. This is all done purposely, and it is done to swindle the people in order to get an extra joist out of a log. You stated in your speech that a cubic foot of lumber contained 12 feet of lumber, superficial measurement. This is the truth; but any lumber sawyer at the present time would make 13 feet of it simply by sawing it thin.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I now want to get back again to these differentials; and I especially invite the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who has just had a letter read, and the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], to a letter from Mr. A. R. Rogers, which was sent to the chairman of the committee, and deals with the cost of finishing the lumber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Minneapolis, Minn., June 9, 1909. Hon. NELSON W. ALDRICH, chairman Finance Committee, United States Senate——

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, will not the Senator from North Dakota be willing to have these printed without being read?

Mr. McCUMBER. I would rather have them read—there are only a few of them—because I at least want the Senators to know what they are. Then they can vote down this amendment if they want to.

Mr. ALDRICH. We have been discussing this question for several days, and I did not know but that the Senator would be willing to have that course adopted.

Mr. McCUMBER. I appreciate the fact that I am making scarcely any remarks, but simply having these letters read. I want them read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 9, 1909.*

Hon. NELSON W. ALDRICH,
Chairman Finance Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I observe that there is now considerable discussion, in and out of Congress, on the question of differential duty on finished lumber as compared with that on rough lumber.

As a lumberman of long experience, I wish to add my testimony to that of those who have pointed out to your committee that the differentials allowed in the Dingley law and the Payne bill are absurd if it be assumed that there is any intention of maintaining the same relation between the cost of production and the differentials.

The cost of dressed lumber, according to the degree in which it is dressed, varies from 25 cents up to 75 cents per thousand, the latter being the maximum price. These figures could be substantiated upon inquiry from the books of hundreds of mills.

Is it not therefore perfectly absurd for Congress to think of giving differentials of 50 cents, $1, $1.50, and $2 for the various classes of dressed lumber?

I do not see how a greater differential than 75 cents for the most highly dressed forms of lumber can be justified.

As the average cost of dressing lumber is 40 cents to 50 cents per thousand, it seems to me that a flat differential rate of 50 cents per thousand on finished lumber should be sufficient.

If it is concern for the fate of a few lumber-dressing concerns in New York and New England that is the cause of the reluctance to give up the excessive differentials, why not make an exception in favor of white and Norway pine; that is, give dressed lumber made of those pines a higher differential than you give to dressed lumber made from fir, spruce, tamarack, western pine, and hemlock, which are the prevailing far western woods?

Yours, truly, A. R. ROGERS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me at this point, I simply wish to ask the Senator if the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Company, the D. N. Winton Company, and the Rogers Lumber Company are not all engaged on a very large scale in the manufacture of lumber in Canada?

Mr. McCUMBER. Some of them may be; I can not answer that. Probably the Senator from Minnesota will be able to give that information. But I have not denied the statement of any person as to the exact cost. I am well aware that no person has given his testimony here, either for or against the present lumber schedules, without being directly interested in them.

Mr. HILL, a Member of the House, wrote some time ago to the Brooks-Scanlon Lumber Company, seeming to question the testimony given by Mr. Scanlon, I think, as to the actual cost of finishing the lumber. Mr. HILL wrote a letter in which he asked many questions; and Mr. Scanlon replied to that letter, and in his reply took up each question asked. I think this is the most important testimony that has been given upon the whole matter, because it reaches each of the questions that are being asked by Senators on the floor, and I ask that it may be read. I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island to the reading of this last letter, which I shall offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *June 9, 1909.*

Hon. E. J. HILL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We were pleased to receive your letter of June 4 addressed to Mr. Scanlon, who is at present absent from the city, and

we hasten to give you the information you asked for in your letter, which we will resolve into questions and answers, as follows:

Q. Will you kindly advise me whether you mean to say that 4-inch yellow-pine flooring planed one side and tongued and grooved is dressed by you at your mill at a cost of 45.8 cents per thousand feet?—A. The figure of 45.8 cents per thousand feet quoted in our letter to Senator ALDRICH referred to the average cost of dressing all lumber at our Louisiana mill. The cost of planing one side, tonguing, and grooving would be about 60 cents per thousand feet.

Q. Will you kindly advise me whether you dress this lumber direct from the mill in which it is sawed, green, or whether you kiln-dry it as a preliminary requisite for good work in dressing, or whether you dress it air dried? If the latter is the case, is it not a perfectly fair proposition that either the kiln-dry or air seasoning should be added to the cost of dressing?—A. Common boards are sometimes dressed direct from the mill. This is a very common practice in the West, and is resorted to to some extent in the South. The higher grades of lumber are kiln-dried. The lower grades are usually air dried. The average figure of 45.8 cents per thousand feet which we gave covers all the cost of handling lumber for dressing or planing from the time it leaves the saw until it is finished.

Q. Can you take lumber, green, from the saw and dress it with satisfactory results?—A. It can be done, and is very frequently done, but better results are obtained from dressing dried lumber. One reason why we prefer to dress the lumber dry is that the purchaser of lumber likes bright, new lumber, which he would not get if we dressed our lumber green and stored it. To satisfy the trade, it is better to store it green and dress it a short time before shipping.

Q. Is there any machinery made now by which lumber can be planed one side and two edges, or one side and tongued and grooved, as rapidly as it can be planed two sides and with the edges left unfinished?—A. Modern machinery will plane one side and two edges, or one side and tongue and groove, almost as rapidly as two sides can be planed with the edges left unfinished. There is a slight difference, but it is not enough to be of much importance.

Q. Does not dressing the edges at the same time that the planing is done compel putting one piece at a time through the planer, instead of two or three, according to the width of the planer, when only the sides are dressed and the edges left unfinished?—A. There are now machines which handle two pieces at a time while dressing the edges and planing.

Q. Is there not a difference in the cost of the various forms of dressing lumber?—A. There is; but the difference is nothing like the differentials allowed in the Payne tariff bill. Lumber going direct from the saw to the planer can be partly dressed as low as 25 cents a thousand feet, and the most expensive dressing will not exceed 75 cents per thousand feet. The ordinary average cost of dressing at Minnesota mills, including every expense incidental to the operation, is about 40 cents per thousand feet.

Now, the Payne tariff bill allows a minimum differential of 50 cents, with increasing gradations up to $2. This is simply absurd in a tariff bill that was supposed to remove inequalities and symmetrize our tariffs, if it did nothing else. It is our idea that 50 cents per thousand flat would be all the discrepancy there should be in favor of dressed lumber, if we are going to make any. As you know, our company will be quite willing to see the duty on both finished and rough lumber repealed. We do not think it at all complimentary to the business ability of the majority of our American lumbermen that they should be so insistent on retaining the Dingley rate. The fact is that if this present tariff revision had not come just at a time when the lumber industry was depressed, it would hardly have been possible to get together enough opponents of the repeal of the lumber duties to make a respectable-sized lobby in Washington.

We do not think that the lumber trade has any right to ask Congress to impose tariffs that will stand for ten or fifteen years on the basis of the present temporary status of the lumber industry.

We are of the impression that the Senate is going to raise the rate on rough lumber to $1.50 and maintain the same differentials that are in the bill at present. We hope that if the Senate acts in that matter that the House conferees will compel it to recede.

As lumbermen of wide experience, it is our judgment that two years from now the lumber trade would not know the difference if lumber were put on the free list to-day.

We might add that if the other schedules of the tariff bill, the application of which we can not judge from experience, are as widely separated from actual conditions of production cost as the differentials on finished lumber, with the production of which we are thoroughly familiar, the people are not getting the sort of tariff revision they were promised.

Very truly, yours, BROOKS-SCANLON CO.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it has been suggested here on the floor, and, I think, once or twice by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, that the differentials are too high under the present law, and that there will be what he regards as a substantial reduction. He has reported from the majority of the committee his amendment, showing this "substantial reduction." The "substantial reduction," however, leaves the amount in every instance above the amount contained in the House bill, so, on the whole, there has been an increase. And while you may say that you have reduced the differential, you have added to the unfinished lumber such an amount that, with the reduced differential, you have raised every one of them above the House measure.

We are somewhat in the position of the merchant who advertises that he will sell his goods at a reduction of 50 per cent; and he immediately raises the marked price of all of them 75 per cent and then reduces that increased price to the extent of 50 per cent. That is just exactly what this means. And to show that that is what it amounts to, I have prepared a table showing the rates under the Dingley bill, under the House bill, under the committee amendment, and under the amendment which I have proposed, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

	Dingley.	House.	Committee amendment.	McCumber amendment.
1. Rough	$2.00	$1.00	$1.50	$1.50
2. Planed one side	2.50	1.50	2.00	1.75
3. Planed on one side, tongued and grooved	3.00	2.00	2.25	2.00
4. Planed on two sides	3.00	2.00	2.25	2.00
5. Planed on three sides	3.50	2.50	2.62½	2.25
6. Planed on two sides, tongued and grooved	3.50	2.50	3.00	2.25
7. Planed on four sides	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.50

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have done all I could on this floor and in the Committee on Finance to secure free lumber. I think it is a mistake on the part of Congress to refuse this almost universal demand for free lumber. I feel, also, that no injustice would be done the producers of lumber if we entirely removed the tariff; and I feel that it is a great injustice to add in any way to the House rates. But I suppose we shall have to submit to whatever the Senate may give us in the matter of rates. They should be reduced, however, and this amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, certainly ought to prevail.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, before the Senator resumes his seat, I should like to inquire if he bases his conclusion to any extent upon the showing or statements of Brooks, Scanlon, Rogers, and others whose letters have been read, or does he base his conclusion upon outside information?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have information from perhaps a hundred different sources, and they all practically agree as to the actual cost of finishing the lumber.

Mr. HEYBURN. I would suggest that Brooks, Scanlon, Rogers, and others are organizing the American Timber Holding Company. I have a memorandum given me stating that that is a concern holding timber lands in Canada valued at half a million dollars, capitalized at $6,000,000, and that they are selling their stock to the American people on the strength of the assertion that the tariff is to be removed, and that Scanlon is president of the concern. That, I presume, ought to have some weight in considering the value to be given to those letters.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, without reference to the character of Mr. Scanlon, I ask the Senator, in all good faith, when he is running two mills, one in Louisiana and one in Minnesota, and he gives, even to the number of mills, what it costs to finish a thousand feet of lumber in each one of those mills, whether he has given a false statement? As I have said before, I have no doubt that Brooks & Scanlon have such interests that a reduction of the tariff would be beneficial to them.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think it is quite material to consider the sources of information; and, realizing that, I have taken some pains to obtain information that did not depend upon some other men's statements of facts. The item upon which to base a differential is not composed of wages altogether, nor to a very great extent. I have some knowledge of this business, and have had some considerable interest in it during my lifetime. I have taken pains to learn the facts, and I am not at the mercy of letters from anyone in regard to the facts. Twenty per cent of the lumber that is sawed in the mills, as I suggested the other day, goes into sawdust, which is a dead loss. That loss lies between the log and the board pile—that is, it occurs at that point. If you take a board 12 inches wide and cut it into four pieces——

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. Or, we will say, into three 4-inch strips, you have lost 5 per cent of the board right there—5 per cent of the product that you have purchased and paid for. That is a dead loss.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. HEYBURN. In a moment, when I finish. If you run those boards through the planer, you will loss 5 per cent more in the discovery of wany or knotty or imperfect conditions of the board. Those are facts that any man who knows anything about or has ever had any practical experience in this business will tell you.

I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho yields to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course the planing of lumber will undoubtedly disclose defects; but no mill can sell lumber to-day to the

man who buys without the purchaser discovering the defects and the lumber being graded accordingly.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator there. That is not the item that I mentioned at all, and ought not to be confused with it.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator mentioned both. The Senator says 20 per cent is sawdust, and consequently is lost. Undoubtedly there is some loss in that. But take a stick of timber 12 inches square and put it through a saw and reduce it to inch boards. It is still returned by the mill man and costs the consumer upon the basis of 12 inches, twelve 1-inch boards being taken out of the 12-inch square timber.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator is mistaken in that, as a matter of practical experience.

Mr. CLAPP. I am not mistaken. It is the experience of everyone.

Mr. HEYBURN. Unless, as stated in a letter portraying a dishonorable method, read a few moments ago at the desk, where they sawed the lumber, instead of 4 by 4, 4 by 3½. We can not meet that by legislation on the civil side of the law. We have to meet it on the criminal side.

Mr. CLAPP. I am not speaking of that. I am speaking of timber on an average that goes for inch boards. It is not an inch thick. In other words, I undertake to say that a mill man would take a stick of timber 12 inches square and put it through into boards, and he would still have 12-inch boards. That is, commercially carried as 12-inch boards.

Mr. HEYBURN. He would sell the sawdust to the consumer. I have a statement to that effect from a mill man here. He says the consumer pays for the sawdust.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. HEYBURN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state that what is termed an "inch board" is a little thicker than an inch after it is sawed. It is slightly thicker than an inch. It is a matter of physical impossibility to take a piece of timber 12 inches square and run a saw 11 times through it and make boards that would be an inch thick, because the saw will take from a sixteenth to an eighth of an inch.

Mr. CLAPP. I can not dispute with the Senator from Maryland, for I suppose he is speaking of Maryland timber running more than an inch thick.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am speaking of the lumber manufactured in the South, which is about 48 per cent of all the lumber manufactured in this country.

Mr. CLAPP. I do not know about the lumber in the South, but I do know that in the North it has often been the subject of attempted legislation in Northern States to require that inch boards should be an inch thick. It is a matter of common notoriety that that portion of the loss falls on the consumer of lumber. If you do not believe it, go and buy a load of lumber to put up a shack and see whether it will be an inch thick.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I have no intention of going into these questions extensively, but the demand was made for a few facts that I have within my knowledge, and I will give them no further than is necessary to demonstrate those facts.

If you lose 5 per cent of logs in converting from boards in the rough to flooring or siding or that class of commodity, the 5 per cent represents the differential, regardless of the money that you have lost; you never do get it back; it has gone into the waste pile; but the sawdust may be worth something.

Senators raise these questions, and they seem to lose their interest after they have raised them. If a question is submitted and an answer requested, the answer is as important as the question. Some one asked for a proper basis upon which to fix the differential. It is the loss resulting from the changing from one character to another. That is a concrete and definite answer. If you lost 5 per cent in weight, that, at least, is one item. There are other items. Of course there is the one of the detection of imperfect lumber, and it is a large item. That is 5 per cent. It is more than that in this part of the country. It is 5 per cent in that part of the country, where the proportion of knotty lumber is much less than it is here. The first two cuts of a tree—that is, from the ground up—will have comparatively small waste, but the next two will have an increase in waste, and when you come to dress your lumber and run it through the planer, it is not the fact that you discover a knot and lose the knot, it is that it transfers the lumber from one class to another. If third-class lumber is selling at $18, and you knock the knot out of it, you will no longer have third-class lumber, but it must be sold for $15. You have lost $3 a thousand on it right there. If it is second-class lumber, which would sell for $28 or $30, and you knock the knot out of it, it falls to $20. Five per cent of that lumber is transferred from one class to another. That is a final arbitrament and determination of this question. You can not get away from it. There is no use of going into refinements of reasoning as to how many minutes it takes to run a board through, or whether it takes as long to run it through once as to run it through three or four times. That is a comparatively useless process. The difference comes in the transfer from one class of lumber to another by this process.

Those are the items of loss, and the report of the committee has made a fair estimate for the loss incident to the transfer of lumber from one class to another by process of manufacture. It is not enough; it does not cover it, but we are satisfied with it. The suggestion contained in the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota does not in any adequate way meet the loss that is incurred in the transfer of lumber from an unfinished to a finished class.

Then, there is another thing I will mention before I take my seat. The Senator has spoken only for a very high class of mills. A man has a right to go into the lumber business without investing a million dollars. He has a right to engage in the lumber business in the ordinary way, which was the only way for a century or two. Just as soon as some one comes in with a band saw and double planers and groovers he is not compelled to abandon his business because his neighbor has outclassed him in the methods or facilities of business. It is as much our duty to protect the men who do business in an ordinary way against competition with other countries as it is to protect those who are like one before me here, one of the largest in the world, because a very small profit on their work would amount to a fair dividend, while the same profit on a mill that would cut ten, twenty, thirty, or even fifty thousand feet a day would not pay for the wages of the men. We must bear that in mind, and we must not measure everything by the scale of the very highest protection and the more expensive equipment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCUMBER. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, before the lumber schedule passes from the attention of the Senate, I want to make a brief statement. When it was in the Senate before, two or three weeks ago, I voted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] to put lumber and all building materials on the free list. In the discussion I remarked that I was in favor of free lumber. When the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] offered an amendment, which did not give us free lumber, leaving the duty on whitewood, sycamore, and basswood at 50 cents a thousand, I voted against it, because it did not give us "free lumber." The Senate adjourned immediately afterwards, giving me no opportunity to vote for free lumber. There has been no amendment proposed for free lumber to-day.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator will recall that some time ago I introduced an amendment for free lumber, and it was defeated.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was not present then.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes; it was argued here for days and then defeated by a very decisive vote.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will look at the RECORD, he will see that he did not offer any amendment for free lumber, but only one for "sawed lumber not specially provided for," and so forth, leaving in the bill 50 cents a thousand on basswood, sycamore, and so forth.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not change that, it is true.

Mr. TILLMAN. I voted against the McCumber amendment. It was defeated by a very decisive vote, 55, I think, or something like that, to 30, or around there. I still think we ought to have free lumber, and I will give my experience and my reasons for that belief. I know, of course, we can not get it.

Twelve years ago, when the Dingley bill was on its passage, I voted for a $2 tariff on lumber, and remarked, very much to the disgust of some people and the edification of others, "if there was to be stealing, I wanted my share." I have found out that I can not get my share; that the conditions of the South are such that the articles and products of that region which are capable of being protected are so few in number that if we were to throw around everything down there a high protective tariff, we would not get anything like a proportionate benefit with the New England and manufacturing States of this Union.

In regard to this matter of lumber, I have watched the result of the duty. Immediately afterwards our timber lands, which

had previously been neglected so there were comparatively small lumbering industries down there, began to be in demand. Men from Wisconsin and Michigan and other Northern States where lumbering had practically denuded the forests of timber, or were about to finish them up, came into the State and bought up very large tracts of timber at a very small price. They did this all over the South. Large mills were established and the lumbering industry began to pick up, showing investment of capital and a large export. At the same time the price began to rise, a little faster, apparently, than the industry itself.

Now, consider for a moment that the people of South Carolina are in about this shape; the State being a triangle, the upper part, cutting off like the letter "A," is largely the white section of the State. Nearly two-thirds of the white people, although it is only one-third of the area, live there. They are consumers of lumber, and they have no yellow pine or very little. They have been importing that lumber from the lower belt of counties next to the sea, and that region is occupied almost wholly by the negroes; that is, the negroes outnumber the whites in Beaufort County, for instance, 10 negroes to 1, Colleton 7, Georgetown 7, Williamsburg 4, Sumter 6, and so on. In this coast region the lumber industry has taken root and is now very extensively carried on.

I noticed after three or four years of this introduction of lumbering on an extensive scale that the price went steadily up, up, and it very soon became noised abroad, I do not know on what foundation, that these lumbermen had formed a combination, and they would not sell under each other to the consumers in the upper part of the State.

Lumber is not a luxury. It is a necessity. It is one of the necessaries of life. When I saw that the farmers, who had to build houses and fences and barns in the whole upper country, were being charged steadily increasing prices for their lumber I began to change my opinion as to whether I was getting my share of the stealing or not. It looked like somebody not very far away was getting an unreasonable profit out of our trees, which had cost them a very small sum of money relatively. So my opinion in regard to the benefits of the tariff in our State changed very radically.

I believe in the greatest good to the greatest number; and when I saw that the people who use lumber, practically four-fifths of them, were paying an increased price, I decided if I ever got a chance I would take that tariff off. That is all there is about it. I do not feel that it is my business here to protect the industry of lumber, which, perhaps, involves the interests of 50,000 good and worthy people, as against the 500,000 equally good and worthy people who have to use lumber; and we would not be saved from an exorbitant price, because, I think, those people formed a combination and agreed that they would not undersell each other.

The only reason why we were able, or will be able, to get lumber at a reasonable rate was due to the fact that there were some old field pine, second growth, left in the upper part of the State, and small patches, or small areas—two or three hundred acres or 500 acres, all through the middle lower region that the lumbermen had not bought or could not buy at the high prices—I mean the great lumber companies, with their railroads, and all that sort of thing, running out into the swamps. The only reason why the upper-country people could get lumber at decent prices was because a little one-horse sawmill, costing $1,500, or at most $2,000, would go into these little patches of pine and saw the timber up and furnish the people this necessary lumber, as against these great combinations of capital which had absorbed our timber.

I have felt that it was my privilege to explain why I am apparently in contradiction with myself, because I voted against the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. Having stated that I wanted free lumber, having had no chance to get free lumber, I still am against the amendment, because it did not offer free lumber.

That is all I want to say. I did not want to appear to be at war with myself, nor do I say this because of the hue and cry raised in some quarters that I have not stood on the Democratic platform. I am here as a Democrat. If my Democracy is not above suspicion, I do not want any certificate from any source.

Mr. PILES. Mr. President, when I had the honor of addressing the Senate on the lumber schedule in the early part of last month I submitted a proposed contract between the Spanish Mills Company, of Ontario, and the Edward Hines Lumber Company, of Chicago, showing that Canadian manufacturers were demanding from wholesale dealers in this country one-half of the reduction of the duty on lumber in addition to current prices. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] at that time called in question the proposed contract. I then said that, at the proper time, I would submit the original papers, which I now send to the Secretary's desk for permanent filing. In this connection I wish to submit an affidavit from Mr. Edward Hines, which shows that the proposed contract was presented to him in the ordinary course of business.

I also desire to state, in this connection, that the original papers were filed by Mr. Hines with the Committee on Finance, and that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] also filed with that committee a letter from the governor of the State of Vermont, which shows that he entered into a written contract with the Canadian manufacturers whereby he actually agreed to pay them one-half the reduction. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate to read the affidavit, but ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No objection is heard, and the affidavit will be printed in the RECORD.

The affidavit is as follows:

"'DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

"'Edward Hines, of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, of Chicago, Ill., who is personally known to me, appeared before me this — day of May, 1909, and solemnly affirmed as follows:'

"I am president of the Edward Hines Lumber Company, of Chicago, Ill., and I hereby solemnly affirm that a contract was submitted to me by the Spanish Mills Lumber Company (Limited), of Spanish Mills, Ontario, for the purchase of them of a certain quantity of lumber, said contract being dated November 11, 1908, and containing a clause reading as follows:

"'In the event that this lumber shall remain on dock over winter and that all or any part of the duty now charged by the United States Government being taken off, you are to pay us an amount extra per thousand feet equal to one-half the amount of duty which was taken off—that is, if $1 per thousand is taken off, you to pay us 50 per thousand additional on the above prices.'

"The said lumber was first submitted to me by George D. Jackson, of Bay City, Mich., acting for the Spanish Mills Lumber Company (Limited), in the form of a letter dated November 4, 1908, reading as follows:

"'EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY,
"'*Chicago, Ill.*

"'GENTLEMEN: Spanish River Lumber Company have a small lot of 12/4 Norway on dock at Little Current, and a little lot of 4/4 that goes with it. I think this can be bought for about $14.50, and it is a very nice lot.

"'Yours, truly, GEO. D. JACKSON.'

"I replied by letter dated November 6, 1908, reading as follows:

"'GEORGE D. JACKSON, Esq.,
"'*Bay City, Mich.*

"'DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 4th instant, the steamer *Barth* will be at Spanish Mills about the 18th to put on the 148,000 of 4-inch strips left by the *Wiehe* from lot 9 of the Spanish River Lumber Company stock. Please advise your man at Spanish Mills and have him see the mill people and have plenty of men on hand to give the boat prompt dispatch.

"'We might be able to load the little lot of 3-inch Norway you mention in yours of the 4th on this boat. How long has it been cut? If the Spanish River Lumber Company want to load it on the boat at $14 per thousand, you may put it on, cash less 2 per cent—that is, provided the boat can take it. Let us know promptly about this.

"'Respectfully, yours,
"'EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY.'

"B. W. Arnold, who is president of the Spanish Mills Company (Limited), telegraphed from Spanish, Ontario, on November 9, 1908, as follows:

"'EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY,
"'*Chicago, Ill.:*

"'Will sell 12/4 and about 25,000 4/4 Norway at Little Current, $14, shipment this fall; terms 1½ discount or February 15. Wire answer.
"'B. W. ARNOLD.'

"Submitting a definite proposition. I telegraphed them as follows:
"'CHICAGO, *November 9, 1908.*

"'B. W. ARNOLD, *Spanish, Ontario.*

"'Will take Norway, culls in same, $9, if you can ship this fall; think we can.
"'EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO.

"'Paid.'

"This telegram being an acceptance to his proposition above referred to. This was followed by a telegram from B. W. Arnold, reading as follows:
"'SPANISH, ONTARIO, *November 11, 1908.*

"'EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY,
"'*Chicago, Ill.:*

"'Am sending contract for Norway. You have 60,000 pine shorts here.
"'B. W. ARNOLD.'

"This was followed by their contract, dated November 11, 1908, a copy of which is hereto attached, marked 'Exhibit A,' in reply to which I telegraphed refusing to accept the contract unless the clause in regard to the division of any reduction of duty was erased.

"It then having become very late in the season, naturally the opportunity of selling the stock was not so favorable, and under the depressed conditions existing in lumber last fall, Mr. Arnold waived the clause and telegraphed as follows:
"'SPANISH, ONTARIO, *November 14, 1908.*

"'EDWARD HINES,
"'*Care of Edward Hines Lumber Company, Chicago, Ill.:*

"'Cross out duty clause in contract if you prefer.
"'B. W. ARNOLD.'

"The said proposition was offered to me in the ordinary course of business, and said contract was actually submitted to me in good faith by the Spanish Mills Company (Limited) in the ordinary course of trade, without any knowledge on my part that such a provision would be submitted or was thought of by the said Spanish Mills Company. I

refused to enter into a contract for the purchase of said lumber with a provision therein dividing any benefit that might be derived by the removal of any part of the duty on lumber by the American Congress and adding one-half the amount of duty so removed to the prices named in the contract, and by reason of my refusal this clause was stricken out of said contract.

"I hereby further solemnly affirm that neither the Edward Hines Lumber Company or any of its subsidiary companies or myself personally nor any stockholders of any of the companies that I am interested in have any interest financially, directly, or indirectly, in the Spanish Mills Company (Limited).

"The Edward Hines Lumber Company buys large quantities of lumber from various mills in Canada; have done so every year for the past fifteen years; bought large quantities last year, and have purchased this year in Canada at least 15,000,000 feet of lumber, or in value about $250,000, up to this time, and in all probability will purchase as much more during the season.

"Since the date of this contract I have met Mr. B. W. Arnold, and he told me that in the selling of his lumber this year, since this tariff discussion on lumber has been raised, that he has inserted in all his contracts for the sale of lumber from Canada the provision above cited, providing that if any reduction is made by the American Congress in the duty on lumber that one-half of whatever this amounts to shall be added to the prices named in the contract as an extra compensation to him; *that such a* provision is insisted upon, and has been inserted in all the contracts he has made for the sale of lumber this year.

"EDWARD HINES."

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of May, 1909.

[SEAL.] BENJ. VAIL, *Notary Public.*

EXHIBIT A.

THE SPANISH MILLS COMPANY (LIMITED),
Spanish Mills, Ontario, November 11, 1908.

EDWARD HINES LUMBER COMPANY,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: We will sell you our 12/4 and 4/4 early cut Norway at Little Current, estimated at about 130,000 of 12/4 and 25,000 4/4, at $14 pile run, with a mill cull tally at $9; terms, cash, less 1½ per cent if paid within ten days from date of shipment this fall. If lumber is not shipped this fall, it is to be paid for as cash, without discount, February 15, and you are to pay us pro rata insurance after that date; George D. Jackson to measure as long as satisfactory to both of us, we each paying half his measurement; the 12/4 to be measured on a piece tally and the 4/4 on the give-and-take basis; final settlement at date of the final shipment, with interest either way at 6 per cent per annum.

In the event that this lumber shall remain on dock over winter, and that all or any part of the duty now charged by the United States Government being taken off, you are to pay us an extra amount per thousand feet equal to half the amount of duty which was taken off; that is, if $1 per thousand is taken off, you are to pay us 50 cents per thousand additional on the above prices, etc.

Yours, truly,

SPANISH RIVER LUMBER COMPANY (LIMITED),
Per B. W. ARNOLD, *President.*

Accepted.

Please sign and return one copy to Albany.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, as I understand it, we are about to vote on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota reduces the duty upon manufactured or finished lumber.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance if the amendment proposed by the committee does not also reduce the duty upon finished lumber from the present law?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a 25 per cent reduction on finished lumber, with the exception of boards planed on one side.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is 25 per cent?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is a 25 per cent reduction on lumber.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Of the present Dingley rate?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator how it compares with the House provision?

Mr. ALDRICH. The House maintains the existing rate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. So that this is not only a reduction of the Dingley rate, but of the provision in the bill as passed by the House?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; the provision of the House as to dressed lumber.

Mr. McCUMBER. There is not an article out of dressed lumber in the Finance Committee amendment that is not higher than the same article of dressed lumber in the House provision.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I simply want to say that when the Dingley law was passed I voted for $1 on lumber in the House. I felt it was ample protection then, and I feel so now.

I desire to keep the mills of our country running upon this side of the Canadian border. I should like to have them get as much raw material as possible from the largest possible area, so that it will enable them to manufacture the product here. I believe in the employment of American labor for that purpose, and I propose to vote in such a manner as seems best calculated to insure the continuance of that industry here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I therefore withhold my vote. I would vote "nay" if he were present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLINT. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. For that reason I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bacon	Clay	Gore	Overman
Beveridge	Crawford	Hughes	Owen
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Paynter
Brown	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner
Burkett	Davis	La Follette	Stone
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	Tillman
Carter	du Pont	McLaurin	
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	

NAYS—49.

Aldrich	Depew	Lodge	Simmons
Borah	Dick	Lorimer	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Dillingham	McEnery	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Dixon	Martin	Smoot
Brandegee	Elkins	Money	Sutherland
Briggs	Fletcher	Nixon	Taliaferro
Bulkeley	Foster	Oliver	Taylor
Burnham	Frye	Page	Warner
Burrows	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren
Chamberlain	Guggenheim	Perkins	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Hale	Piles	
Crane	Heyburn	Root	
Cullom	Kean	Scott	

NOT VOTING—13.

Bailey	Daniel	Newlands	Stephenson
Bankhead	Flint	Richardson	
Clarke, Ark.	Frazier	Shively	
Culberson	Jones	Smith, S. C.	

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

Mr. McLAURIN. I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment by striking out all after the word "measure," in line 5 of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee modify its amendment by inserting, in line 12, after the word "sides," the language which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Committee on Finance modifies its amendment as the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. In line 12 of the printed amendment, after the words "three sides," insert the words "or planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. (Putting the question.) The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the words be stricken out on the next page, as indicated.

The SECRETARY. On page 2 of the printed amendment, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "planing or finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving or."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as stated.

Mr. ALDRICH. Was the committee amendment agreed to, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not understand that the committee amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what I was asking the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair declared that by a vote the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCUMBER. I mean the original amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The original amendment as modified by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from North Dakota want a vote upon that?

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like the yeas and nays upon that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Then the Chair will regard it as an open question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELKINS. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I should like to have the amendment stated, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will again be stated.

The SECRETARY. The amendment as modified now reads:

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 or planing and finishing on two sides and tonguing and grooving, $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. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], and also of the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. ALDRICH]? Is the effect of this amendment of the Senate Finance Committee to increase or reduce the rates on these varieties of lumber as fixed by the other House?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is an increase on every one of them.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when Mr. FRAZIER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. FRAZIER] is paired for the day with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON].

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

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BURROWS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and I therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—50.

Aldrich	Crane	Hale	Root
Bacon	Daniel	Heyburn	Scott
Bailey	Depew	Kean	Simmons
Borah	Dick	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Bradley	Dixon	McEnery	Sutherland
Bandegee	du Pont	Martin	Taliaferro
Briggs	Elkins	Nixon	Taylor
Bulkeley	Fletcher	Oliver	Warner
Burnham	Foster	Page	Warren
Carter	Frye	Penrose	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Piles	

NAYS—28.

Bankhead	Clay	Gore	Overman
Beveridge	Crawford	Hughes	Owen
Bristow	Cummins	Johnson, N. Dak.	Paynter
Brown	Curtis	Johnston, Ala.	Rayner
Burkett	Davis	La Follette	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Dolliver	McCumber	Stone
Clapp	Gamble	Nelson	Tillman

NOT VOTING—14.

Burrows	Flint	Money	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Frazier	Newlands	Stephenson
Culberson	Jones	Richardson	
Cullom	McLaurin	Shively	

So the amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask that the paragraph be agreed to as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas rise to this amendment?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. No amendment will be in order to this amendment now.

Mr. DAVIS. I thought differently, Mr. President. I was going to move to strike out the paragraph before it was finally agreed to, and to offer an amendment——

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can not offer an amendment now.

Mr. DAVIS. Or to offer a substitute.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Chair's pardon. I am reminded that the vote just taken was on the paragraph as modified. Then I ask that paragraph 196 may be agreed to as amended. Paragraph 196 was amended by striking out the words "otherwise than by sawing," and inserting the word "or" after the word "hewn" and the comma.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 196 as amended.

Mr. DAVIS. I should like a ruling of the Chair on the proposition to strike out paragraph 197 and insert in lieu thereof the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Arkansas can do that in the Senate, but not now.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to do it now, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out paragraph 197 and to insert:

197. Boards, planks, deals, and lumber of all kinds shall be admitted free of duty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is not now in order. It will be in order when the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. DAVIS. Before the paragraph had been finally agreed to I offered that amendment as a substitute for the entire paragraph. I can not quite agree with the Chair that it is not in order, though, of course, I shall submit to the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is obliged to hold that the amendment is not now in order.

The question is on agreeing to paragraph 196 as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment which is an additional paragraph to the lumber portion of the schedule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert a new paragraph in Schedule D, as follows:

All lumber imported into the United States which shall be used in the construction of any church, school, college, or university building, or any other religious, educational, or charitable establishment, or which shall be used in the construction of any public building erected at the expense and for the use of any State, or any county or municipality thereof, shall come within the drawback provisions of this act in the same manner and to the same extent as if such lumber had been exported subsequent to importation; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe suitable rules and regulations to carry the provisions of this section into effect.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the various States of the Union have exempted schoolhouses, churches, and other religious and charitable institutions from local taxation. It seems to me that the General Government ought to be as generous and as just toward these local institutions as have been the local governments themselves. It seems to me that any building, either dedicated to learning or consecrated to religion, ought to be exempted from the exactions of the taxgatherer. It seems to me that such a building ought to be safeguarded against the invasion of the publican and the sinner. It seems to me that the money changers should be scourged from the temple now as they were in the olden times.

This amendment, it seems to me, is founded upon different principles from the proposition to levy either a protective or a revenue duty upon imported lumber. It is my recollection that during the last ten or twelve years we have collected about $20,000,000 of revenue from imported tin plate. It is also my recollection that during the same time the Standard Oil Company has received some $18,000,000 of this revenue as a drawback, due to the exportation of tin cans manufactured from those imported tin plates. I may be regarded as a little eccentric for saying that, in my judgment, the schoolhouse, the church, and other religious and charitable institutions are entitled to as much consideration at the hands of this Senate as is the Standard Oil monopoly itself. As I have a kindred amendment to submit, and upon a kindred subject, and as I desire to see how other Senators view this proposition, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma asks for the yeas and nays on his amendment. Is there a second? In the opinion of the Chair, there is not.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the question be put again. Senators may not have understood the proposition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a second to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? In the opinion of the Chair, there is not a sufficient number.

Mr. BACON. I ask for a division on the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no use in taking up the time of the Senate for that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators in favor of acceding to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma for the yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [A pause.] Eight Senators have risen; not a sufficient number. The yeas

and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the amendment striking out paragraph 198 was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 199 be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Paragraph 199 has already been agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 200 be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 200.

The paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. On behalf of the committee I offer an amendment to paragraph 201, making the duty on clapboards $1.50 a thousand, instead of $1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Page 70, paragraph 201, after the word "dollar," it is proposed to insert "fifty cents."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 202 be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 202.

The paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have an amendment to paragraph 203. I move to insert the word "five" after the word "twenty."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 203, page 70, line 25, strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 204 be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 204.

The paragraph was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee report an amendment to paragraph 205, striking out "thirty" and inserting "fifty."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 205, page 71, line 3, after the word "shingles," it is proposed to strike out "thirty" and insert "fifty."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that paragraph 206 be agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is already agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that pragraph 207 be agreed to.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I move to amend paragraph 207 by inserting, in line 8, after the word "oranges," the word "pineapples."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 71, paragraph 207, line 8, after the word "oranges," it is proposed to insert "pineapples," so as to read:

207. Boxes, barrels, or other articles containing oranges, pineapples, lemons, limes, grape fruit, shaddocks, or pomelos, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope that amendment will not be adopted, because if we are going to change the duty on pineapples, it ought to be changed by a straight vote, and not by indirection.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, this is not an effort to change the duty on pineapples at all. This paragraph, as it stands now, distinctly excludes pineapple crates, while it covers the crates of all other fruits of the general character of pineapples.

The chairman of the committee has announced more than once that it was the purpose of the committee to construct this bill so as to apply with equality to all sections and all products of the country. If the proposed duty on orange boxes, lemon boxes, and the other fruits mentioned in the paragraph is to induce the importers of foreign fruits to buy their boxes in the extreme East, there is no reason that I can see why the same rule should not apply to the boxes made of materials that are produced in the Middle States and in the South. So the question is fairly before the Senate whether the Senate will permit a distinct discrimination against this product of the South; whether they will pass a law providing a duty on boxes that bring oranges and lemons and limes into this country, but distinctly exclude those containing pineapples. That is the question.

I do not need to argue the point at all, and it is not necessary for me to go into the question of the right or wrong of the paragraph as it stands. It is sufficient to say that the boxes in which the other fruits are imported bear the duty imposed under this paragraph and that pineapple boxes are studiously and pointedly omitted and discriminated against. I ask the Senate to correct the wrong while they have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do.

Mr. RAYNER. I thought the Senator had concluded. I beg his pardon. I will wait until he is through.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I am through now.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator from Florida a question. What is the difference between the character, if there is any, of the boxes in which pineapples are shipped and the boxes in which oranges and lemons are shipped?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. None whatever, except that in the case of lemons, I think, a thinner wood is used, probably produced in the State of Maine. In the case of crates for oranges, grape fruit, and limes, yellow pine is used, which is produced, as we all know, in the Southern States. If there is a discrimination in this bill it is shown conspicuously, Mr. President, in this very item that is now before the Senate.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I had no expectation that this amendment would come up this morning. I am very much opposed to it. I think the proper place to discuss the amendment would be after the pineapple schedule comes before the Senate, for it is impossible to analyze it unless you understand the whole question. The duty on these crates amounts absolutely to an increase of duty upon Cuban pineapples. There is no question at all about an equality of assessment; it does not follow by any means that because particular crates with particular kinds of fruit have a duty imposed upon them, that all crates with all kinds of fruit should have the same duty imposed. I respectfully submit that there is no logic at all in that argument.

In order to understand it, it is necessary to discuss the pineapple schedule. I am opposed to any increase of duty upon the schedule appertaining to pineapples beyond the duty the Senate committee has placed upon it. It is well for the Senate to understand that when that schedule is reached the Senator from Florida will move an amendment increasing the duty on pineapples beyond the duty reported by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I want to ask merely if the Senator from Maryland spoke with authority on that point?

Mr. RAYNER. The only authority I have, Mr. President, is that the Senator from Florida has frequently stated to me that there is to be an amendment to the amendment reported by the committee increasing the duty.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There has already been an amendment submitted, and it is now pending.

Mr. RAYNER. There is an amendment pending now.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I wanted to know if the Senator spoke with authority when he informed the Senate that there will be no further report from the committee on this subject? I understand that the matter is still under consideration by the committee, or by members of the committee.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from Florida not only misunderstood me, but he evidently did not hear me. I said nothing about the Senate committee making another report. I said that an amendment would be offered increasing the duties that the Senate committee had placed upon pineapples. So the Senator misunderstood me.

Now, Mr. President, it is impossible to discuss this schedule without discussing the pineapple question, and, unless the Senator from Florida is unwilling to discuss that question now, I am perfectly willing to take up the pineapple schedule now.

Let us take up that schedule now and discuss it before the Senate, and when that schedule is passed upon, then we will discuss the proposition whether or not an additional duty is to be levied upon the crates that contain pineapples, because the duty on the crates is a duty on the pineapples themselves. That there is a duty on the crates that contain lemons and

oranges is no reason on this earth why a duty should be placed upon the crates that contain pineapples. It is an entirely different proposition from that appertaining to crates containing these articles. There are plenty of fruits——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator states that the duty here placed upon boxes containing pineapples will increase the duty upon pineapples. Is it not also true that it will for the same reason increase the duty upon oranges, lemons, limes, grape fruit, and so forth?

Mr. RAYNER. But, Mr. President, the increase of duty upon pineapples stands upon an entirely different basis from the duty upon lemons and the other articles the Senator mentions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have already put a duty of a cent and a half on lemons. Does this provision add to that cent and a half duty on lemons?

Mr. RAYNER. I should suppose it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I simply wanted to know as to that.

Mr. RAYNER. I should suppose most decidedly that it does. But as to pineapples, what I want to say to the Senator is this: These pineapples all come in crates. I can not tell whether lemons all come in crates, or whether the other fruit mentioned here come in crates; but every Cuban pineapple comes in a crate, as I understand it. There is no importation of Cuban pineapples in bulk. This is imposing an additional tax upon the pineapples that come from Cuba. A million crates of pineapples come from Cuba every year; and we are dependent upon the Cuban pineapple. I want to say this in passing, because neither my colleague nor myself were ready to discuss this matter; but we are perfectly willing to take it up. I want to say this, that these Cuban pineapples come in in the month of April and the month of May, and there is not a pineapple from Florida that is used before the Cuban stock is exhausted. No Florida pineapples come in in April——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. One moment—to any appreciable extent. The Florida crop commences to come in, as I understand it—and the Senator from Florida will correct me if I am wrong—substantially during the latter part of May.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I will state, if the Senator wants the information, that it commences to come in the last of April and the first of May.

Mr. RAYNER. Then, Mr. President, we are incorrectly informed. But I am prepared, I think, to prove to the Senate that, substantially speaking, the Florida crop does not come in until the latter part of May. It does not come in during the month of April, when the Cuban pineapples are canned, for the use of the American consumer.

At any rate, I want to say this, and I repeat it: We are willing now to discuss this pineapple schedule, and I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will permit us to take it up, because I have been waiting here for some time to discuss it; but this particular duty ought not to be discussed and ought not to be considered except in connection with that schedule. I hope the Senate will at least defer action upon it until that schedule is reached, because until the schedule is reached we can not arrive at a proper determination as to whether or not an additional duty or a new duty ought to be placed upon the boxes that contain the fruit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. RAYNER. I yield; yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to ask the Senator if he can state approximately the additional duty that would be imposed upon a crate of pineapples if the wood case containing them were dutiable?

Mr. RAYNER. My calculation is, I think, a little in excess of the calculation that the Senator from Utah makes. There were about a million crates imported from Cuba; and, with the drawback off, my calculation is that there would be some forty or fifty thousand dollars of duty imposed that is not imposed now.

Mr. GALLINGER. My inquiry was directed more particularly to a single crate. What would the duty be approximately upon a single crate?

Mr. RAYNER. Upon a single crate, I think it would be about from 3 to 4 cents. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] says it would be 2½ cents a crate.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, the estimate of the Senator from Utah, to which the Senator from Maryland has referred, includes the labor of making the crate, which is done abroad, the material being shipped over from this country. So that a reasonable estimate of the duty on crates would certainly not exceed from 1½ cents to 2 cents a crate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. RAYNER. No; I have not yielded the floor. I have the floor, and I yielded it to the Senator from New Hampshire. I have not yielded it heretofore, but I now yield to the Senator from Utah. If we can have a little order here while the Senator from Utah is speaking, I should like to have it, so that we can understand what the Senator from Utah says.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the way I figure the duty it would be this—that the price of the crate is from 15 to 16 cents.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Made.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, the crate itself; and 15 per cent on 16 cents would make $2\frac{4}{10}$ cents per case; and a million cases or crates would represent $24,000 of additional cost put on the pineapples.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I am not in favor of putting one cent additional duty upon the Cuban pineapple—not a cent a thousand, nor a cent a million. There never was any duty upon Cuban pineapples until some ten or fifteen years ago, when a duty was put upon them; and the duty is high enough now as reported by the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee reported an amendment here bringing the duty back to where it was under the Dingley bill. Under the Dingley bill the duty was 7 cents a cubic foot or $7 a thousand, in bulk; and the House of Representatives raised it to 8 cents a cubic foot and $8 a thousand in bulk. The amendment of the Senator from Florida is protection run mad. Mr. President, the Senate committee unanimously reported in favor of the Dingley rates.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. What does the Senator from Maryland mean by saying that the Finance Committee "unanimously" adopted this amendment, and repeating the word "unanimously?" I ask what he means by that?

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, when a report comes in here without any dissenting report, I presume that the prima facie presumption is that it is at least a unanimous resolution of the majority of the Finance Committee. When I speak of the Finance Committee, I speak of the majority of the Finance Committee, not including the Senator from Florida.

I want the Senate to understand this matter, Mr. President, though it ought not to be discussed in this connection. This duty on crates is a matter that enters with relevance and pertinency into the discussion of the question of the duty on pineapples. The Senate committee put it back to where the Dingley rates were. And now, after the Senate committee placed it where the Dingley rates were, the proposition is made to put it up above the Dingley rates, to put it up to the point where the House of Representatives placed it, and at a higher standard.

As the duty on crates is a duty on pineapples, I will ask the Senate to at least defer the discussion of the duty upon the crates that hold the pineapples until we can take up the pineapple schedule. If the Senate comes to the conclusion that the Senator from Florida is right, and that a Congress convened for the purpose of revising the tariff should put a prohibitive duty upon Cuban pineapples, then I have no doubt that the Senate will also put a heavier duty upon the boxes that contain the pineapples. But it is utterly impossible to discuss that proposition without discussing the other one. I am willing at this moment to take up both propositions—to ask the Senate either to vote down this new duty or to defer this suggestion until the main proposition is reached in the Senate—because I shall have a good deal to say upon it, although I shall say it within a very brief time, as is my usual practice in this body.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will excuse me for a moment, I think the committee will recommend striking out this paragraph entirely. I think it ought to be stricken out. It is an anomaly in our legislation. Paragraph No. 490 of the free list, as amended by the Senate, covers these boxes absolutely, and there is no reason why this paragraph should not be stricken out of the bill. I shall therefore move, when I have an opportunity, to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I shall not make the slightest objection to that course.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I ask that it may be stricken out.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I want my State, or the products of my State, treated in this bill as the products of other States are treated; and I will join the Senator from Rhode Island in writing down the products of the other States in the Union and writing down ours correspondingly in this bill.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I ask that the paragraph may be stricken out.

Mr. RAYNER. That is right. I will make that motion myself.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURROWS in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island offers the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 71 strike out all of paragraph 207 as printed in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island will pardon me——

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall now be glad to take up the pineapple schedule.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I am ready to take up the pineapple schedule. I will be very glad to do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that disposes of all of the paragraphs of the wood schedule.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, this morning when the vote was taken on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to put a duty upon lumber, I was unavoidably detained at the Treasury Department and did not get here in time to record my vote. If I had been present, I should have voted "nay;" but I was paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the Finance Committee to allow me to take up section 199 for the purpose of offering an amendment. I think the section has been adopted; but I will ask to have it reconsidered.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the amendment?

Mr. SCOTT. I will send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia proposes the following amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. It is an amendment to section 199, page 70.

The SECRETARY. On page 70, paragraph 199——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that that paragraph has been agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. But, Mr. President, the chairman of the Finance Committee agreed to have it left open.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that it be reconsidered.

Mr. KEAN. Let us hear the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the paragraph was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Motion is made to reconsider paragraph 199. If there be no objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from West Virginia proposes the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On line 12, page 70, after the word "satinwood," insert "briar root or briar wood, ivy or laurel root."

Mr. ALDRICH. I am willing that that shall go in. The committee will afterwards examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. I offer the following amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. May I ask what paragraph it is on?

Mr. GUGGENHEIM. It is on this schedule.

Mr. LODGE. Let the amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado proposes the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 63, after line 21, insert the following paragraph:

187½. Tungsten-bearing ores of all kinds, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to know what the present duty is on tungsten ore. There is a great deal of confusion in the reports in regard to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The general impression is that it is 20 per cent. I am not sure. I think that there has not been any uniformity of decision. I think the Senator from Ohio is right about that. It has been sometimes admitted free, I think.

Mr. BURTON. There is now pending in the courts, as I understand it, a controversy about the classification of the article.

Mr. ALDRICH. The ore is free, or supposed to be; and the metal is dutiable at 20 per cent, as a nonenumerated metal, manufactured.

Mr. BURTON. Is this a proposition to put a duty of 15 per cent on the ore?

Mr. ALDRICH. On the ore.

Mr. BURTON. I hope the amendment will not be adopted. Tungsten is an article that is being used in the manufacture of the finer grades of steel, and is coming into very extended use.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, if this amendment should be adopted, the committee will give it very careful consideration hereafter, and will be glad to hear the Senator from Ohio upon the subject. Perhaps it may go in now and thus save time.

Mr. BURTON. Then, is it understood that it will come up again for discussion?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Now I ask that paragraph 275, in relation to pineapples, be taken up. And I give notice that after it is disposed of I shall ask that the paragraph relating to the duties upon coal be taken up.

The SECRETARY. Page 84, paragraph 275, "Pineapples, in barrels and other packages," the committee proposes to strike out "eight" and insert "seven."

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I proposed an amendment to that paragraph, which was printed and ordered to lie on the table. I ask that that be reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida proposes the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. As a substitute for paragraph 275, on page 84, the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] proposes the following:

275. Pineapples, in barrels or other packages, one-half of 1 cent per pound; in bulk, $8 per thousand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, we want to discuss this amendment. I thought the Senator from Florida wanted to be heard on it first, and I want to be heard on it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope order will be restored.

Mr. RAYNER. There is so much disorder that it is utterly impossible to understand what the amendment is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida proposes an amendment, which has been read.

Mr. RAYNER. I desire to be heard upon it, but I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment as offered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will ask that we may have a little more quiet. I have been trying to follow this amendment as well as I possibly could, but I had not the slightest idea what amendment was offered, or by whom, or what the committee amendment was, or whether the committee amendment had been offered. I shall be glad if we can have a little quiet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida proposes the following amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 284, insert a new paragraph, in lieu of paragraph 275, as follows:

275. Pineapples, in barrels and other packages, one-half of 1 cent per pound; in bulk, $8 per thousand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] has the floor.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RAYNER. Yes; I do.

Mr. CLAPP. I was about to suggest that if, before the Senator from Maryland proceeds with his argument, it pleases the Senator from Florida, or some one familiar with the subject, to make a statement showing what the change would in effect be if this substitute were adopted, we would be in a better position to understand the force of the argument that follows.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I yield to anybody, always. It does not make a particle of difference. I yield to anyone. I will yield to the Senator from Florida with pleasure; yes.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That is better.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I rise to a matter of procedure, if the Senator will permit me. I was called out of the Senate for a moment. I understand that while I was in the Marble Room another schedule was taken up, and the tungsten item disposed of.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] offered an amendment putting a duty of 15 per cent upon tungsten ore.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will ask that the matter be left open. I do not care to be foreclosed in that way.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] made a similar suggestion; and I stated, on behalf of the committee, that we would examine the matter, and would be glad to hear the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HEYBURN. I merely want to say that I thought that I might safely rely upon the presumption that the subject under consideration would not be broken into for the purpose of taking up another schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. The lumber schedule had been concluded.

Mr. HEYBURN. I was here at that time, and then the pineapple item came up.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the pineapple item had not been reached.

Mr. HEYBURN. When I left the room the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] was speaking.

Mr. ALDRICH. That matter was disposed of as part of the lumber schedule.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will ask that this matter be considered as open, because it is one of more than passing importance.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from Idaho what I have already said to the Senator from Ohio—that if they desire any change, the committee will confer with them, and the Senator will not be foreclosed.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I do not want it to be deferred until the bill is in the Senate. I want to have an opportunity to discuss the matter while we are in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will ask that the matter be reconsidered, if the Senator so desires, later on.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, it is true, as the Senator from Maryland stated in discussing the question of the duty on fruit boxes, that the Dingley tariff law fixes the rate on pineapples at $7 per thousand in bulk and $7 per cubic foot when in packages or barrels. That law was enacted at a period when there was practically no production of pineapples in this country, and only a very small consumption of pineapples in the United States. There is a plain error in the law. On all the bases of the fixing of these rates the pineapple schedule in the Dingley tariff law was so manifestly incorrect and unjust that I feel warranted in stating that it was a mistake. The bulk rate is supposed to be the lower rate, of course, whereas under the Dingley law the bulk rate was 5 or 6 per cent higher than the crate rate, the bulk rate being about 19 cents on the equivalent of a crate of pineapples when shipped in bulk and 14 cents a crate when advanced in cost by the purchase of the crate, the wrapping, and the crating.

But I repeat that, in my judgment, when the Dingley law was enacted there was a want of familiarity with the facts of the case, with the value of the product in bulk as compared with its value in crates, and that not being understood by the committee and by Congress, the anomalous situation appeared that the low rate is on the product advanced in cost and the high rate on the bulk product, which has no cost at all added in preparation for shipment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. If it will not interfere with the Senator, I should like to ask him a question not directly related to the matter that he is discussing. I should like to ask the Senator what the possibilities are in Florida, and possibly in other Southern States, for raising pineapples? Can the industry be very largely extended beyond its present measures or not?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Oh, undoubtedly. The State of Florida will produce this season a million crates of pineapples. They have about 7,000 acres of land in pineapples, and they have a million acres that could be put in pineapples if the price warranted their production.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator say that Florida raised a million crates?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I say that this season Florida will raise a million crates.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator tell me what the importations were? I have not looked it up.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It is estimated that the importations from Cuba this season will be a million and a half crates.

Mr. RAYNER. The average production is between five and six hundred thousand crates. This was a phenomenal year. Oh, I thought the Senator was speaking of the Florida crop. The Florida crop averages, I think—and I think the Senator will assent to this—between five and six hundred thousand crates; but it has been more this year.

Mr. GALLINGER. So, according to the statement made by the Senator from Florida, the present production of pineapples in Florida is almost, if not quite, as large as the importations from Cuba.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The present production in Florida plus the production for this season in Porto Rico will almost exactly equal the importations from Cuba.

Mr. GALLINGER. I thank the Senator. I disliked to interrupt him, but I wanted to get that information.

Mr. RAYNER. I think the Senator from Florida will agree with my statement that this is a phenomenal year, and that until this year the average crop in Florida has never amounted to over 600,000 crates. If I am wrong about that, the Senator will correct me.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator from Maryland is wrong to this extent: The Florida crop in 1907 was 690,000 crates, and the importations for that year were, singularly enough, almost exactly the same—about 690,000 crates.

Mr. DIXON. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Certainly.

Mr. DIXON. Was there any production of pineapples in Florida until the Dingley rates were placed upon pineapples in 1897?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. In 1897 the production of pineapples in Florida was about 100,000 crates.

Mr. DIXON. Had there been any duty upon them before that time?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I think not. I do not recall that there had been, although I do not make the assertion positively.

Mr. DIXON. Has the imposition of the duties under the Dingley bill tended to increase the production of pineapples in Florida?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The crop has increased, as I have stated, from about 100,000 crates in 1897 to a million crates in 1909.

Mr. DIXON. In the Senator's opinion, has the imposition of the tariff rates on pineapples imported from Cuba tended toward the development of the industry in Florida?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I think that the present rate tends to develop very largely the industry in the island of Cuba.

Mr. DIXON. The Senator evidently has not answered my question. I will say frankly to the Senator that if the imposition of a duty on pineapples will produce in our own country the pineapples that we consume, I, as a protectionist and a Republican, want to vote for it. If it is not going to do so, I do not want to increase the duty. We might as well have a fair explanation of the matter. I think many Senators on this side of the Chamber would appreciate it.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I will say for the benefit of the Senator that the producers of pineapples have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and have taken the position that it is impossible for them to continue in this business unless the duty is increased; that with an increased duty on pineapples they can succeed, and can so far increase the product in this country and develop the industry in the State of Florida as to supply the American demand at a reasonable price. That is their contention. But I am not asking for this amendment on that ground. I am asking for it because it will increase the revenues of the country. I am asking for it because I propose to demonstrate that, with this duty, the Cuban can put his product of pineapples in the eastern markets for 50 cents a crate less than the Florida producer can raise his product and put it in New York.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. In one minute I will.

So that if this were a protective duty that I am asking for, the rate would be a cent a pound or more, as it is on oranges and limes and grape fruit and all the other fruits of the same general character as pineapples, except lemons, which carry a duty of 1½ cents a pound.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Now I will answer the Senator from Indiana.

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

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Florida says that he presents this amendment, which increases the rate fixed by the committee, because of its revenue-producing features. If it be true that it amounts to a substantial prohibition of the importation of pineapples, of course the Senator will concede that it would not increase the revenues. Then, the question is, if it should very greatly reduce the importation of pineapples almost to the point of prohibition, whether, upon the ground that he states, he would be in favor of his own amendment upon the revenue-producing ground? I think it can be demonstrated that that will be the case.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, if it were demonstrated that this amendment of mine would prevent or prohibit the importation of pineapples into this country, I think I should not have introduced it. I will say that for the benefit of the Senator from Indiana. But I should like to have the Senator from Indiana inform me why he makes the inquiry as to whether it would prohibit or would not prohibit that importation, basing his consideration of the question on the idea that the rate I propose would be a prohibitory one?

The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House conclusively demonstrates, taking up the production item after item, that the cost of the American pineapple, the Florida pineapple, delivered in New York is $1.80 a crate. The horticultural reports from the island of Cuba and the estimates of the cost in the book of Imports and Exports—used as a basis for ascertaining the ad valorem value—show that the Cuban product costs less than a dollar a crate delivered in New York. The same rule, the same argument, the same conditions apply as to Chicago and the western market, there being a slight variation in the cost of freight, which is in favor of the Cuban product.

So I want it understood, Mr. President, that all the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and before the Republican members of the Finance Committee of the Senate, goes to show and does show conclusively that if this amendment of mine is adopted the Cuban can pay that rate of duty and deliver his pineapples in New York for fifty-odd cents less than the producer in Florida can produce and deliver his fruit in the same market. That being the case, I maintain that the rate proposed by me is not a protective rate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator mean to say that the rate is cheaper from Cuba to New York than from Cuba to Jacksonville, Fla.?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I mean to say that every incident entering into the business of the production of this fruit is more expensive in this country than it is in Cuba. I include labor, implements, freight, and every incident.

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

Mr. TALIAFERRO. You may.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is the price of day labor employed in raising pineapples in Florida?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That information is given in detail in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. I have not charged my memory with it, and I must refer the Senator to those hearings for his information. It is there set out in detail.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is hardly any difference at all. For instance, in Cuba——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. My colleague says the rate is from $1.50 to $2 a day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is $1.50 to $2 a day in Cuba also. Land in Cuba is equally expensive, equally valuable on the market, if, indeed, not more so at the present time, than that portion of Florida.

If I may interrupt the Senator further, the only point in which it costs more in Florida is that it is very difficult to raise pineapples there without certain fertilizers and special preparation. Also, I think the Senator will admit that the crop there is hazardous and irregular, whereas in Cuba, being perfectly adapted to it, it is regular. Those are the only differences of cost, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I will remark in passing that I am one Member of the Senate who believes in consistency. If we can develop the pineapple industry in Florida and extend it and supply this great Nation by imposing this slight increase in duty, I do not know under what rule of enactment of this law it should not be done. This is not one of the great items of the bill. I should like to have a full Senate to hear the discussion, and I suggest that most Senators on this side of the Chamber are absent. I raise the point of no quorum. Let them come in and hear the question discussed.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I would not do that. Senators know, generally, what is going on here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bailey	Clay	Gallinger	Overman
Beveridge	Crawford	Gamble	Page
Borah	Cullom	Gore	Perkins
Bourne	Cummins	Guggenheim	Piles
Briggs	Curtis	Hale	Rayner
Bristow	Daniel	Heyburn	Root
Brown	Davis	Hughes	Scott
Bulkeley	Depew	Johnson, N. Dak.	Smith, Md.
Burkett	Dick	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Mich.
Burnham	Dixon	Jones	Smith, S. C.
Burrows	Dolliver	Kean	Sutherland
Burton	du Pont	Lorimer	Taliaferro
Carter	Fletcher	McLaurin	Taylor
Chamberlain	Flint	Money	Warner
Clapp	Foster	Nixon	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Oliver	Wetmore

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Florida will proceed.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator from Indiana, when I was discussing the question of the relative cost of producing pineapples in Florida and in Cuba, was bold enough to state with great positiveness the wage scale in the island of Cuba as far as it applies to the production of pineapples. I think that my colleague here has the facts and figures immediately at hand, and I will ask him to read at this point just what the cost of labor is in Cuba, that it may go into the RECORD in this connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida yields to his colleague.

Mr. FLETCHER. My colleague yields to me for a moment on the question of wages raised by the Senator from Indiana. I find in volume 4 of Tariff Hearings the statement to be thus:

> With their small cost for land and no fertilizers used, the Cuban grower has a maximum cost for labor of 80 cents per day, and at times much less figures, whereas we have a minimum cost for labor of $1.25 per day, with the average for a large part of the season above $1.50 per day, and a part of the year we pay as high as $2 and even $2.50 per day.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me? The statement which I made, and which I understood I made upon good authority or, of course, I should not have done so, has not been controverted by the testimony of one of the Florida growers just read. I said that on account of the cheapness of land in Cuba, and not having to use fertilizers there, and so forth, whereas they do in Florida, their average labor cost, in which is included the use of fertilizers and all that sort of thing, was so much. The statement which I made—and I ask the Senator whether it is not true—is that the cost of day labor in raising pineapples in Cuba is from $1.50 to $2 a day. Is not that statement correct? If I am wrong, I will be glad to be corrected.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is not correct.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What is it, then?

Mr. FLETCHER. Eighty cents is the maximum.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I have not yielded to the Senator to conduct an argument in the midst of my discussion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do not wish to have any argument or colloquy in the midst of my remarks.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator perhaps is quite right about that, but I only called attention to it now because the Senator asked his colleague to read the testimony of a Florida grower with reference to the cost of labor. I will take it up at another time.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I have suggested to the Senate, and I repeat, that I am not discussing this question from a purely protective standpoint. I have referred to the cost of production for two purposes—on the one hand, to show my friends on the other side of the Chamber that there is no excuse for this inequality in the bill against pineapples; and on the other, to show my friends on this side of the Chamber that they can vote for this amendment with absolute assurance that they are not voting for a protective tariff on pineapples. It was for that purpose, and that purpose alone, that I went into the cost of production in this country as compared with Cuba. I want to repeat here and now that from all the testimony, not only before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, but before the Republican membership of the Committee on Finance of this body, and also the personal assurances to me from interested parties, whom I know are informed, the cost of the Cuban product is less by 50 cents a crate in the New York market than the cost of the Florida product, after the duty that I ask for has been paid by the Cuban.

The paragraph next preceding this, No. 273, lemons, 1½ cents a pound; oranges, limes, grape fruit, shaddocks, and so forth, 1 cent a pound.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the duty that he proposes on pineapples, expressed in pounds?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. A half a cent a pound.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Forty cents a crate.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It is 40 cents a crate, or, because of the reciprocity treaty, 20 per cent off for Cuba.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. An increase of 128 per cent.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I think it would be better for the Senator from Indiana to put that kind of remarks in his own speech.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; if the Senator objects, I shall not.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, it costs the same to produce a crate of pineapples that it does a box of oranges. They are worth the same in the market. They weigh the same, thereby carrying the same cost of transportation to the market. Yet the Committee on Finance, or the Republican membership of the Committee on Finance, have put oranges in the bill under a rate of 1 cent a pound, and pineapples, produced alone in the State of Florida of all the States in this Union, at less than a quarter of a cent a pound. If there is any reason for it, if there is any justification for it whatever, if there is any warrant, it has never been suggested to me.

I know, Mr. President, there are gentlemen on the other side who would vote to reduce this duty on pineapples. They are protectionists, who wish to buy on the free-trade basis and to sell on the protection basis. I know there are gentlemen on this side who would vote to reduce that rate. They are "tariff-for-revenue" men, who believe that the revenue of this Government should be raised by putting all products on the free list.

I ask not the rate that has been given to the fruit of equal value and of equal cost of production with this Florida pineapple. I do not ask for that rate, but I ask for one-half that rate; and I propose then, for pineapples in bulk, a rate actually less than the Dingley rate intended to give when the law was enacted.

Let it be understood, Mr. President, that the Florida pineapple is not the only fruit that is canned. Why should they be the special target of the canneries here before the Senate? Why should it be selected out from among all the fruits in this bill to be put practically on a free-trade basis, while they themselves on their canned products are enjoying a duty of 1 cent per pound and 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Certainly.

Mr. DIXON. What is the rate of duty carried by the bill as reported by the Finance Committee?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Less than a fourth of 1 cent a pound.

Mr. DIXON. What percentage of value is it?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Fourteen per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Is that all that is carried in the bill?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That is all that is carried in the bill as it comes from the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. DIXON. What rate of duty would the Senator's amendment carry?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It carries 32 cents a crate as against Cuba, our real competitor in pineapples.

Mr. DIXON. What is the percentage of value?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. About 30 to 32 per cent on the total value of the Cuban product in Cuba.

Mr. DIXON. Does the duty which the Senator asks in his amendment any more than equalize the cost of the production in Cuba as compared with the cost of production in Florida?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, it does not begin to do it. It falls 50 cents a crate and more below the difference in the cost between the products of the two countries.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, because I am very much interested in the statement he is making about this fruit. I understood him to say pineapples are grown in this country only in the State of Florida.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Only in the State of Florida.

Mr. SIMMONS. Lemons and oranges are grown not only in Florida, but on the Pacific coast.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Lemons are not grown in Florida for the market, but oranges are grown in Florida, and lemons are grown almost exclusively, as far as the market product is concerned, in the State of California.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator to say that the duty upon oranges, grown in Florida and on the Pacific coast, is about four times as much as the duty upon pineapples, grown only in Florida.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Four times as much.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask this question of the Senator: What is the relative cost of growing oranges and pineapples?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It is the same cost, as I have stated to the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. They are both grown in Cuba, are they not?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. They are both grown in Cuba and both grown in Florida.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is the difference in the cost of producing oranges in Cuba and in this country any greater than the difference in the cost of producing pineapples in this country and in Cuba?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The cost of producing oranges and pineapples is about the same in this country, and I dare say there is about the same relative difference in Cuba.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator, that being so, what is the source of this opposition to treating pineapples exactly as oranges are treated in this bill?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do not know any opposition except from the canners.

Mr. SIMMONS. Are pineapples canned and oranges not canned?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Oranges are canned to some extent, and figs are extensively preserved and canned. I want it understood that, in the case of the canners who come here protesting against this duty, the canning of pineapples is a mere incident to their business. They are not exclusively pineapple canners. They can all of the varieties of fruits and vegetables that are grown and imported into this country, and yet of all their varieties of canned fruits they select out of this bill this one item of pineapples, and they say they must come in practically free of duty in order that they may enjoy a more extortionate profit on the product.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator a question about this. He says there are other fruits canned. Are the other fruits canned raised both in Florida and elsewhere?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Peaches are raised all over the country. Figs are raised in California and in many other States, and they are in the bill at 2½ cents a pound. They are the product of practically the entire country, and are canned and preserved wherever produced. Yet when I come here and ask the Senate to give to the Florida producer one-half the amount that they are giving the California producer on a product of equal cost of production and equal value in the market, the canners complain that it will ruin that side of their business.

Let me show you, Mr. President and the Senate, that I mean it when I say this rate I ask for would in nowise prohibit or discourage the importation of pineapples. The rate of a cent a pound upon oranges has not prohibited the importation of oranges. The duty on oranges is twice as much as I am asking for on pineapples; and yet the aggregate revenue paid on oranges is double the amount we get from pineapples, although there are twice as many pineapples imported into this country as there are oranges. Six hundred and ninety thousand crates were imported into this country from Cuba in 1907. They paid a duty of ninety-odd thousand dollars—about $96,000, I think. What I am asking here will double that duty and give us practically $200,000 from pineapples, and not operate in the slightest degree to discourage the Cuban from sending his product to this country. He still finds a market here with a clean profit of half a dollar a crate in his favor over and above what it costs the producers of Florida to produce that fruit and put it on the market.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do.

Mr. DIXON. But if we had the same importation from Cuba that we now have under the increased duty, how would the Florida pineapple grower get any advantage of this change? I want to cast my vote to help the Florida pineapple grower.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, I think I have shown. I have stated—and it is susceptible of proof—that the production of pineapples and the delivery in the New York market costs the Florida man $1.80 a crate. I have stated—and it is equally susceptible of proof—that the Cuban producer can produce and get his fruit there for less than a dollar a crate.

Mr. DIXON. But if, under this increase of duty, they keep on importing the same number of pineapples, how will the proposed duty help our people here at home?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The duty I propose would be, to the Cuban, just 32 cents. Take $1.32 from $1.80, and you have practically the advantage—I have not gone into it exactly, as it is gone into in the hearings—but, practically, that is the advantage which the Cuban enjoys over the Florida producer, even if the rate is fixed according to my amendment.

Mr. DIXON. But with the new amendment, the Florida pineapple grower would get 32 cents benefit from the proposed duty, which would help out, I should think, in the production of pineapples at home.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. They seem to think so, Mr. President.

I have referred to both sides of this question—both the protective side and the tariff-for-revenue side—because this is a fair proposition from either point of view.

If we, Mr. President, on this side were here making a bill under the Denver platform, instead of you gentlemen on the other side, this pineapple item, in my best judgment, would go into the bill just as I have proposed in this amendment. Can you gentlemen over there do any less than give me what I ask for, when I show you that even when you give me that the foreign competitor has 50 cents a crate advantage over the Florida producer? That is the true situation. I do not know that I could state any more if I stood here and talked the remainder of the afternoon. I know that the Senate wants to get through, and certainly I have no disposition to detain it. I therefore defer any further remarks on this subject until the gentlemen who are going to speak for the canners have had their say.

Mr. RAYNER. I object to that remark, Mr. President. I am not going to speak for any canners; I am going to speak for the consumers of the United States. Canners have nothing to do with the business at all.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I propose, Mr. President, to speak for no special interest. I propose to speak for the people of the United States generally. I am reluctant to prolong the discussion of the pending tariff bill, for I realize the impatience of the country and the anxiety of Congress to see the close of this debate.

So long as the bill is pending business men will be at a loss and a spirit of injurious unrest will exist. Therefore it is only a sense of duty which could drive me to retard the progress of this session of Congress by so much as the few minutes I shall use in addressing the Senate.

I have, however, been able to give the subject of the proposed duty on pineapples more than the ordinary study, and can perhaps furnish information of some service to gentlemen who have not had as full opportunity to get at the root of the subject as has been my fortune.

The duty on pineapples, as fixed by the Dingley law, is 7 cents per cubic foot of the capacity of barrels or packages; in bulk, $7 per thousand.

The Payne bill increased this rate to 8 cents per cubic foot; in bulk, $8 per thousand.

However, the Senate Finance Committee restored the Dingley rate of 7 cents per cubic foot and $7 per thousand when the bill reached this end of the Capitol.

On April 26 the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] proposed an amendment to the pending bill, fixing the tariff on pineapples at one-half of 1 cent per pound, an increase, it may be added, over the present duty and over the rate reported by the Finance Committee of over 125 per cent on pineapples imported from Cuba.

Mark you, the increased rate of duty that the Senator from Florida is asking over the present rate is over 125 per cent.

I have tried to consider this amendment offered by the senior Senator from Florida fairly; and, distasteful though it is to me to differ with him and his associates, especially when his State is so deeply interested, I am absolutely unable to reach any conclusion other than that the rate of one-half of 1 cent per pound, or any increase over the present rate, is unjust.

I have detected, in fact I have felt, during this session of Congress, the pressure of a widespread demand throughout the country that pineapples be admitted free of duty or that a material reduction be made in the present rate of duty.

The reason for this is not hard to find, for pineapples are universally used throughout the United States, and are not grown in appreciable quantities except upon a narrow strip of land on the east coast of one State—Florida.

I have not yielded to this demand for the importation of pineapples free of duty.

In the nature of things, revenue must be raised from the tariff to support the Government, and except under most extraordinary circumstances, and in very rare instances, I can see no philosophy or reason in admitting any article free, thereby letting its consumers evade their fair share of the burden of an import tax, which must consequently be shifted to the shoulders of the consumers of some other article perhaps equally necessary. I say this is the case except under extraordinary conditions.

Therefore, in my judgment, pineapples, as I believe all articles which pay a tariff, should be taxed for the purpose of raising revenue, and for that purpose only. If in laying such a revenue tax our pineapple-growing friends from Florida reap any advantage by way of incidental protection, I am very glad.

Hence I can not see any sufficient reason for losing a revenue of over $107,000 per annum derived from the duty on pineapples by putting them on the free list. Nor can I see the wisdom or justice in losing this revenue by putting a prohibitive duty on pineapples and keeping the foreign-grown fruit out of this country altogether, as the amendment of the Senator from Florida, I predict, will do if adopted. So much for my personal views.

Taking another view of the case, the view of our friends on the other side of this Chamber, who believe in protection for protection's sake, a doctrine we on this side condemn as vicious in principle and without warrant of authority under the Constitution——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I thought I understood the Senator from Maryland to say that this proposed duty would be prohibitive. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is my prediction, sir; or almost entirely so.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That is the Senator's prediction?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And if the Senator will wait, I will give my reasons for that prediction later on.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. In justice, Mr. President, it seems to me that when the Senator makes a broad and wild statement of that kind his evidence might accompany his statement.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have just stated to the Senator that I shall give my reasons later.

For while there is a wide division of sentiment, as I understand, between Senators on the other side as to the schedules on certain classes and the rates on particular articles, some Senators belonging to the party in power contending that the promised revision of the tariff means a reduction of duties and others being quite as positive that a bona fide revision means an increase all along the line, there is substantially no division on the other side as to the fundamental principle involved, as there is none on this side. And though I can not bring myself to believe the doctrine of protection for protection's sake is wise and just, I am bound in candor to admit that the sentiment of the people of this country as expressed in the last three presidential elections is overwhelmingly against my own views.

Therefore, looking at the subject from the standpoint of business expediency, from the point of securing the prosperity of the United States as a whole, a little study discloses how disastrous any increase in the tariff on pineapples would be, weighing as best we can the advantages accruing to our friends on the 200 miles of sparsely settled pineapple land bordering the east coast of Florida, confessedly the only class benefited by a prohibitive tariff, as against the disadvantages to all the people of all the remaining States of the Union by reason of such a tariff.

Pineapples can scarcely be said to be in their native element in Florida. The climate is too uncertain and cold; slight freezes, such as sometimes occur, blast the year's crop in a night. Their growth must be stimulated with immense quantities of fertilizers, sometimes as much as 2 tons being used to the acre per year, and the area in which they can be grown at all is limited.

Cut off the supply from Cuba by this proposed protection to a fruit, which as grown in Florida can almost be said to be a hothouse plant; let the first frost come to decimate the Florida crop, and the United States will be without fresh pineapples for one season at least. The Florida crop at best only amounts to about 700,000 crates, less than one-half the fresh pineapples consumed in the United States; to state it accurately, I think that the greatest number that has been imported up to this year is 690,000 crates.

This protection asked for by the Senator from Florida could certainly be termed under these conditions "hothouse protection."

The Hawaiian Islands produce pineapples, which are, of course, admitted free of duty, but which can not be delivered

raw even in California in good condition, owing to the long sea trip. Almost the entire crop of Hawaii is canned, chiefly with the assistance of cooly labor, and marketed in the United States.

Porto Rico also produces pineapples. Most of them, however, are canned on the island.

The really dependable and regular source of supply for pineapples is Cuba. There the fruit finds congenial surroundings. It grows well, ripens well, and the island produces about 1,000,000 crates per annum. Nearly three-fourths of the Cuban crop under existing conditions find a market in the United States.

Almost invariably the Cuban pineapples are shipped in standard crates of one size, containing 2½ cubic feet, and weighing, when filled, about 80 pounds. They hold from 14 to 54 pineapples, and I am informed by competent authorities that the average-sized pineapples run about 36 to the crate.

Now, bearing in mind the reciprocity treaty with Cuba, making a reduction of 20 per cent on all Cuban imports, it is as simple as arithmetic can be made that one crate of Porto Rican pineapples will, at the present rate, pay a duty of 2½ times 7 cents, or 17½ cents, computing the duty by the cubic foot; and a crate of Cuban pineapples will pay 20 per cent less, or 14 cents duty.

But under the rate proposed by the senior Senator from Florida, the crate of Porto Rican pineapples will pay a duty of 40 cents and the crate of Cuban pineapples a duty of 32 cents, an increase as applied to Cuban fruit of 128½ per cent.

Mr. President, I have failed to hear such a startling increase proposed in the rate of any article since this session began; and I take it the Finance Committee, after considering the subject carefully and hearing experts, acted advisedly in reducing even the small increased rate named in the Payne bill, 1 cent per cubic foot or $1 per thousand, to the amount which was named in the Dingley Act, which has existed now for about twelve years, and under which the Florida growers have reached their present state of development.

But there are other considerations of expediency. The boxes in which pineapples are shipped are convenient to handle. The fruit remains in the original package from the field to the consumer; the business furnishes traffic for the American railroads, for the fruit is distributed to points far inland. The boxes themselves are all made from American lumber, and the paper in which each pineapple is wrapped before being packed for shipment is American made. The duty under the present system is easily computed by simply counting the crates and necessitates no weighing, since but very few pineapples are imported in bulk. I may say right here, Mr. President, that it is not feasible to import them in bulk, because they will not keep, and the detention to vessels while they are being counted is such that it is impracticable.

All custom-house men know the duty on these standard crates. To abandon the present system for a duty assessed according to weight necessitates the additional trouble and expense of weighing, and opens the door to frauds, such as have recently marred the good names of individuals and cost a large corporation an immense, though deserved, fine.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Will the Senator please state whether or not, in his judgment, it is more difficult to weigh a crate on a pair of scales or to measure it and ascertain its cubical contents?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In regard to that, these crates are easily estimated, because they are of one size; you only have to count the crates; you do not have to weigh them.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Then the Senator presumes that the same rule would not be applied if they were shipped by weight?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not in bulk.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I thought the Senator was addressing himself to the crate rate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I was speaking of the bulk.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. They would simply have to be counted if they came in bulk.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is a great deal of trouble to count a shipload of pineapples in bulk, one at a time. Besides that, if they were in bulk, they would not keep nearly as well, but would arrive here in very bad condition. I will say for the benefit of the Senate that there are practically none brought in bulk, and there have not been for several years.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. So that the reference was really between the measurement as to cubical contents and the weight that the Senator was addressing himself to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. American capital is largely engaged in the Cuban fruit business, and the importation of Cuban and West Indian fruit stimulates the export of American products, since freight rates are cheaper in the returning fruit steamers. Cuba herself pays the United States more than $11,000,000 for eight staple articles. She pays us over $17,000,000 for foodstuffs alone, and she sells us her pineapples.

This Cuban fruit forms the base of the supply for American canners, and this business has grown to be an important industry not only along the coast, but also in the interior. Cut off the supply of Cuban fruit and the men, material, and machinery employed must be used elsewhere. I venture the assertion that there are more men employed in packing pineapples in one State of the Union, perhaps one city, than are employed in growing all the pineapples produced within our borders.

I say, Mr. President, when you come to count the employment of labor, that the amount of labor employed in the production of pineapples does not begin to compare with the amount of labor that is employed in the canning of the fruit after it is ripe.

The canners now have to compete in the sale of their canned goods with the pineapples preserved in the Hawaiian Islands and in Porto Rico, where labor is cheap, the fresh fruit convenient, and with no duty to pay either on the raw or finished product. As against this the American canner starts out with an additional handicap at the least of 14 cents per crate. His business will simply be paralyzed should this be increased to 32 cents per crate.

Mr. President, under these conditions the canners of this country, competing with those of Hawaii and Porto Rico and with the fruit that is brought here to-day free, on which the freight is so much lessened by the fact that it is canned before it is brought into the country—I say it will simply paralyze the business should this duty be increased to 32 cents per crate.

And then, in applying the doctrine of expediency, the ultimate consumer ought to be considered. Pineapples ought not to be made a luxury. They are wholesome, palatable, and a staple article of food now fast growing in popular favor. It is idle to say that if the American consumers are placed at the mercy of the frosts in Florida and the enormously increased duty on the Cuban fruit that the price will not only be beyond the reach of the American canners, but also of everyone except the very rich.

Looking at the situation from yet another standpoint, I do not believe the Florida growers are dependent upon any increase of tariff for success.

Of course, they will make more with an increased tariff, but they will make it at the expense of our people elsewhere. They have reached a point of development and prosperity under the present tariff where they produce nearly 700,000 crates per year.

It seems that no amount of stimulus by reason of a protected tariff can result in the ultimate production of enough pineapples in Florida to supply the United States; otherwise we might bear the burden proposed with a little more patience, buoyed by the hope that in the course of time Florida might supply the demands of the country at some price.

But here we are confronted with the assertion that under the existing system of cultivation the area in Florida which will produce pineapples can not be materially enlarged.

It is therefore entirely clear that an increased duty will not increase the size of the crop, and will only increase the price to the consumers and the size of the profits to the owners of the acres now in pineapples.

By reason of their texture Florida pineapples carry better and keep longer than the Cuban fruit, and command a better average price of about 50 cents per box. The Florida fruit ripens about the time the Cuban crop is over, and the Florida fruit is best suited to table use, while the Cuban fruit is preferred by canners. So that because of these physical differences the competition is perhaps more fanciful than real.

In my part of the country fertilizers cost from $11 to $35 per ton, and while our farmers are enterprising and prosperous there is no staple field crop they raise sufficiently high priced to justify the use of more than half a ton of expensive fertilizer to the acre. Therefore, when I hear that the Florida pineapple growers apply 2 tons to the acre per year, it seems fairly conclusive to me, aside from everything else, that there is already at least a good profit in the business, and that all the Florida growers need is not an increased protective tariff, but something which we can not guarantee—that is, protection from frost.

Mr. President, to give this increased duty on pineapples for the benefit and protection of a few growers, means the breaking down of a large canning industry, the throwing out of employment of many employees, the increasing of the price to the consumer, and excluding a staple article of fruit from the

great masses of the people who have become accustomed to having it upon their tables.

The amendment of the Senator from Florida proposes an unreasonable and unjust taxation, which I can not believe for a moment will be sanctioned by this body.

I received a circular letter from some of the protected pineapple growers of Florida, in which they give as a reason for an increased duty on pineapples that they have to fertilize very heavily. Another is that the land in Cuba is cheaper. Mr. President, it is not my impression that the Government or the people should be taxed to pay for fertilizers or to pay for the difference in the cost of land to the people who raise the products of this country at the expense of the people generally.

Mr. RAYNER obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aldrich	Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Owen
Bacon	Clay	Gamble	Page
Bailey	Cullom	Gore	Paynter
Bankhead	Cummins	Guggenheim	Perkins
Beveridge	Curtis	Heyburn	Piles
Borah	Daniel	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rayner
Bourne	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Root
Briggs	Depew	Jones	Scott
Bristow	Dick	Kean	Simmons
Brown	Dillingham	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Bulkeley	Dixon	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Burkett	Dolliver	Lorimer	Smoot
Burnham	du Pont	McCumber	Taliaferro
Burrows	Elkins	McEnery	Taylor
Burton	Fletcher	Martin	Tillman
Carter	Flint	Nelson	Warner
Chamberlain	Foster	Nixon	Warren
Clapp	Frye	Oliver	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have responded to their names. There is a quorum of the Senate present.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I shall be brief in the explanation I will make upon this schedule. I am really of the opinion that the Senate, as a whole, does not understand it; therefore I should like to ask the attention of Senators that have not had an opportunity to examine it. They understand one side of it, but not our side. And as we have had no opportunity whatever to present this matter to the Finance Committeee, not the slightest, I should like to have the opportunity to present it to the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO], at the conclusion of his speech, I think, made a rather unfortunate remark in reference to the Senators from Maryland representing the canning industries of that State.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, the Senator understands that that remark had no personal significance. I knew that there were many canning factories in Maryland, in Baltimore, the managers of which were the constituents of the Senators from Maryland, and I meant my remark in that sense alone.

Mr. RAYNER. Of course there was nothing objectionable about that, Mr. President; but if it was not personal, I hardly know what it was. I only know, directly or indirectly, one gentleman connected with the canning industries of Baltimore; and if the Senator from Florida says that we are here representing the canning industry of Maryland, I could with equal grace say to him that he is here representing the high protectionists of the Republican party. But I will not say that, because I do not believe that he does represent them.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. If the Senator from Maryland believes that I do not represent the high-protection idea of the Republican party, I submit to him that he has gone out of his way to make an allusion indicating that possibly I do; in other words, to set up a man of straw and knock him down at my expense.

Mr. RAYNER. And in the same way, Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has made an unfortunate allusion in referring to us as representing the canning industries of Baltimore. I desire to say, in order to explain and qualify the statement I made just now, that the constituents of the Senator from Florida who are urging him on in this matter do represent the high-protection principles of the Republican party; and I think I will demonstrate that fact to the entire satisfaction of the Senate if the Senator from Florida will permit me to proceed.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I can not interrupt the Senator against his consent.

Mr. RAYNER. No; but if I can not prove that, I will submit to an interruption. I make the proposition that I can prove and demonstrate to the Senate that the principle advocated by the Senator from Florida represents the extreme protection principles of the Republican party.

I find no fault with the Senator from Florida. There is no angry feeling, no personal hostility whatever, with me. I have the highest respect and admiration for the Senator from Florida and his distinguished colleague. No two men in the Senate have been more faithful and loyal and zealous for the interests of their State than the two Senators from Florida; but I want to show the Senate that it is going beyond all bounds in adopting this amendment, as it proceeds beyond the high-protection ideas of the leader of this Senate, the Senator from Rhode Island. This is asking for protection beyond what the Senator from Rhode Island deems necessary in the way of protection. This, from a Democratic source, is asking for a duty that the Senator from Rhode Island has said is not necessary even for the purposes of protection. I want the Senate to understand that. If it is not protection, what is it—a revenue duty?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose we leave out the idea of what the Senator from Rhode Island thinks about protection. Does the Senator from Maryland think that it is protection?

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator from Maryland believes that this duty is prohibition, not protection—absolute prohibition. Under the guise of a revenue measure, it is an absolute prohibition against an article of necessary importation, as I think I shall be able to show. And as I am opposed to prohibitive duties and opposed to protection, I shall argue the matter along the line of what has been my consistent argument for a quarter of a century when propositions like this have been involved.

Let us look at this matter for a moment. We want to look at it fairly. I do not want to do any injustice to anybody—certainly not to the State of Florida, because within the last week or two there has been formed in my State a commercial alliance with the State of Florida that will inure, I hope, to the perpetual benefit of both States.

I want to say this—and I say it honestly and frankly: That if the canning industries of my State had asked me to vote for a certain duty, and I thought in my own mind that that duty would only benefit the canning industries and would not benefit the consumers of my State, I would not listen to it. I would not pay the slightest attention to it. But when the manufacturing interests of my State simply ask for a retention of the Dingley rates, simply ask for a proposition consented to by the senior Senator from Rhode Island, when we simply ask, not that rates be increased and not that rates be reduced, but that the high rates of the Dingley bill may be permitted to stand——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. Let me finish. I trust the Senator will not interrupt me right in the middle of a sentence. I will yield in a moment. And when their ideas are in accordance with my own ideas, opposed as I am to prohibition and protection at every point, then it matters not to me whether, directly or indirectly, I represent the manufacturing interests of my State. I represent those interests whenever they are in accord with the demands of the American consumer. I decline to represent those interests, either in the way of free raw materials or a reduction of duties or an increase of duties, when they conflict with what I consider to be the rights of the American consumer.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator now yield?

Mr. RAYNER. I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Maryland look upon the Dingley rate as a revenue rate only?

Mr. RAYNER. I am not prepared to say that it is a revenue rate only. I can only answer the Senator by telling him the amount of the Florida fruit that has come into the market under the Dingley rate; and then he can come to his own conclusions as to whether it is a revenue rate or not. I will say that this amendment is not a revenue rate—it is a prohibitive rate. It will keep Cuban pineapples out of the American market. If the Senator will allow me to proceed, I think I can demonstrate that proposition to him. I have no academic opinion to pass upon whether the Dingley rates are revenue rates or protective rates upon this schedule. I suppose that to some extent they are both revenue rates and protective rates. But the Senator from Idaho must not confuse protective rates with prohibitive rates. That confusion has existed all along during this debate. Protection is one thing; prohibition is another.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. You may levy a protective rate for the purpose of encouraging American industry, and you may impose a prohibitive rate so as to keep out all importations and give the

whole American market to the American producer; but these two elements constitute entirely different propositions.

Now, Mr. President, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. As the Senator has given considerable attention to this matter, I thought he would be able to tell us whether, as a matter of fact, the Dingley rate was a revenue rate, or whether there was any protection in it.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I have spoken now for six minutes, and I am very sorry I can not tell the Senator everything in six minutes. I have heard speeches made here for hours that I thought I could have compressed into twenty minutes; but if the Senator will give me just a few minutes longer, I think I shall satisfy him on that point. I can not answer all these questions in a few moments. Let me proceed in my own way and he will be satisfied.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean he will proceed to satisfy me that it is a revenue rate?

Mr. RAYNER. I propose to proceed in my own way in reference to the Dingley rates.

Mr. DIXON. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes; if it has any pertinency to the subject.

Mr. DIXON. I assure the Senator that it has. The Senator states that the rate of duty proposed by the Senator from Florida is a prohibitive one. Does he mean by that that if it is enacted into law, it will transfer the production and raising of pineapples from Cuban soil to Florida soil?

Mr. RAYNER. In one sense I mean that and in another sense I do not mean it at all, and I will explain this statement.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. In one sense I mean it.

Mr. DIXON. This difference between protective-tariff duties——

Mr. RAYNER. Please let me answer the question without any suggestions. In one sense it will not do that; and that is what seems to me, if I may say it with great deference to the Senator from Florida, the perfectly senseless proposition that is now before the Senate. In the month of April and during the greater part of the month of May not a Florida pineapple comes into the American market. The Cuban pineapples come in here during April and the Cuban pineapples come in here during May, but not a Florida pineapple comes into the American market during that time. In other words, when the canning industries have finished with the Cuban product the Florida pineapple commences to come in.

Not only that, Mr. President, but——

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. Not only that, but the Florida pineapple—and I want the Senate to understand that—is not used for canning. I trust that both the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Montana understand that the Florida pineapple is not used for canning purposes at all.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RAYNER. I do; yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Is there a time during the year when the Florida pineapple and the Cuban pineapple do compete in the same market in the United States? And if so, if the Senator has the information, when is the time, and what is the effect of the competition?

Mr. RAYNER. I think there is such a time. I think they compete at the time when the Florida pineapples come into the market; and that, I understand——

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. Just one moment—that, I understand, is about the latter part of May. But they do not compete for canning purposes. Florida pineapples are not canned at all. This is a proposition to prevent the importation of a product that does not come substantially in conflict with the product that the amendment is designed to protect. Has there ever been another proposition like that before the Senate of the United States?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. Just one moment. The Senator from Delaware has arisen. I know he has a very important question; and if he will wait just a minute, until I finish this sentence, I will yield to both of you.

The Florida Protective Fruit Growers' Association—that is the name of your association, a "protective" association—asks for a prohibitive duty upon Cuban pineapples that come in here at a time when Florida pineapples do not come in, and that are used for a purpose that Florida pineapples never have and never will be used for.

Now I will yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he considers the pineapple as an article of luxury or an article of necessity? And if it is an article of luxury, is it not perfectly proper to levy a duty upon it?

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, it is a necessity to the Senator from Delaware, and perhaps a luxury to me. [Laughter.] I will explain that. There is a celebrated philosopher who divides society into two elements. One is the element that has more appetite than dinner, and the other is the element that has more dinner than appetite. To one element pineapples might be a necessity, and to the other element they might be a luxury. They are as much of a necessity as pears, or oranges, or peaches, or lemons, or any other article that you have upon the fruit schedule.

Not only that, but I have been told by a celebrated physician within the last few weeks—and, by the way, he made a mistake about it—that pineapples are good for insomnia. I suffer a great deal with insomnia; and he told me that if I would eat two pieces of the pineapple that the Senator from Florida sent me, I would go to sleep and sleep all night. [Laughter.] That was two weeks ago, because Florida pineapples only came in at that time, and I could not get them before. I ate two pieces of pineapple two weeks ago, and I have not closed my eyes since. [Laughter.] They evidently were not very much of either a necessity or a luxury to me. They will put to sleep the canning industries of my State, however, if you will pass this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And of other States.

Mr. RAYNER. Yes; and of other States. But I want to be brief about this matter. I am not talking to our side, because I hardly believe there is a Senator on our side——

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

Mr. RAYNER. One moment; I will yield to both of you in a minute. I hardly think there is a Senator on our side that will vote for a protective duty that the Senator from Rhode Island does not ask for. I hardly think that there is a Democrat that will say: "We will vote for a duty beyond the duty believed to be sufficient by the Senator from Rhode Island." I have never known a Senator upon this side of the Chamber to vote for such a proposition. The Senator from Rhode Island comes in here—and I want to put the whole burden of this argument upon him—with this proposition:

> Pineapples, in barrels and other packages, 7 cents per cubic foot; in bulk, $7 per thousand.

That is the opinion of the Senator from Rhode Island—and he is the foreman of the jury that is sitting in this case. In the House they had it 8 cents per cubic foot and $8 per thousand. The Senator from Rhode Island thought that was too much. High protectionist as he is, about as high as you find them, he puts the duty back to 7 cents per cubic foot and $7 per thousand. Now comes in my Democratic friend from Florida and says that the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is too low, the proposition of the House of Representatives is too low, the provision of the Dingley bill is too low; and he wants to put it at a half a cent a pound, which, instead of being 14 cents a crate, as under the Dingley bill, amounts to 32 cents a crate, or 128½ per cent protection, and an absolute prohibition upon what I conceive to be an article of necessity.

I say this, because the same physician that gave me this advice about eating pineapples at night, before retiring, gave me some other advice which may or may not be equally reliable; but I have sustained that portion of it in consultation with other medical men in this city. He told me that pineapples are now being used in almost every hospital of the United States.

I do not know what is in them, but there is something in them that, in the case of persons convalescing from fevers, acts as a tonic and a recuperative; and they are used to-day as an article of absolute necessity. They are used at the home and at the fireside of the American consumer. They are used in the tenement districts of New York. They are in universal use to-day wherever people can purchase them at the prices that now obtain. And the proposition to protect a narrow strip of land, consisting of a few hundred acres, in a single State of this Union, and to absolutely keep out a product that is necessary for the American consumer, is one that I think will not be tolerated, even by the protectionists of this body. I have no idea that a Senator upon this side of the Chamber will arise in his place and say to a Democratic constituency: "I have gone beyond the Senator from Rhode Island in my principles of prohibitive protection."

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator has three times distinctly declared that this is a prohibitive rate. I appealed to him when he first made the declaration to prove it, and he said he would prove it. He has made the statement twice since without any proof whatever to support it. I now ask that in justice to these people whom he is slandering on the floor of the Senate he will either offer his proof or cease to make statements that have no foundation in fact.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, let us see how much I am slandering these gentlemen. Let me read a circular that has been sent broadcast from these gentlemen that the Senator says I am slandering, and see whether this is a revenue duty or not. When the Senator from Florida arose, he said—I thought by way of irony and satire, but he now appears to have been in earnest—that he was advocating this measure because it is a revenue duty. Let us see, now, upon what ground his constituents are advocating it:

Florida Fruit and Vegetable Shippers' Protective Association.

Why, the very name of the association is "Protective Association." They are not a revenue association. Why do they not change their name, and call this the "Florida Fruit and Vegetable Shippers' Revenue Reform Association?" [Laughter.] There is no revenue about this.

We are supposed to be in the possession of our senses here in the Senate. We are not a kindergarten, nor an institution for the feeble-minded, nor anything of the sort. We are presumed to understand this subject. I am not criticising the Senator from Florida, because he is acting for the best interests of his State. These gentlemen are asking for protection because this fruit grows upon the soil of Florida. If it were not grown upon the soil of Florida, the Senator from Florida would not be here asking for a revenue duty, for instance, upon Montana or Indiana pineapples, if they were cultivated there.

When this question comes up, please see that the Florida industry—

Does what? Gets a revenue duty? Oh, no!

Please see that the Florida industry is protected—

Is this protection?—

against fierce competition from Cuba, as Florida pineapples are now handicapped.

And so on, going on to the cost of production.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I ask that the Senator will give the Senate the benefit of the communication that he has referred to.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Secretary please read it? I have no objection to it at all. I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

FLORIDA FRUIT AND VEGETABLE
SHIPPERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 29, 1909.

Hon. ISIDOR RAYNER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Florida pineapples. When this question comes up please see that the Florida industry is protected against fierce competition from Cuba, as Florida pineapples are now handicapped as follows:

First. Cost of production. Owing to the fact that Florida pineapples are grown under a protective tariff, making greater expenses in labor, fertilizers, material, and general living expenses of the producer while possessing no advantages in the markets of the country. On the other hand, Cuban land is cheap compared with the cost of Florida pineapple land. The Cuban soil is more productive without the use of fertilizers, the labor is cheaper, and living expenses of the producers are less.

Illustration: The average cost delivered of a crate of Florida pineapples to the markets of the country, including cost of production and freight charges, is $1.90 per crate. The average cost delivered of a crate of Cuban pineapples to the markets of this country, including freight and duty charges, is $1.36 per crate. Difference in favor of a foreign production in American markets is 54 cents per crate. (See pamphlet entitled "A Protective Tariff," issued by the Indian River Pineapple Growers' League. These figures have never been questioned.)

Second. Florida pinapples are handicapped by the transportation companies, who impose a higher freight rate for a shorter haul than on Cuban pineapples.

Illustration: The freight rate on Cuban pineapples in carload lots from Habana to Chicago, Ill., via Knights Key and Jacksonville, is 66½ cents per crate, while the freight charges on Florida pineapples from Miami to Chicago are 92.6 cents per crate, which is equivalent to $78 per car.

Third. The Florida pineapple is entitled to duty of not less than one-half cent per pound in order to partly offset the difference in cost of production and to help equalize the difference in freight charges.

Yours, very truly,

J. C. CHASE,
Secretary and Treasurer.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I want to get this matter correctly, if I can. The Senator from Florida is offering an amendment proposing one-half cent per pound on pineapples. Is that correct?

Mr. RAYNER. That is correct.

Mr. CLAY. What is the duty on oranges under the bill as we have it? Is it 1 cent a pound?

Mr. RAYNER. I think so.

Mr. CLAY. What is the duty on lemons, as it stands? It is 1½ cents, according to my understanding.

Mr. RAYNER. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. Why should the Finance Committee put a duty of 1 cent a pound on oranges and 1½ cents a pound on lemons and half a cent a pound, or less than half a cent a pound, on pineapples?

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator might as well ask what is the duty on bichromate of potash, or on snakes, or anything else. They have no possible connection with each other, not the slightest. Every schedule is governed by its own environment.

Mr. CLAY. It is in the fruit schedule.

Mr. RAYNER. There may be a hundred things in the fruit schedule that have no connection with each other. There is no connection in economy or in logic in any such proposition. Because oranges have the protection of a cent a pound and lemons have the protection obtained by the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] of a cent and a quarter, that is no reason why pineapples should have a protective duty of half a cent, because the environment that surrounds the growth of the pineapple is an entirely different proposition from that which surrounds the other fruits in the schedule.

Now, if Senators will let me just proceed for a little while without interruption, I will then yield to any question, and I think I can satisfy the Senator from Georgia. I wanted to answer the question of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Montana. The letter which was just read answers it. I will emphasize what this letter says. The Senator from Idaho asked the question whether this was a protective duty under the Dingley bill. I want to show what this letter says.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRISTOW in the chair). The letter has been taken to the reporters' office. It will be here in a moment.

Mr. RAYNER. I will proceed without the letter and refer to an argument made upon this schedule. It is put in as good a form as I can put it; no line or argument that has been advanced has been overlooked. First, let Senators understand what are the Dingley rates:

268. Pineapples, in barrels and other packages, 7 cents per cubic foot of the capacity of barrels or packages; in bulk, $7 per thousand.

The Senator's amendment is half a cent a pound and $8 a thousand, going beyond the Dingley law; as I have said, going beyond the House provision and going away beyond the senior Senator from Rhode Island and what I conceive to be at least a majority of his committee, until some strange dream came over their spirit that I only heard about in the last few days, and that was without any notice to us and without the opportunity on our part to cross-examine them or even to see them. Within the last few weeks the Florida protectionists have had a hearing, and at that hearing the Fruit Growers' Protective Association of Florida gave their version of this affair, and Senators who are opposed to the Fruit Growers' Protective Association were not notified to come before the committee; and I think we may as well understand that quite a number of the committee have changed their minds. It was a star-chamber proceeding, an ex parte proceeding, absolutely unjustified by any procedure in any civilized assemblage of the earth.

I have not criticised this procedure except, perhaps, in an academic way; but looking at this proposition now here, the committee of the Senator from Rhode Island unanimously—and when I speak of unanimity I mean unanimous among its majority members—comes into this body with an amendment, and then, after that amendment is submitted to us and assurance given to us that that amendment will not be changed by that committee, an ex parte hearing is given to gentlemen who are opposed to that amendment, without the slightest notice to the persons who are in favor of it, and upon the basis of that proceeding, without the right upon our part to confront them and the members of that committee, without listening to any arguments on the other side, they changed their minds. It is not right; it is not fair; and you can not make it right before the American people.

Every man is entitled to be heard, and that is the reason why I was anxious that the Senate should hear me, because we have had no hearing before this grand jury. We have been practically convicted upon ex parte testimony, or rather the indictment is before the Senate and I am before a petit jury, with the hope of getting justice done, although I know it is largely prejudiced against me, and swayed even by the silence of the senior Senator from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. RAYNER. What does the Senator say?

Mr. ALDRICH. I wished to interrupt the Senator to say that the Committee on Finance have not changed their recommendation in this regard.

Mr. RAYNER. I am very glad to hear that. I am very glad indeed to hear it from the Senator from Rhode Island. I hope that he and the committee will be with us on this proposition.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RAYNER. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIXON. There is so much discrepancy among the Democratic Senators that I should like to know what the Senator from Maryland is going to do with the Democratic members of the Finance Committee.

Mr. RAYNER. I do not know the attitude of the Democratic members. The Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] is a member of the Finance Committee. The Senator from Montana knows what his attitude is.

Mr. McLAURIN. I believe the Republican members have not allowed the Democratic members to be present at their meetings.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not know that we had placed any restriction on the voices or votes of the Democratic members of the committee.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not a member of the Finance Committee, but I understand that the bill is being considered in the committee by the Republican members of it alone.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a matter which has been frequently discussed upon the floor of the Senate. I have never noticed that any member of the committee felt any restraint upon his utterances on account of it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not believe they are invited to the committee meetings. If I am in error on that I should like to be corrected, because I have been laboring under the impression that when a committee meeting is held it is exclusively composed of the Republican members of the Finance Committee. Not being a member of that committee, if I am in error I would like to be corrected.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] is not present. He will likely inform the Senator from Mississippi on that subject.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, this letter answers, from the standpoint of the writer, the inquiry of the Senators from Idaho and Montana.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RAYNER. Will the Senator allow me to read the letter?

Mr. BORAH. I wish to ask the Senator what his opinion is, after an investigation, as to whether or not there was any protection in the Dingley rate. If the Senator has no opinion upon that subject, I do not care to press him.

Mr. RAYNER. My opinion is, and always has been, that the Dingley rate is entirely too high. Pineapples ought to be free. There is no reason on earth why they should not be free except for purposes of revenue. Upon any principle of political economy they ought to be free. A fruit of the earth like this ought to be free, but for purposes of revenue and protection the Dingley duty was put upon it and the Dingley duty is high enough. That is my opinion. I have said that over and over again. What is the opinion of the Fruit and Vegetable Shippers' Protective Association of Florida? They say:

> Owing to the fact that Florida pineapples are grown now under a protective tariff—

That is the reason. They are now under a protective tariff. I want to ask one thing. Did the Republican platform agree to protect against fertilizers? Did the Republican platform agree to protect against the price of land? Mark this in the Republican platform, because I have no fear that on this side we will vote for any duty beyond what the Senator from Rhode Island seems to think proper. I may be mistaken in this, but that is my supposition. Did it agree to provide against loss by freight? I ask these Senators is there anything in the Republican platform that goes beyond a reasonable profit to the producer? Why not put in the platform that we will protect them against loss in freight, that we will protect them against the use of expensive fertilizers, because I understand—I may be wrong—that it takes 4,000 pounds to an acre to fertilize the fields and orchards of Florida into prosperity at the expense and sacrifice of the American consumers. I may be wrong in that proposition, but that information has been imparted to me.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President, if I should take the time to correct all the misstatements and errors the Senator has made on this subject, we should not get to a vote this afternoon.

Mr. RAYNER. Correct that one. That will not take a long time. Just correct this one.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I would correct them all.

Mr. RAYNER. Just correct that one. That will take a very short time. In the absence of the Senator's correction, which is an admission that the proposition is true, I say it takes about 4,000 pounds of fertilizer to adapt this land for the purpose of the cultivation of this fruit. If I have made any other misstatement, the Senator has plenty of time.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I will avail myself of it.

Mr. RAYNER. The Senator says he will avail himself of it. I have no doubt of it. I am glad of it, because I want a fair and frank statement.

I want to say to the Senator, that while I may be very emphatic in my statement, I have no feeling on this subject. If I have made any misstatement or any erroneous statement, I want the Senator from Florida to correct me at the proper time, because I do not want the Senate to labor under a misapprehension. I do want, however, the Senate to have fairly and squarely the facts before it, and then let it do what it may think best and proper according to the dictates of its own conscience.

Now, let me go on. The report of the Senate committee struck out the word "eight" and restored the old Dingley rate of 7 cents per cubic foot as the capacity of barrels or packages and made the rate in bulk $7. The Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO], on April 20, introduced the following amendment:

> On page 84 strike out lines 14, 15, and 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Pineapples, one-half of 1 cent per pound."

Now, what the Senator wants to know is the difference between the Dingley rate and one-half of 1 cent per pound. I will give it according to this statement, and if it is wrong the Senator can correct it.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator understands that that is not now the amendment which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. RAYNER. You have it half a cent a pound, or $8 a thousand. Listen to this argument for just a moment that I shall read. It is very instructive.

> The pineapples imported into this country from Cuba are packed in crates.

I want the Senate to understand that they do not come in bulk. I am reading from an argument made by a canner, who, I suppose, is to be classed with the fiend known as an "importer." No matter what I am reading from, if it is all true, it does not make much difference. If it is untrue, the Senator from Florida will, I know, contradict it.

> Cuban pineapples have never been shipped in bulk, but for many years were shipped in barrels, until some of the American woodenware mills introduced the crate now in common use.

This crate is manufactured in the United States. It is not manufactured in Cuba, nor the paper, I understand. That does not influence me one way or the other. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] shakes his head. That is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That was the crate.

Mr. RAYNER. It does not make any difference if the Senator votes with us on his own grounds, but that is not the ground I take, because these crates are manufactured in the United States; but it is true that it affords a sufficient ground for high protectionists to at least stand by the chairman of the committee.

> These crates are of one standard size, measuring 10 inches by 12 inches by 36 inches, outside measurements, and having a cubical capacity of 2½ feet each, which, under the Dingley law and under the Aldrich-Payne bill, will make the duty exactly 14 cents per crate.

Does the Senate understand that it is 14 cents a crate now?

> Pineapples packed into these crates are packed with regard to size, from 14 to 54 being placed in each crate. These crates vary slightly in weight, but will weigh approximately 80 pounds each.
>
> Second. The duty under the Dingley law, and as reenacted in the Aldrich-Payne bill, is 14 cents per crate.

That is the duty now, 14 cents a crate, approved of by the committee in the first instance.

> If the amendment proposed by Senator TALIAFERRO should be adopted, it would increase this duty to 40 cents per crate.

Is that true?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It is absolutely false. It would make the duty 40 cents a crate on pineapples, or 32 cents a crate under Cuban reciprocity, as compared with 15 cents a crate.

Mr. RAYNER. I asked the Senator whether it is true or not, before I finished reading the sentence. The statement is made that—

> It would increase this duty to 40 cents per crate, less the 20 per cent allowed on Cuban imports by the reciprocity treaty, making the net duty on each crate of pineapples 32 cents.

That is correct, is it not? This duty raises it from 14 cents to 32 cents under the Taliaferro amendment, or an increase of 128½ per cent, which would practically mean the prohibition of the importation of Cuban pineapples.

Now, Mr. President, here is some of the testimony by one of the witnesses who represented the fruit growers' association.

That is a very important point. It is that these Florida pineapples have over again been subjected to frost and the crop has been ruined. This year they have a phenomenal crop, on account, I suppose, of the advancing season and the rain, but they have never had a crop in all the history, as I understand, of the Florida production equal to what they have had this year.

The amount of crates that have come in from Cuba have been about a million crates. One of the witnesses testifies:

The pineapple industry is more subject to frost than oranges, and for a frost to get into an orange tree requires what we term a "freeze;" but a frost will get into the pineapple just as it would into a tomato plant, for it is a very tender plant.

In other words, you can not depend upon the Florida crop and no amount of protection can make it so. I say again and I repeat, because I want the Senate to understand it, I want the high protectionists of the Republican party to understand it, that the duty the Florida Senators are asking for now is a duty upon a product that does not conflict with their own product at all in one of its principal uses and purposes, and that is because the Florida pineapple can not be used, never has been used, and never will be used for canning purposes. Is it right—I appeal to this body upon the principles if not of economy, upon the principles of right and justice—is it right in behalf of the fruit growers' association of Florida, to give them a duty upon Cuban pineapples during the months of April and May, when their pineapple is not grown and when the Cuban pineapple during these months is used in the canning industries of this country, a use to which the Florida pineapple is never put, and never has been?

Now, just one word——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. For information, I ask the Senator if there is any reason why the Florida pineapple can not be canned?

Mr. RAYNER. There is, I understand. There is a reason why it can not be canned.

Mr. GALLINGER. In other words, my question would go to this point—that if the production was greatly increased and beyond the consumption of the fresh pineapples, could they not be canned as we can pineapples here? I know nothing about it.

Mr. RAYNER. I do not either, except what somebody tells me.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. As a matter of fact, the Florida pineapple is canned and is being canned. There are canneries right among the fields actually canning pineapples. What is the use of talking that sort of stuff? They are being canned. It is wholly immaterial whether the Florida pineapple is used for all the purposes the Cuban pineapple is used for or whether the Cuban pineapple is used for all purposes the Florida pineapple is used for. In other words, what difference does it make whether the Florida pineapple is canned or not if the Cuban pineapple is eaten as well as canned?

Mr. GALLINGER. I recall what a young lady is said to have observed in California when asked what they did with all their fruit. She said, "We eat what we can and we can what we can't." So I wondered whether after we get through eating Florida pineapples and there are some left, they can not be canned.

Mr. RAYNER. I have not the testimony before me, but one of their own witnesses testified that the Florida pineapple is not canned. Oh, I suppose by some process a few of them might be canned; but I ask the Senator from Florida whether the Florida pineapple is canned outside of his State?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I am not as familiar with the Baltimore canneries as the Senator from Maryland. I can only state that they are canned in Florida.

Mr. RAYNER. Are they canned outside of Florida?

I say the Florida pineapple is not only too valuable to can, but their composition is of such a nature that they are not fit for canning purposes. Now, let us look at this for a minute. This is their own witness, I understand:

Mr. BOUTELL. To what extent are you canning fruit in Florida?
Mr. MCMULLEN. Not at all.

There is your own witness before the committee. Is he a reliable witness?

Mr. BOUTELL. Why not?
Mr. MCMULLEN. It is on account of the price of labor; and then, again, the supply of fruit is not sufficient to keep the canneries running. We have nothing to keep the industry going all the year round. The fruit comes in by itself, and it is in a territory by itself, and if we shipped we could not pay the local freight of 25 cents per crate.
Mr. BOUTELL. Then you can not have canned pineapples down there?
Mr. MCMULLEN. No, sir.
Mr. BOUTELL. How are they eaten; are they eaten raw?
Mr. MCMULLEN. Yes, sir.

That contradicts the statement of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have seen them canned.

Mr. RAYNER. There are very few pineapples that are canned in the United States except the Cuban pineapples. The Senator's pineapples do not come in.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. RAYNER. Certainly.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that when the Florida pineapples do come into the market it is about the time the Cuban market is being unloaded with a poorer and cheaper stock; that it is all thrown into this country at that time at very much reduced prices, and as a result drives the price of the Florida product down in the only months in which they can sell it?

Mr. RAYNER. No, sir; I do not think that is true at all. I do not think the Florida pineapple is driven out. I think the Florida pineapples sell at 50 cents a crate in the New York market when they come in—higher than the Cuban pineapple. I think I am right about it. Then when the Cuban pineapples come in they come in for canning. When the Florida pineapples come in, the canning season is over. The canning season is never over when they come in. The Florida pineapple is not a canning pineapple. You can not make it useful for canning. It is used for a different purpose.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Assume that the canning season is over, then the Cuban pineapple that comes in after the Florida pineapple comes in is used for exactly the same purpose as the Florida pineapple.

Mr. RAYNER. I have no doubt about that proposition.

Mr. MCCUMBER. And gluts the market with pineapples at that time.

Mr. RAYNER. I do not know about that.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Just at the time when the Florida pineapple is on the market.

Mr. RAYNER. Does the Senator think that the Senators from Florida would agree to let the Cuban pineapples come in free in April and May? That will settle the question. You can then get all the duty you want on June and July pineapples. Let pineapples that come in April or May, that do not conflict with the Florida growth, come in free. Why put a duty upon these pineapples that do not conflict with the American growth? That is what I am trying to argue. Let them come in free then, or lower the revenue duty.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I merely want to call attention to the fact I stated in the beginning: It was the position of the Senator that he wanted the tariff raised by putting things on the free list. That is his revenue idea.

Mr. RAYNER. I have no objection to being called a free trader by a Democrat. I am for free trade wherever it is consistent with the revenues of the Government. I will not deprive this Government of any revenue if I can help it, because I believe in collecting revenue by custom-house taxation; and when consistent with the revenues of the Government and the Government does not need revenue on a particular article or on a particular schedule which is a necessity of the American market, wherever I can do it I will put the article on the free list. I am not hurt by any such allusion as that.

Mr. President, I may have something further to say, but I think that this discussion has been very much prolonged. I only want, in conclusion, to refer to one thing which is pertinent now when we are dealing with a prohibitive duty. There is but one man on this floor who, in my judgment—and I say that with great deference to all Senators who have made great arguments on the tariff—there is but one man on this floor who has properly defined what the Republican platform really means; and, with great respect, I commend that definition to the Senators from Florida.

I want to give the definition of the word "revision"—and then I shall conclude—as laid down by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN]. He gave that definition in a great speech delivered a few days ago. I was giving him my rapt attention; I was greatly interested in that definition; and I do not want to make any mistake about it, for I have the speech. The Senator from Idaho, who is one of the most capable lawyers in this body, and possessed—I am sorry that he is not here, but what I am saying is complimentary to him—of a penetrating and analytical mind, made a startling and entirely accurate

announcement in his address in regard to the proper interpretation of the Republican platform. I want the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to hear it, for he was not present when the statement was made, but came in just as the Senator from Idaho was finishing. The gifted senior Senator from Indiana and the able and fearless Senators from Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and other States have for weeks proclaimed that "revision" meant "revision downward." This insurgent artillery has cannonaded the Senator from Rhode Island with such a continuous volley upon this subject that the Senator from Rhode Island had almost concluded that this was really what the platform meant, when the Senator from Idaho relieved his mind of any such fantastic notion.

The senior Senator from Idaho goes to the root of things. He does not dally amid the shrubbery and the foliage. He does not care what declaimers and elocutionists and false prophets and commentators tell the people about the platform. He goes to the dictionary and consults the art of the lexicographer; and, lawyer that he is, he gives to the Senate a bill of particulars upon the definition of "revision," so that, for the first time, now we really know what "revision" means.

When the platform speaks of revision—

Says the Senator from Idaho—

it simply means that the Republican party will promise to look into the tariff. To "revise" means to look into, to see again, and to review for the purpose of correcting errors. That is all, and nothing more; so that when the Republican party promised to revise the tariff it simply promised to look into it, and all this talk about revision meaning revision downward is merely captious and frivolous sophistry and quibbling.

In order that I may do the Senator from Idaho no injustice, I read a few lines from this delightful dissertation. This is the language of the Senator from Idaho:

The Senator from Iowa stated correctly to-day the meaning of the word "revision" or "revise." It was merely a promise to the people that we would look again at the tariff laws of the country.

What does the Senator from Iowa think of that?

Look again, for what purpose? That we might inspect, as a man inspects the home in which he lives.

* * * * * * *

Mr. NELSON. The Senator will concede that the Republican platform at Chicago did prescribe a revision of the tariff, and did provide for it. Now, what was the purpose of that? What was the purpose of putting any plank about the revision of the tariff in the platform? What was it for?

Mr. HEYBURN. Because there was an inquiry abroad in the land as to whether or not the tariff rested upon a sound basis.

* * * * * * *

Mr. NELSON. What was the purpose of revision contemplated in the platform? What was the revision that the platform had in view?

Mr. HEYBURN. The purpose I have already stated. The insertion of that plank was an assurance to those who were in doubt, and in doubt because of their want of knowledge.

* * * * * * *

It was a reply to their expression of uncertainty that the great Republican party would look into the matter.

And, Mr. President, that is the meaning of the word "revision." There is a canon of the law that when a word has a well-defined and accepted signification you must construe it in that sense, and this is an unbending and inexorable rule; and when you come to construe the word "revision" in the Republican platform you must construe it in the same way that you would if it occurred in the bill of sale of a cow or a mule. "Revise" means to see again.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator from Maryland is not now quoting any remarks of mine?

Mr. RAYNER. No; I am reading my own speech. I do not want to quote the Senator's speech as mine.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is one part of it for which I am not responsible.

Mr. RAYNER. I have finished with the Senator from Idaho, and I am now going on myself. I hope the Senator will not accuse me of quoting his speech as a part of mine. "Revise" means to see again. It comes from the Latin.

I want to say to the Senator that he is absolutely and accurately right about this proposition, and that all of his colleagues are all wrong. "Revision" means exactly what the Senator from Idaho has said it meant. I said so upon many a platform, but the people did not believe me. I said, and so did a number of my Democratic colleagues upon this floor, that "revision" meant nothing; that "revision" did not mean revision downward, because "revision" might mean revision upward; and I am here to sustain the Senator from Idaho that his interpretation and definition of that word is correct; and when the Republican party said they would revise the tariff they simply meant to defraud and deceive the people; but the people did not understand it the way the Senator from Idaho defined it.

But, as I was going on to say, the Senator from Idaho is correct. "Revise" means to see again. It comes from the Latin word "re," again, and "videre," to see. Translated into French it is "au revoir;" in German, it is "wiedersehn," and translated into every dead and living language it has but one definition and means but one thing, and the expert who framed the Republican platform, being a lawyer of great distinction, now occupying a high place in the federal service, knew exactly what he was doing when he put the word "revision" into the body of the instrument. He meant "au revoir," we will see you again, we will look over you, we will review you.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. RAYNER. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator's speech, but I would merely like to suggest that inasmuch as the Democratic party gave the definition of the word "revision" when they used it, and that definition was utterly inconsistent with the claims that had been made for the interpretation of the Republican party, and the people having refused to accept the Democratic proposition, I guess there was no misunderstanding among the majority of the voters as to what the Republican party meant.

Mr. RAYNER. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I will state that the Republican party has looked into the tariff, and having seen it again, and looked over it and reviewed it, has allowed it to stalk abroad in all of its unblushing and naked deformity. It has done worse than this. It has observed the gaunt figure of tariff reform hovering over the western plains and prairies, and instead of heeding its pleading voice and giving it, in this bill, the sustenance to sustain its life, it has taken it and buried it with all of its longing hopes and aspirations. But, Mr. President, one thing is sure, and that is that it has buried it alive. Its pulse still throbs and its heart still beats. The figure will again come forth, and with the blood coursing through its veins it will rise again. Its silenced voice will again be heard. It will be heard at the home and the fireside of the American consumer; it will be heard in the lowly hut and the humble hovel; it will be heard in the strongholds of the Republican party wherever men assemble to assert the rights that God has given them.

It will seek no repose and it will wander from place to place until this mighty question is settled upon the side of eternal right and justice. It will not accept the definition of the Senator from Idaho. It will accept no technical definition and legal phrases as an explanation of the platform, but it will point to the fact that but one construction was accorded to it by the people; and I predict now that as your unfulfilled promises, evidenced by these schedules, reverberate among your revolting and outraged constituencies you will at last arrive at the conclusion that even in a document like a political platform, constructed by cunning and dexterous hands, the principles of truth and honor must prevail and that even in such an instrument, while strategem and artifice are often resorted to and, unfortunately, tolerated, one thing is sure, and that is that treachery can never triumph and a lie can never live.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. He enumerated a great many places where this would be heard, and heard from, but he omitted to enumerate the ballot box.

Mr. RAYNER. It will be heard in the Senators' State. The Senator will have an opportunity to explain to his constituency that "revision" means simply "to look into again," and that the Republican party has accurately lived up to that definition in this bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, in the portion of the speech of the Senator who has just taken his seat which was devoted to this particular item of this schedule he left very little for those who agree with him to say. There are, however, one or two points which have occurred to me that in the abundance of his statement and argument he did not touch upon.

I will restate one that he did suggest, and that is that the present duty on pineapples is already a protective duty. It was placed there by Governor Dingley, for the purpose of protection; and in that protection not only was taken into consideration the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, as ordinarily is done, but also the peculiar conditions of the land in Florida. That protection covered the difference in the cost of labor, the cost of fertilizing, the cost of freight, and all the differences that might produce profitable pineapple growing. Under this protective duty, which has now existed for about twelve years, according to the figures given by my friend the Senator from Florida, that industry has so flourished that it has grown from 100,000 crates to over 1,000,000 crates in the last year.

The duty which the Senator from Florida asks is 128 per cent increase over the duty which Governor Dingley fixed; the

duty which has been in the law twelve years for the express purpose of protection; the duty under which this business has increased more than 1,000 per cent since that duty was put on; and yet we are asked to increase that duty 128½ per cent, which is prohibitive. That bare statement brings home to all of us, without any further argument upon it, the exact situation with reference to this proposed increase.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Does the Senator contend that this product receives the same tariff rate now as was provided in the Dingley tariff bill, or the same rate that was intended to be given it when the Dingley bill became a law?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What was the Dingley rate? What has been the rate up to the present time?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator has correctly quoted the rate, $7 per thousand.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That was the Dingley rate, was it not?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. That was the Dingley rate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is what I said.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. But the Senator understands that 20 per cent was taken off of that under the reciprocal arrangement with Cuba after the law was passed, and that to-day, by his own theory of protection, this product is not receiving what the Dingley rate intended it should get.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But, Mr. President, instead of asking for an addition of 20 per cent taken off by the Cuban reciprocity, the Senator actually asks for 128 per cent.

I say that this was a protective rate, and was intended by Governor Dingley to be protective under peculiar and unusual conditions. It was made as high as it now is because of those conditions. It was doubted then, but can no longer be doubted, that, natural conditions being considered, the land in Florida where these pineapples are grown is not naturally suited to their production in any degree comparable with the land in Cuba, the general source of our supply; indeed, the testimony of the pineapple growers themselves before the House committee demonstrated that the Florida land is not naturally fitted for that purpose at all.

The Florida growers must use fertilizers; the whole thing must be done at great expense; the climate is against them; they are battling, even with the aid of the present heavy protection, against the seasons; they are fighting the processes of nature. Here is what these growers say——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator excuse me just a moment, and then I will yield?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House Mr. McMullen, who, I believe, represents the Florida pineapple growers, testified as follows. And think of it; he was asking for this increased duty at the time:

> The Florida pineapple is somewhat out of its native element as to soil and requires a large amount of fertilizers.

What do Senators think of that?

Mr. E. P. Porcher, who also appeared for the pineapple growers, said:

> The pineapple situation with us on the east coast is such that we produce, out of 690,000 crates, 640,000 crates.

Then he speaks about how small this is. Then he says:

> It is in a section of country where it has been necessary to go to extreme expenditures in matters not only of preparing the land—

It is not naturally fitted for this fruit. That is important language—

> which has been done, but in the cost of fertilization it runs up as high as 4,000 pounds per acre per annum.

This Florida pineapple grower continues, testifying, mind you, before the House committee:

> The pineapple industry is more subject to frost than oranges, and for a frost to get into an orange tree requires what we term "a freeze," but a frost will get into the pineapples just as it would into a tomato plant, for it is a very tender plant.

Then Mr. McMullen again testifies:

> That land can not be applied to growing anything else, for it will not produce anything else, and we have practically to produce our pineapples with a fertilizer.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator twice said that this was a high duty. I think I have looked into this book accurately, and I find that the duty on pineapples averages about 20 per cent, while lemons bear a duty of 54 per cent under the present law, and I believe in the present bill the duty has been increased far beyond that. The duty on oranges is 59 per cent; on limes, 88 per cent; and on grape fruit, 47 per cent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator wants to know the difference——

Mr. GALLINGER. It looks to me as though this, compared with the duty on other fruits, is a low duty. There may be a good reason for it——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is, indeed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not mean to say there is not, but it looks to me as though, compared with other fruits, it is a very low duty rather than a very high duty.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the land in this country appears to be naturally fitted for the production of oranges and lemons and these others kinds of fruits, but, from this testimony, the land does not appear to be so fitted for the growth of pineapples. The question was asked of the Senator from Maryland, "If we give a certain protection to oranges, should we not give the same protection to pineapples?" His answer was accurate when he said they have no relation to one another. The pineapple industry is maintained upon an artificial basis.

I wish it were not. Certainly Governor Dingley, in fixing this tariff, considering that we had this industry right here at home, thought that he had fixed it so that we could afford to put fertilizers upon the land, we could afford to overcome the natural conditions, and the fact that we have done that, the fact that it has been a protective duty, is shown by the statement that this industry has increased from 100,000 crates to something like 1,000,000 crates, in spite of natural obstacles that do not apply to oranges and lemons. That does not look as if it were decreasing.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; but I will be through in a moment.

Mr. CLAPP. But right there I should like to ask the Senator a question. Of course the Senator will see that the relation of the tariff to an article as a protective tariff is not measured entirely by the growth of the article, but that one element of that test and measure must ever be what has been the corresponding growth of imports as against that tariff. Is not that fair, I submit to the Senator?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is one element.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; when you come to take into account that while the article itself has grown in production, the fact that the importations have grown a greater percentage—as I understood the Senator from Florida to say has been true in this case—is very material in determining whether the duty is sufficiently protective.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; and the Senator will see why in a moment. While the importations may have grown to a greater proportion compared with each other than the domestic production, they have not grown in proportion to the increased consumption. The pineapple a few years ago was a luxury, as the Florida growers insist that it is now, and they ask for this duty specifically upon the ground that it is a luxury; but within the last few years it has become a necessity. The Senator from New Hampshire knows that it is present now in every sick room. As the Senator from Maryland said, it is a necessary in every hospital. When you raise the price of pineapples, you are putting a tax upon the sick bed, and you are laying the finger of your imposts upon the brow of fever.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I scarcely think that argument will hold. I have some familiarity with hospitals, and I do not think——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not recently.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, recently; and I do not think that pineapples are used there any more than other fruit.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As a matter of fact, the Senator does not dispute the statement that the pineapple is used extensively in the sick room, in the case of fever particularly. He also knows, because he is thoroughly familiar with the conditions of the laboring man—he says so himself—that pineapples are not a rare thing in the homes of labor. They are excellent as a kind of tonic and are a thing which the human system seems to require.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not so much of a tonic as grape fruit. The laboring man is getting pretty much everything that is good in this country, and I am glad of it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I want him to get more.

Mr. GALLINGER. But I rose for another purpose, if the Senator will pardon me for just one moment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. In speaking of the ad valorem duty on pineapples, I stated it as having been about 20 per cent. I

find that on Cuban pineapples the duty is only 14.88 per cent—and that is where the competition comes—which is among the lowest duties in this bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course it is not necessary for me to take up the time of the Senate by reiterating a statement that the Senator from Maryland has made practically without challenge—very few persons have challenged it, if at all—that this is a duty upon a product that, after all, does not come very much into competition with the domestic product. Nor shall I, because it would only be taking time unnecessarily, repeat his oft-repeated and demonstrated statement that this increased duty on top of a protective duty is not a protective duty at all, but a prohibitive duty. If that is not conceded, this statement will be conceded: That we do not supply enough pineapples for our own demands and can not supply enough for our own demands. The testimony of the growers themselves shows that, owing to the nature of the soil and the limited extent of its area.

If we can not supply enough pineapples for ourselves, if our consumption is vastly beyond what we can ourselves produce, no protectionist will deny that this is one of the cases where the duty is added to the price; and thus the price of what is now a necessity of life becomes increased to all the people, whether they are sick or whether they are well.

There is another point I wish to emphasize, and that is about labor. I have been told—I did not know the fact myself, but I have been told it by such credible persons that I believe it—that a great deal of labor in the Florida pineapple groves is imported labor, brought in from the Bahama Islands. What is the situation with reference to the Cuban pineapple industry? It is distinctly an American enterprise. We have always looked to Cuba for our source of supply in this respect. Why? Because the nature of the soil, the climate, and every natural condition make the crops there regular. Here they are not regular. The Senator from Florida will admit that. As the growers themselves have testified, the Florida crop is very easily frozen out; that it often fails on account of climatic conditions, which is never true in Cuba, which seems to be more perfectly adapted to pineapple culture and growing than any other similar section of the earth.

But although Cuba is our great natural source of supply of pineapples, Cubans are not raising them there and shipping them here. No; it is Americans and American capital that is doing that. It is American citizens who are engaged in the Cuban pineapple industry. They bring down American lumber out of which to make their crates; they ship those pineapples in American ships to American markets; and those American ships, on their return, go to Cuba loaded with American cargoes. In this tariff bill I have heard very little about the increase of our foreign trade, which is in itself quite the largest subject of a commercial character that will confront us in the future. And yet it is proposed to give not only an unnecessary protection, but an absolute prohibition, to gentlemen who actually testify under oath that their soil is not fitted for this purpose, and who now propose to ruin American investors in an American industry that is promoting American trade, and to ruin American canners of this American product, and at the same time raise the price of pineapples to every American consumer.

A moment ago I looked over the American exports to Cuba which these pineapple-carrying ships take back. They consisted of lard, meat, potatoes, and all the products of our farms and of our factories. I have no doubt that the factories of New Hampshire sent many products there in exchange for pineapples. I know that many of the agricultural products of the Northwest went there in exchange for pineapples.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So you are not attacking a foreign industry; you are not protecting against a foreign industry a domestic industry which thrives as you do protect it now. No; on the contrary, you are giving a prohibition against an American industry for the benefit of another American industry, whose own operators say that they are not well fitted for it. You are giving that prohibition as against an American industry which produces not only pineapples, but increases our commerce as well.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the Senator is accurate in saying that some of the products of the mills of New Hampshire go to Cuba. But I want to say to the Senator that unless I have read history incorrectly, in view of what this country has done for Cuba in the way of sacrifices of men and money and the advantage it is giving Cuba in the way of a differential in the tariff rates on her products, the increase in our commerce with Cuba has been very slight indeed. Cuba has not been a very good customer of the United States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Nobody knows better than the Senator from New Hampshire and that shrewd race of men who come from his section of the country that the foundations of commerce must be laid; that the beginnings of trade must be planted. And more than any other section of this country, the keen commercial genius of New England has recognized the fact that we must labor for long years in planting the seeds of trade, which finally, like every other process of nature, flower and fruit into profitableness. Is not that true?

Mr. GALLINGER. That would hardly strike me as being true in reference to an island that is at our very doors, and that has received such benefactions from this country as Cuba has.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Our benefactions there, however, were given in the name of liberty; and then——

Mr. GALLINGER. Not altogether.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. They were voluntarily given.

Mr. GALLINGER. I saw it stated the other day that the recent occupation of Cuba by the United States had cost this country eight or nine million dollars.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and that was done in the name of civilization. That was done in the name of restoring order. But do not let us get away from this commercial matter. I do not want to go into the general question of Cuba.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I rose simply to say what I have said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am glad to have the Senator say it.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I wish to repeat it, that I think Cuba has not been quite as good a customer of the United States as, in view of all the circumstances, she might have been.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be true; but even if it is, does the Senator want to cut off a part of the small export cargoes that we do send there in exchange for the pineapples that we can not so well raise here?

Mr. GALLINGER. Well——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me just a moment, and I shall be through.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to make any reply to that. Of course I do not want to do an injustice to anyone.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course not.

Just one other thing, Mr. President, and then I think I shall have no more to say.

If I believed from the testimony that Florida pineapples needed any more protection, and they were a natural product which we could increase as we can lemons and oranges, I should vote for additional protection. But the Senator from Florida himself will tell the Senate that on account of the seasons the Florida crop is very often impaired. If that be true, as the Senator from Maryland says——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Just a moment.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. You have invoked my name.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As the Senator from Maryland says that this increased duty amounts practically to a prohibition, then in case by reason of the frost, which the growers say very easily overtakes these tender plants, your crop were to fail, what would become of the supply of the American people? It could not be had, of course, except at exorbitant prices.

Now, I think that I am through, and I yield the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, before taking up this matter in detail I will refer to what the Senator from Indiana has had occasion to observe in this connection. Of course that Senator has no direct or personal information upon this subject. I happen to live in Florida, and I happen to know something about the lands there and their adaptability for different purposes, horticultural and agricultural, and I happen to know something about pineapples. I am not dependent solely on what somebody may have said, or what somebody else may have said to him, or upon somebody's supposition or belief, or upon extracts from somebody's testimony. I happen to know. Of course it is just as comfortable for a man to think he is wise as it is to really be wise, and in that respect the Senator from Indiana may feel entirely justified in making these observations. But I submit that the facts lead us to this conclusion:

First, that he is entirely and absolutely wrong in his contention that this industry is an artificial one, and that it needs stimulation by an exorbitant tariff before it can successfully live. He is absolutely wrong in saying that the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] is intended to furnish that sort of artificial stimulation which no industry in this country is entitled to receive even at the hands of the highest protectionist.

I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana on what item in all this tariff bill has he voted for a duty of 14 per cent and felt that he was giving it an exorbitant duty? I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana where he draws the line between industries which are entitled to live and have a right to consideration and fair treatment and industries which ought to die because they need exorbitant artificial stimulation? Is it at 14 per cent ad valorem on the product? Is it at 32 per cent? Does he not know perfectly well that he has voted, in the case of item after item here, for duties of more than 50 per cent and never felt any qualms of conscience that he was giving artificial stimulation to an industry or a product that had no right to ask consideration at the hands of an American Congress? Does he not know perfectly well that he has voted for a duty of 50 per cent upon articles of food, upon articles necessary to sustain life? Does he not know perfectly well that every item in the fruit schedule bears a higher duty under the present bill and report of the Finance Committee than does the article of pineapples under the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida?

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

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the present price of pineapples in Cuba per crate?

Mr. FLETCHER. One dollar a crate.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; in Cuba? I am talking about the price in Cuba.

Mr. FLETCHER. The present price of pineapples in crates in Cuba?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is estimated at $1 in arriving at the revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no! I am talking about the price in Cuba, at the plantation in Cuba.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can furnish the Senator the testimony as to what it costs to produce pineapples in Cuba——

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not talking about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. What it costs to deliver them in the eastern markets, and what it costs to deliver them in the western markets; and that is more important.

Mr. ALDRICH. What does the Senator say it costs to raise pineapples in Cuba?

Mr. FLETCHER. I say, in the first place, that it is absolutely unimportant for me to know what at this hour or at this minute or at this day or last week pineapples were bringing on the fields in Cuba. I can give the data as to what, on an average——

Mr. ALDRICH. Has the Senator any information at all on the subject?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have information upon the subject, and I propose to give that information which bears directly upon the question here, whether you propose to give this industry fair treatment or whether you propose to deny to it fair treatment. I am going to give you the data upon which you may base that sort of judgment, and it is utterly immaterial what the price of a crate of pineapples is to-day on the fields in Cuba. That may vary very materially, and, as a matter of fact, it does, according to the law of supply and demand. Comparatively little of the crop is disposed of there. We do not sell in Cuba. Cuba markets her crop in the United States, where we sell ours. The price here is the material point.

Mr. ALDRICH. What was it last week, or last month? What has it been at any time in the last three months?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am going to give you the figures. I can give you this—and this is in answer also to the suggestions of the Senator from North Dakota, who made a very apt inquiry of the Senator from Maryland when he was on the floor as to shipments from Cuba. Here is a quotation from the New York Journal of Commerce of June 10, 1909, from Baltimore. It says:

> There were offered yesterday some 8,000 crates of Habana pineapples. The demand was not very urgent, and the market easy—24-size per crate selling $1.05 to $1.30; 30-size at 80 cents to $1.10.

That means 30 pineapples to the crate.

> Thirty-six-size at 90 cents to $1.05, and 42-size at 80 cents to $1.

These have been the ruling prices for Cuban pineapples, approximately, since June 1.

Florida fruit is quoted in the same journal, on June 11, as follows:

> About 1,000 crates of Florida pineapples sold at $1.45 to $1.75 for 24-size; $1.10 to $1.40 for 30-size; $1 to $1.20 for 36-size; and 90 cents to $1 for 42-size.

Those are very recent quotations, and they show the market to be glutted in Baltimore, where the canners are clamoring for relief from any duty whatsoever on pineapples.

But further pursuing the argument of the Senator from Indiana, who sought to inject some sort of sentiment into this debate upon what seems to me a very practical question, to the effect that these pineapples are needed for the patients in the sick room, and that the poor unfortunates and diseased are about to be denied a sufficiency of needed means of relief from suffering—does he remember that the diseased person in the hospital lies upon a bed which bears a duty, covered by a sheet which bears a duty? Everything the poor unfortunate one has on is taxed more than 32 per cent. Why do you not relieve him of all these things? The very surgeon who operates on him operates with instruments taxed 100 or more per cent. And yet this appeal is made here solely that the pineapple, which he may need for his relish or what not, ought to be given him without any duty, or practically without duty.

Another statement is made, Mr. President, to the effect that the Florida pineapple is produced by foreign labor. There never was anything further from the actual truth than that. I do not mean to say that the Senator meant to misrepresent. His information is wrong. The labor that produces the Florida pineapple is the native labor, or the labor that has come in there for the purpose of growing pineapples. The growers of pineapples in Florida are people from all over this country. A large majority of them are Republicans, men coming from Republican States. Are you going to say the Republican principle of prosperity does not apply in a State because it lies outside of Republican territory?

But I am not bothered about their politics. I never inquired into it. I know this is an important industry. I know that there are 7,000 acres under cultivation in Florida to-day and 10,000 people are engaged in producing pineapples there. I know—and this is no guesswork, because I have seen the land and I have had to deal with some of it—that there are 500,000 acres of land in Florida suited and adapted to this industry. I know perfectly well that Florida, with Porto Rico and Jamaica, can supply the demands of this country, no matter what it may be in the future. I know that perfectly well.

The Senator says that Florida wants protection to stimulate artificially an industry that is not entitled to consideration, and that works against Cuba; that American capital is in Cuba, and that the industry in Cuba is an American industry. I ask Senators whether matters have reached a point where we are to legislate to promote the commerce and trade of Cuba as against an American industry? Have they reached the point where we must claim, because Americans are engaged in some industry in Cuba, that such is an American industry, when the citizens of our own States are to be denounced as engaged in an industry promoted by foreign labor?

That is an absurd statement—that Jamaicans are brought into Florida and work in the groves. Most of the labor in the pineapple groves is white labor. Most of it is intelligent labor. It requires a man of sense as well as of industry and enterprise to grow pineapples, I will tell you. The people who are doing it are people of sense; and they are enjoying as high a degree of civilization, with as nice homes and as nice surroundings and as great skill and industry as the people in any portion of this country, I care not where they come from.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is it true that that industry has, under the present tariff, grown in production from 100,000 crates to 1,000,000 crates this year?

Mr. FLETCHER. It has grown in production from 100,000 crates fifteen years ago to over 1,000,000 crates to-day; not under, not in pursuance of, and not because of any protection or any law, but because of the enterprise and the industry and the intelligence of the men who are operating the groves.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator does not mean to say that he does not want the protection that he already has?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am giving you the facts. I am not going to admit that any industry in Florida owes its life and existence to any law; and I never will admit it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not saying that legislation may not help it. I am not claiming that. But I am not going to admit that but for the law the industry would naturally die, unless the people saw fit to give it up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DIXON. I have been very tenderly inclined toward the duty the Senator asks for. But when he states that the duty has no effect on the production, I am not inclined to vote for it

as a tariff for revenue. I think he is destroying the sympathy of the argument that is affecting ten or fifteen votes on the Republican side. If that is the contention—that the duty does not increase the production in Florida—then I am not in favor of it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator must have misunderstood me. The point I was seeking to make was this: The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] was endeavoring to show that because an industry had grown under the present law, as he sought to put words in my mouth, therefore it did not need any other legislation. I was contending that it was not under the law and solely by reason of the law that it had grown, but I am not contending that an increase of the duty upon pineapples would not benefit that industry in the State of Florida. On the contrary, I believe it would.

Mr. DIXON. I have been under the impression that this increase in duty would transfer the pineapple industry from Cuba to Florida. If it will do so, I shall gladly vote for it; but if the duty does not affect it, I should not want to raise the price of pineapples. I thought it depended almost entirely on this duty.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course the representations of the people engaged in the industry are that they are losing to-day 40 cents a crate upon all their pineapples. That is a loss of $400,000 in that industry up to this time, this year, this season, and they can not continue that.

Mr. DIXON. But if the tariff were taken off entirely the industry would languish; would it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. They say they would absolutely go out of the business. They would not continue it as a commercial proposition, as a business undertaking, of course, under those circumstances. They might grow a few pineapples around their yards for their own use.

Mr. DIXON. Does the Senator believe that if we increase this duty to 40 cents a crate or 32 cents a crate it will result in establishing a great pineapple industry in the Senator's State?

Mr. FLETCHER. I undoubtedly do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator, I know, as much as any Senator, does not want to do another Senator an injustice. I did not put words in his mouth; I merely asked him permission to ask him a question. That question was this—and they were my words, not his: Whether or not under the present law, this industry has grown from a production of 100,000 crates annually to more than a million crates? The Senator said that it had.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is practically so in fifteen years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then the Senator said that of course it was not on account of the law, but it was on account of the enterprise of the growers.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do. I do not believe now that they are making any money out of it. As I understand, they are losing 40 cents a crate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In the case of nearly every protected article I hear that either the manufacturers or somebody is losing a great deal of money. I am willing to take their word for that, although it is extraordinary to me to contemplate the number of commercial and manufacturing enterprises in this country that have been losing vast sums of money and are still going along, growing pineapples or making machines, as the case may be.

Mr. FLETCHER. They have no right to think the Government will destroy it. They think, probably, the Government would not discriminate against them.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If what the Senator said was true—that the growth of the industry was not at all due to the duty, but was due to the enterprise of the growers—of course the duty could neither destroy it nor the reverse.

With reference to the question of the Senator from Montana about transferring this industry from Cuba here, I want the Senator from Montana to hear it. Will the Senator permit me to read from the growers themselves? I do not know that I need to take the time to repeat it, because I can put it in the RECORD. They say that the Florida pineapple is somewhat out of its natural element as to soil and as to climate, and go on to explain the margin of frost; that, as to soil, it requires a vast amount of fertilization all the time; and as to the seasons, it is often stricken with the blight of cold. All that is true, is it not? Therefore if the duty was 500 per cent under certain conditions the growers themselves testify it could not transfer the industry from Cuba, where it is a natural industry, to a country where it has such a climate and soil as that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. If my colleague will pardon me a moment, I should like to have the Senator from Indiana make it clear to the Senate whether he is opposing this proposition on the ground that the development in this business for the last ten years proves that it does not need any more assistance, or whether on the ground that the crop is so unreliable that it is not worth while to discuss it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The first ground certainly, and partly on the second ground, though the Senator does not quite state accurately my idea as to the second ground. It would appear that an industry which has increased more than 1,000 per cent under the present law, and 1,000 per cent is an enormous increase, did not need more protection than Mr. Dingley gave it. That is the first one. On the second proposition the testimony of the growers themselves before the House committee shows that the Florida crop is subject to the cold in a peculiar way. I will ask the Senator to state if it is not true, because he knows and I do not know, except as I read from this testimony, that the frost often very materially impairs the crop. If that is true, and if we have to depend solely upon Florida for our pineapples, with such a climate as that, the American people would be without their pineapples or else would have to pay an exorbitant rate.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The absurd inconsistency of the Senator from Indiana is what compels me to get up and interrupt my colleague. In the first place, he practically says that we can not grow any pineapples, because the climate is so unreliable and is so subject to frost——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say that. The Senator will pardon me.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. The Senator practically said that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; on that point I do not say——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. In the next breath he proceeds to say that this development has been so extraordinary and so remarkable under the present duty that no greater assistance is needed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What I did——

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Let me tell the Senator he must take one horn of the dilemma.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What I did was to quote the testimony of the growers themselves before the House committee, who were pleading for this duty. If the Senator considers that there is any inconsistency in their position and their statements, it is the inconsistency of his own witnesses.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not want to weary the Senate; I want to hurry on with this question as fast as I can. I do not want to be simply beating the winds here and wasting my own breath and energy.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a question?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will hear the Senator.

Mr. JONES. I will state to the Senator that I felt very favorably inclined toward his proposition, but I have not heard all of his talk. He may have answered this proposition. I should like to know whether he is urging an increase of the duty solely on the ground of revenue.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, of course I expect to answer a good many questions where Senators are anticipating me. It breaks into any logical discussion of a question to be anticipated in this way. I contend, and I will be able to show, that at the present rate of duty of 14 per cent ad valorem over $100,000 came into the Treasury of the country last season; and this season there will be over $200,000 placed in the Treasury under the present rate, because whereas Cuba shipped into this country 840,000 crates the last season, they will ship here this season over a million and a half. Consequently, there will come into the Treasury under the present duty over $200,000 from that importation.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, at the rate of 32 per cent you can see that the revenue would be practically four times what it is now. So, the Government would get a revenue of over $400,000 out of the importations of pineapples.

Mr. JONES. Is that the sole reason of the Senator's advocacy of this increase?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; I am taking it up one step at a time. I can take up that proposition, and I say no one who is in favor of a tariff for revenue only would be justified in opposing this amendment. But I can take it up on the other proposition, and upon the ground of protection there is absolutely no ground whatever to stand on in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JONES. I wondered whether that was the position the Senator is taking. That is what I was wondering.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am going to present my position fairly and fully and discuss the matter from every standpoint.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator that I assume I might very likely be in favor of it; but simply on the ground of revenue, I might not.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator is a splendidly equipped Senator in every respect, and I shall be glad to find myself in accord with him, and shall feel honored by his support. I can substantiate, as I said, the claim here of a duty of a half a cent a pound to the satisfaction absolutely of any fair-minded man, whether he be a tariff-for-revenue man or a protectionist.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will ask the Senator which of those two grounds he takes in advocating this amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I have stated, I am going to place the matter before the Senate in all its phases as far as I can with absolute frankness and fairness, upon its merits, and each Senator can figure out for himself whether he votes for it for one reason or for another reason.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will, but it is breaking into a proper presentation of the subject. I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is talking about a duty of 14 per cent. It is very evident that the pineapple industry both in Cuba and in the United States is now in a demoralized condition. But if pineapples are sold in Cuba at the price the Florida growers say they are now, the duty suggested is more than 100 per cent instead of 14.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am basing this statement not only upon the testimony of witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, but upon the reports of the Government itself, and that the Senator from Rhode Island has been kind enough to furnish to us here, not for our misguidance and our misleading, I hope. His document shows the rate of duty to be 14.88 per cent. Any Senator can refer to the report before him and find out whether I am correct or not.

Now, Mr. President, in reference to this question of the possibility that the country would be without pineapples some time in some period hereafter, there never has been a time but once, I believe, in the last fifteen years when pineapples were seriously hurt in Florida, and that only in the northern portion. Pineapples are not grown within 150 miles of the northern limit of our orange territory. The east coast of Florida, I would have the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] understand, is 500 miles long. There are 1,200 miles of seacoast about the State of Florida.

The east coast is, as I have said, 500 miles long, and pineapples are grown in the southern 250 of those miles. They are grown also on the west coast in the same latitude. While this gentleman so testified, perhaps, before the Committee on Ways and Means, although it is a perfectly well-recognized rule of law which ought to obtain in any intelligent body, that in order to be fair a man's whole statement should be furnished to the Senate, not merely extracts from some portions of his statement. Mr. McMullen perhaps did not contemplate when his testimony was given—I do not know just when it was given, as quoted by the Senator—that, as the whole country knows—and the Senate knows, I take it—at an expense of perhaps $15,000,000 a railroad is being built to sea down the east coast of Florida, and that railroad runs for 140 miles across the Keys, which are adapted for pineapple growing. All that territory has been opened up within the last few months.

But, Mr. President, I insist that we ought to consider the industry of a State in this Union, be that State North, South, East, or West; be it outside the Republican territory or in it; either a State with a comparatively sparse population or a State with a tremendous population. I would mention to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] that Florida has eight times more people than the State of Wyoming, although that State furnishes the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. WARREN]. I say is it not the proper thing for us to consider an industry in our own country, in a State of prior importance to the interests of those, even though they may have removed from the United States, in a foreign country? Is it not, furthermore, statesmanship, is it not wisdom, is it not proper and right, that we should consider the interest of our possessions in the islands of the sea ahead of and before the interest of foreign countries? Have we not, as mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], done enough for Cuba?

I do not care to throw one single stone at Cuba. I would see her prosper. I would aid her and assist her. I would favor any sort of proceeding that might help that country to establish a government for all time, permanent and prosperous, but I submit that not only should we discharge our duty as to an industry of a State of this Union, but our efforts are certainly next to be enlisted in behalf of our productions in Porto Rico and in Hawaii. The Senator from Indiana has entirely overlooked the possibilities of Porto Rico.

Last season Porto Rico shipped into this United States 75,000 crates of pineapples. This season Porto Rico will send to us 400,000 crates. The industry is developing at a wonderful rate in Porto Rico and it will not be long before she can send us a million crates just as well as not. So with Hawaii the same thing is going on. I say to the Senate here absolutely that for ten months in the year Florida can produce pineapples. It is absurd to say that she can not have any pineapples in the market in March, April, and May.

She can produce pineapples for ten months in the year, practically every month in the calendar; but Porto Rico can produce pineapples and have them in the market certainly as soon as Cuba. They have the same climatic conditions, and she can have her pineapples here as early as Cuba. Is it not worth while for us to keep Porto Rico in mind? If you want to eliminate Florida, then I will say to you, What about Porto Rico? If, for some reason or other, you think the industry is artificial in Florida, I ask you, What about Porto Rico and what about Hawaii? Porto Rico comes in direct competition with Cuba. Porto Rico can supply a million and a half pineapples in the next two years annually, and she can increase beyond that.

The Senator wants to know why there has been this increase. Because ten years ago the consumption in the United States was about 500,000 crates. The consumption in the United States to-day is over 3,000,000 crates.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. May I ask the Senator a question? Will he please state the production of Porto Rico now? I have been told that it is about 150,000 crates. That is the testimony.

Mr. FLETCHER. A gentleman who is engaged in that industry, who is a Virginian or a West Virginian, and lives near here, and is engaged in the industry in Porto Rico, assured me that he was willing to make a contract with the canners of Baltimore whereby he would agree to deliver to them 400,000 crates this season.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I guess the proposition has not yet been made by the gentleman here.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course I have only his word—a reliable gentleman—and I have not been to Porto Rico.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I understand the crop of Porto Rico is about 150,000 crates. That would be a very small dependence for the canners of this country. When a man offers to produce 400,000 crates in a territory that produces 150,000, I do not think it would be very safe to make the contract.

Mr. FLETCHER. It can not be questioned that the industry is new in Porto Rico, and that it is developing at a wonderful rate in those islands. There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt but that people from this country have gone over there and purchased lands and are producing pineapples on those lands. I should like to see them continue to do so; and they tell me they are willing to undertake to contract for this season 400,000 crates.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me just a minute, the pineapple in Porto Rico is canned in Porto Rico, and that is one of the reasons why the people of this country are at a very great disadvantage. We all know that you can bring into the country very much cheaper an article after it is a manufactured product than a raw material and manufacture it after it is brought here. Now, in Porto Rico they can their pineapples there and bring them here in competition with the people of the United States free of duty. Our people have to pay a duty now of 14 cents per crate and can in competition with the Porto Rican pineapple and the pineapple of Hawaii. That is one of the troubles to-day with the duty now on as against the canning of pineapples in this country.

Mr. FLETCHER. I undertake to say that without regard to Porto Rico Florida can supply the demand of this country under proper conditions, and if, as the growers contend, Florida is properly supported and encouraged. According to the contention of these people she can do so in her own territory.

Let us see what are the rates. The rates under the Dingley law are 7 cents per cubic foot on a box or crate or barrel, $7 a thousand when in bulk. That rate went into effect in 1897. You must remember that after the war in Cuba all industries languished there. It took some years for this industry to get started after the war of 1898. It takes a plant two years after it is put in the ground before it bears at all, and it was for some years before Cuba began to produce pineapples of any great consequence after the devastation of the war and the destruction of enterprises over there. It is also true that the industry is new in Porto Rico comparatively, but the production is increasing in Porto Rico as well as in Cuba. Cuba shipped

to this country 840,000 crates last season. She will ship this season 1,500,000 crates. Florida produced 690,000 crates last season. She will produce this season about 1,000,000 crates. She can have under cultivation and growing pineapples, instead of 7,000 acres, 500,000 acres. The handicap as against Florida, as shown by the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, is as follows. In the first place I read from page 4052, the testimony of Mr. Porcher:

The matter of pineapples is the point that I want to touch on forcibly, although I may repeat in part statements that have been made. We produced last season on the east coast 690,000 crates, while the importations from Cuba were about 840,000 crates. In addition to that we had importations from the Hawaiian Islands which have not been mentioned at all. We had importations from Porto Rico, and we had importations from Jamaica to contend with.

I do not understand that pineapples grown in Porto Rico are canned at all. They are shipped here, and shipped here in American vessels, whereas the statement that Cuban pineapples are shipped here in American vessel is, according to my information, erroneous. Most of them are foreign bottoms. They have that advantage. Now Mr. F. G. McMullen says:

It costs more to produce, in the field, a box of pineapples than it does a box of citrus fruit. We draw 14 cents a crate, and they draw 80 cents. Cuban pineapples, costing 20 cents to produce and 35 cents to pack, we will say, 14 cents duty, 32 cents transportation to New York, and then add your 7 cents or 7½ cents or 10 cents—they can place them there for $1.11 f. o. b. New York. Florida pineapples will cost you $1.80.

So the Cuban has the advantage, even though you give the duty asked in this amendment, of 54 cents per crate delivered in New York. The Cuban pineapple grower has the advantage, too, of 36 cents on every crate of pineapples delivered in Chicago or Pittsburg.

A Cuban pineapple grower can afford to pay a duty of 1 cent a pound on pineapples and still deliver his pineapples in New York at a less cost to him than the grower in Florida can do it. He will still have an advantage of over 6 cents, and pay 1 cent a pound duty. The Cuban grower can deliver his pineapples in New York, I repeat, and pay half a cent a pound duty at 54 cents less than the Florida pineapple grower can do it. He can deliver his pineapples in the Western market, in Pittsburg, in Chicago, in St. Louis, and pay a duty of half a cent a pound, for 36 cents less than the Florida pineapple grower can do it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Will the Senator excuse me?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Have you the information as to how many plants there are in an acre of pineapples?

Mr. FLETCHER. The average yield is 180 crates per acre. The yield is about 150 to 180 crates of pineapples to the acre on an average crop, there being about 33 pineapples to the crate.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I was asking how many pineapples were produced to the acre?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator will understand that what is meant by a crate is that these crates are 10½ by 12 by 36 inches, approximately 2½ cubic feet. This witness further states.

In asking for this rate of duty we are not asking for a prohibitive tariff, knowing full well that, with his cheapened cost of production, the foreign producer can well afford to come into our markets; but we do know that it will make him more cautious in the growing, handling, and packing of his product, and that he will be able only to place an article of the highest value in competition against us; and that the disastrous condition as at present with large lots of poor fruit of small sizes and in bad order sent in to demoralize the markets, disgust the consumer, and create a prejudice against the pineapple, and in many cases turn the consumer to using other fruits in its place, will be prevented.

This witness further states, at page 4059:

With their small cost for land and no fertilizers used, the Cuban grower has a maximum cost for labor of 80 cents per day, and at times much less figures, whereas we have a minimum cost for labor of $1.25 per day, with the average for a large part of the season above $1.50 per day, and a part of the year we pay as high as $2 and even $2.50 per day.

He further says:

It is shown that the cost of producing a crate of pineapples f. o. b. cars is from 70 to 90 cents per crate.

On page 4061 is given the following statement showing the cost per crate:

After a field is established there is an annual charge, as follows:

For fertilizers	$70.00	
Labor and depreciation	75.00	
		$145.00

Average annual yield, 180 crates.
Average cost per crate to produce, 70 to 80 cents.

Average cost to pack:		
Crates	$0.15	
Labor	.20	
		$0.35
Average cost of transportation to eastern markets		.75
Average cost per crate to produce		.70
Average cost to produce, pick, pack, and deliver to eastern markets, per crate		1.80

Compared to the Cuban industry:		
Average cost to produce, per crate	$0.20	
Average cost to pack	.35	
Average cost transportation, New York	.31½	
Average cost transportation, Cuban seaport	.07½	
Duty paid	.14	
		$1.08
In favor of Cuban product		.72
Increase of duty asked		.66
Balance in favor of Cuba		.06

In other words, the Cuban grower can pay the present duty of 14 cents and deliver his product to New York 72 cents cheaper than it costs the Florida grower. If this duty is raised 1 cent a pound, or 66 cents per crate, the balance in favor of the Cuban grower would still be 6 cents; but we are only asking that the duty be made 32 cents. We are not asking for a cent a pound. The testimony given further by these growers is that—

The cost to produce a crate of pineapples has increased under the Dingley tariff 33⅓ per cent, while the net price of late years has decreased.

		1897.	1908.
Cotton-seed meal	per ton	$18.00	$32.00
Crate material	per 100	9.50	13.50
Labor, negro	per day	1.00	1.50
Labor, white	do	1.50	2.50

That is what these gentlemen meant in the circular which the Senator from Maryland read here to-day, when they said they were growing pineapples under a protective tariff. Every item entering into the making of pineapples is increased in cost to the grower, as he figures it, by reason of the tariff laws. The paper which he uses to wrap his pineapples in, the crate, the nails, the machinery with which he cultivates his crops, the items which enter into the growing of fruit, all are increased by the protective tariff. Why, then, is he not justified in saying to the public that he is growing this crop under a protective tariff? That is what he means.

This testimony before the Ways and Means Committee further shows:

With 1 cent per pound duty Cuba can deliver pineapples f. o. b. New York for $1.74 per crate of 80 pounds, while Florida can not deliver its pineapples there for less than $1.80 per crate. This gives Cuba 6 cents advantage with the 1 cent duty, which we propose, and is positively not prohibitive.

That is the statement of the Indian River Pineapple Growers' League, on page 4065 of the committee hearings.

Mr. President, I shall hurry along. I do not want to weary the Senate. This is a matter of very great importance to us. Of course it is small as compared to a great many schedules and paragraphs of this bill, but it is not insignificant to a great many people down with us. We are not growing these pineapples in back yards. Our people are not living in mud huts. They are undertaking to build up an industry, and they illustrate the highest type of civilization in those pineapple groves. They are undertaking to build nice homes, to educate their families, and to develop this as a business enterprise. I say, then, that the duty under the Dingley law was 7 cents per cubic foot in barrels or boxes and $7 per thousand in bulk. The House raised that to 8 cents per cubic foot in barrels or boxes and $8 a thousand. The committee here returns to the Dingley rate and reports 7 cents per cubic foot when shipped in barrels or boxes or $7 a thousand, which means upon crated shipments a less duty than on bulk shipments. Seven dollars a thousand means an average of 21 per cent ad valorem, whereas 7 cents per cubic foot means 14 cents a crate. Hence Cuba ceased to ship in bulk and began packing and shipping in crates.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, there are no pineapples brought in here in bulk, and therefore that rate does not count at all. They are all brought in here in crates. Therefore, in making the comparison, there is only one way in which it can be made, and that is the difference between what it now costs to bring them here by crate and what it would cost to bring them if the duty were as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is not so important, Mr. President, but the Senator from Maryland is in error about that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I say comparatively, as I will show.

Mr. FLETCHER. In this statement of Imports and Duties, at page 411, you will find that in 1907 there were shipped into this country pineapples from Cuba amounting to 1,726,559.51 cubic feet, valued at $649,723, yielding a revenue of $96,687.41. Those were the crate shipments from Cuba. Of pineapples in bulk under the general tariff there came in 1,212.96, valued at $36,218. Those were the bulk shipments last year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is, in round figures, there were $650,000 worth, which came in by the crate; possibly a small part may have come in by some small vessel. But I make the assertion that so far as shipments by bulk are concerned, that is not a thing to be considered in regard to this duty.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then there were shipments in bulk from Cuba alone, under the reciprocity clause, of 13,700, yielding $76.72 revenue.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In bulk, I see, from Cuba there were imported $369 worth.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Does not the Senator from Maryland understand why they are not shipped in bulk?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because it is cheaper to ship the other way.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The fact is that as against $649,723.70 worth in crates there were $369 worth shipped in bulk. You may say there were none, for it amounts to almost nothing.

Mr. FLETCHER. The result of that criticism must be visited upon the committee. We have nothing to do with it.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am reading from Imports and Duties.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. In 1898 the shipments in bulk were in value $146,982.44. They gradually declined until in 1907 the shipments in bulk amounted to but $36,218.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not from Cuba.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Under the general tariff.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not from Cuba. The amount from Cuba was $369.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I am speaking of shipments under the general tariff.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am speaking of pineapples shipped from Cuba.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no need to take up time in this manner.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to get at the facts in regard to this matter. I think the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has admitted that the value of the pineapples from Cuba shipped in bulk was only $369 as against $650,000 worth shipped in crates.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not questioned that. The shipments of pineapples from Porto Rico in 1901 amounted in value to $11,140. Last year, 1907, the value of pineapples shipped from Cuba in crates was $649,723.70. The bulk shipments, under the general tariff, amounted to $36,218.09, and from Cuba the bulk shipments amounted to $369. The total revenue derived from pineapples for 1908 was $107,189.16. The total shipment was about 840,000 crates; and if you practically double the duty on those shipments, you would, of course, double the revenue. Even under the present rate the revenue would be over $200,000 per annum. The proposition is to increase that rate to one-half cent a pound, which means 32 cents per crate as to Cuba, and there is where the principal importations come from. Jamaica sends in some, but they do not amount to a very great deal.

The duty is less than the canners have on their product. They have no right to complain. They get 1 cent per pound, plus 30 per cent ad valorem. That is the duty they will get under this bill. So there is no justification for the canners to oppose a reasonable duty on this product, which would benefit the growers of the fruit. What does the canner put into the industry? What does the importer put into the industry? Yet the canner is protected, I say, by 1 cent a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem under this very bill.

Mr. President, there is no argument against our contention in favor of this amendment here, except upon the broad basis that there ought not to be any duty on anything; that you ought to do away with the custom-houses entirely. When we get to that point then the Senators from Maryland may well stand up here and ask that the duty be taken off of pineapples. You can not possibly argue, with any sort of foundation for your reasoning, that this duty should not be at the rate at which the amendment proposes to place it, unless you are willing to go the whole length and say there ought not to be any duty at all; and that is what the arguments of the Senators from Maryland come to—that there ought not to be any duty. Either that, or, if they should stand here as representatives of a special interest, the canning interest, they might then say they want them to have their material free out of which they will make their product—either one position or the other would alone furnish the basis for their argument. It seems to me there can be no other ground to stand on, and that all the arguments of the Senators from Maryland lead us to the conclusion that they are opposed to any duty at all on any product.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is very much at fault in that particular. In my remarks to-day I stated that strong pressure had been brought to bear on me to advocate the placing of pineapples on the free list, but I declined to do it. I stated that there was a revenue of $107,000 from pineapples under the present duty, and that I thought the Government was entitled to some revenue. I contended further that if you should increase the present rate of duty over 125 per cent you would not have the revenue you have now, because the duty would be prohibitive. I am for a revenue duty, and I so contended. I said that I was opposed to bringing in pineapples free, but I contended that the duty that now is placed upon pineapples is sufficient, and that it ought not to be increased as proposed by the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, which is over 125 per cent more than it is now.

I contend that if you do that, instead of getting revenue you will have a prohibitive duty that will keep out pineapples from Cuba. I have said that that is the case more particularly; but inasmuch as the canners of pineapples in this country have to contend with the canners of Hawaii and Porto Rico, who can bring their pineapples canned into this country free of duty, they should not be compelled to suffer the disadvantage that the increased duty would impose.

The Senator from Florida says that we are contending for special interests. I contend, Mr. President, that the Senators from Florida are contending for a special interest. They are contending to protect a few hundred pineapple growers in Florida at the expense of this whole country. I say that I am not only endeavoring to protect the interests of the canner, but I am endeavoring to prevent a duty being put on pineapples that will keep them from the households of this entire country.

The people of this country are entitled to this fruit. There should not be a prohibitive duty put upon it, and I do claim that the proposed rate would be a prohibitive duty, that it would keep pineapples out, and that it would lessen the revenue the Government is now getting.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand perfectly well the argument of the Senator. He made it so well in the first instance that it is hardly necessary to repeat it. His idea is that there ought not to be any duty on pineapples.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have just contradicted that. To the contrary, I said there ought to be a duty—the present duty.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I submit——

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I said that I was not in favor of taking the duty off; that I was in favor of the present duty.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I submit, Mr. President, that the inference of my colleague in stating that the Senator from Maryland was practically for no duty on pineapples was justified by what the Senator from Maryland has said.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I will say that I expressly stated in my earlier remarks that I was for a duty; that I had been asked to advocate no duty, but I had declined to do so, and favored the present duty.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Fourteen per cent on the product of Florida, Mr. President, and a cent a pound and 35 per cent ad valorem on the product of Maryland is what the Senator is advocating. Those are the facts, as I understand them.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not advocating any such comparison.

Mr. FLETCHER. I contend that what the Senator from Maryland bases his argument upon, and his course of reasoning and his logic can not be justified, except from the standpoint of being in favor of no duty at all on pineapples. I am not saying that he is arguing for that, but I say that, if we trace back his argument, we will find it will land him there; in other words, although he says he is in favor of a reasonable duty, when he comes to justify his claim for that sort of duty, it amounts to an argument in favor of no duty at all. But, however, that makes no difference.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am opposed to a prohibitive duty. I am in favor of the present duty.

Mr. FLETCHER. Exactly. Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland says the Senators from Florida are looking after their special Florida interests. I am not chagrined to be charged with having an eye to the interests of Florida or her people. I do not know anybody else who is going to look out for Florida if her own Senators do not do so. But, while I am attempting to do that, I yield to no man in affection and love for all the country and a desire to see every State in the Union prosper and the interests of all the States in this country sub-

served. At the same time, this is a matter where the Senators from Florida, not only by reason of attempting to represent that State, but by reason of their residence and by reason of their personal knowledge in connection with an important industry, it seems to me would be recreant to their trust and their duty here if they did not present this matter to the Senate for appropriate consideration in the legislation of this body.

But, in addition to that, Mr. President, Senators forget that Porto Rico, an island in our care and keeping, is largely interested in this same question; that Hawaii has a like interest, and that Hawaii and Porto Rico are asking for 1 cent a pound upon pineapples. That is the duty they are asking for. The Pineapple Growers' Association of Florida, whose communication was read here, are asking for 1 cent a pound upon pineapples, and they ought to know something about the significance to them of that duty. They have testified through their representatives before the Ways and Means Committee of the House that 1 cent a pound would not be a prohibitive duty, and how on earth a Senator can stand here and claim that a duty of 14 per cent is prohibitive, I utterly fail to comprehend. No such statement is verified on the part of anybody who pretends to know the facts, and certainly the claims of people who are interested in the industry, and who know of the history and the development of this industry, are entitled to some weight. Mr. President, the competitor of Florida and of Porto Rico, and, to a certain degree, Hawaii, is mainly Cuba.

The industry has grown up there largely since the war with Spain. She has these advantages: First, the cost of fertilizers that are used in the growing of pineapples in Florida is saved, labor is about one-half, farming implements are cheaper, and freight rates are 30 per cent per crate lower to important markets.

The Florida grower pays higher prices for all he has to buy in the making and marketing of his crop—fertilizers, tools and implements, box materials, nails, paper for wrapping—all are increased by the tariff. And therefore is it any wonder that he says, as quoted here to-day, that he is growing pineapples under a protective tariff?

As I said a while ago, I can not understand how a Senator who believes in the principle of protection can have the heart to stand here and oppose a duty of 1 cent per pound on pineapples, amounting to, as against Cuba, 80 cents less 20 per cent, or 64 cents per crate. The argument from a protectionist standpoint is unanswerable as to this industry for a duty twice what is asked. It is an important industry. That is not denied. There is no question about what the State can produce in the way of pineapples.

We have seen samples of them. Some Senators have confessed to having partaken of some of them, and they know what Florida can produce in the way of pineapples. There is no guesswork about whether they can grow there or be produced there. At the present price, the Florida growers report that they are losing 40 cents a crate, and that they must give it up as a business undertaking under the present duty. People in this country who can afford this wholesome and appetizing fruit would not like that; and the growers, who have invested millions, would suffer great loss. The finest pineapples grown anywhere in the world would disappear from the markets; groves which have received the best attention and required great outlays in time and capital and labor would be abandoned, and the scientific study and development of the fruit would cease.

Those engaged in the industry in Florida are men of the highest intelligence and marked enterprise. They come from all portions of the country, as I have said. I wish to see this industry prosper, and to have the people of this country have the benefit of the most highly developed and choicest pineapples in the world. I am unable to appreciate how a good Republican can find it in his heart to oppose a duty of double what is asked. It must follow that while under the policy he advocates the duty ought to be 1 cent per pound, when only half that was asked he would vote for that.

The difference in cost of production in Florida and in Cuba is greater than 32 cents per crate. The Cuban grower can pay a duty of a half a cent a pound and deliver his pineapples in New York for $1.36 per crate, while it costs the Florida grower $1.80 per crate—an advantage to the Cuban grower of 44 cents per crate. The Cuban grower can ship his fruit right through the Florida fields to Pittsburg for $1.54 a crate, while the Florda grower can not do that at a less cost than $1.90 per crate. These are actual results. That would give an advantage to the Cuban grower in that instance of 36 cents per crate.

The difference in freight rates has been brought to the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and they have said that "if the present duty is not sufficient, these defendants"—referring to the transportation companies—"can not be required to reduce their charges for the purpose of keeping out the foreign article."

But we do not ask for a duty which will prohibit importation. Under the present duty of 14 cents per crate the revenue last year was, as I have stated before, $107,189.16. This year it will be nearly twice that.

At half a cent per pound, or 32 cents per crate, the revenue would be $480,000 a year. This duty is less than the average duty fixed in this bill on food staples, which is about 40 per cent. I want to call the attention of Senators to that.

This bill imposes, and the majority of the Finance Committee has favored, a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on 26 kinds of biscuits in common use by all the people. How can anybody reasonably contend that 32 cents per crate, or practically 32 per cent ad valorem, is an excessive duty on this article, and then vote for the amendment adopted by the Senate on May 29 to paragraph 240, which swept into the 50 per cent duty list a large quantity of cheap, plain biscuits, which are slightly sweetened? Twenty-six different kinds of biscuits are included in that list—Oaten Biscuit, Arrowroot Biscuit, Littlefolk, Wheatmeal, Boudoir, Café Noir, Butter Fingers, Rich Digestive, Household, Concert, Waverly, Marie, Dessert, Albert, Rich Mixed, Sponge Rusks, Algeria, Windsor, Oval Digestive, Oval Rich Tea, Monarch, Coronation, Petit Beurre, Engardine Wafers, Gingernuts, and Cinderella.

Here are 26 different kinds of biscuits, slightly sweetened, used by the people everywhere; yet the Senator from Indiana and his associates voted for a duty of 50 per cent upon these, and he, with queer logic, claims that a duty of 32 per cent on pineapples is prohibitive and excessive and is an artificial stimulation.

There is a duty of 50 per cent on the biscuits that people need imposed in the present bill. How can people who are not obliged to have pineapples, who wish and are able to buy them, and can have them—a fruit which is a luxury, a duty upon which would yield half a million dollars in revenue—claim that 32 per cent is too high?

I insist that pineapples are not necessary to life or comfort. They are luxuries, and revenue should first be sought from just such commodities.

The Senator said that the Cuban pineapple comes in two months earlier than the Florida pineapple, and that the tariff would therefore have no effect. Porto Rico can ship pineapples just as early as Cuba can. There is no question about that. I have already alluded to the fact that Porto Rico has similar climatic conditions, and she will soon be producing as many pineapples as Cuba will produce. But Florida can produce pineapples during practically ten months of the year. It is our duty to consider Porto Rico as well as Florida in preference to Cuba.

As I have said, the canners can get their bulk shipments in at about 16 per cent, or $7 per thousand. This very amendment of $8 per thousand would not amount to over 20 per cent, so that they can come in in bulk from Jamaica and from the Bahamas for at a little over 20 per cent, but from Cuba at about 20 per cent, if they come in bulk; but they can come in that way to the canners where they are wanted.

It is no answer to say that the Florida pineapple is not canned. If the Cuban pineapple is fit to eat it competes with the Florida product. It may be canned, but it can be eaten, and is eaten; and it does lower the price of the Florida product by glutting the markets here in May and in June. There is no question about that.

The canners, as I have said, are, under paragraph 270 of this bill, protected to the extent of 1 cent a pound, plus 30 per cent ad valorem, in the duty on canned fruits. This industry is practically on all fours with the citrus industry. You have given to oranges a duty of 1 cent a pound, or practically 80 cents per crate. A crate of pineapples weighs about 80 pounds. A crate of oranges weighs about 80 pounds. You have given oranges 1 cent a pound, or 80 cents a crate; you have given grape fruit the same; you have given lemons $1.50 a crate; yet you propose to strike down pineapples with about 14 cents a crate.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is no sort of fair treatment of this industry under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee. It ought to be treated on the same plane with the others. As my colleague has so well said, it costs as much to raise a crate of pineapples as a crate of grape fruit or oranges. They weigh about the same; they sell for about the same in the market. Why should you fix a duty of 1 cent a pound on the orange, and a duty of less than a quarter of a cent a pound on the pineapple? Is it because no other State in the Union but Florida produces pineapples? Then, in answer

to that, I ask you to please remember Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands, and consider them as a part of the country.

The average duty under this bill on farm and field products is 34.73 per cent. Mr. President, let Senators remember that when they come to consider a duty of 32 per cent upon a luxury of life, that the average duty under this bill on farm and field products is 34.73 per cent, on dairy products 35.15 per cent, on breadstuffs 33.42 per cent, on grape sugar 55.39 per cent, on maple sugar 49.65 per cent, on raw sugar 64.75 per cent, on wool 40.39 per cent; on fruits the average is 41.81 per cent.

The average of all the duties laid in the entire bill is about 46 per cent. There have been increases throughout the agricultural schedules. It is not a question of how much will be the increase if this amendment is passed. You might have had the duty at 1 cent per cubic foot, and you could have increased it a thousand per cent and still have been within the lines of good judgment and common sense. The question is whether 32 per cent is more than you ought to grant as a duty upon this article. And I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that on the fruits in this bill the average duty is 41.81 per cent, and under the entire bill the average duty is 46 per cent, while all that we ask on this luxury is 32 per cent.

An increase of the duty on pineapples would be in harmony with the action in respect to other similar articles in the bill. It is demanded by any sort of application of the principle of moderate protection, incidental or otherwise. It is justified by the application of the principle of tariff for revenue. It is required by the rule of consistency, the sense of justice and fairness.

To deny this duty of one-half cent a pound and $8 per 1,000 would be to deny to this industry the same treatment accorded to all others of the same kind and character, and indulge in a rank, unwarranted discrimination against the pineapple growers of Florida, Porto Rico, and Hawaii. It would be to deprive the Government of half a million dollars of revenue annually through a duty on a luxury. It would be to withhold from this industry the policy pursued toward the fruit schedules generally; and, instead of making that policy general, broad, and national, you would draw a black line across pineapples—an industry of great importance to our growers to the eastward and the Northwest and the South, growing in significance to the whole country at a wonderful rate; and the committee would blacklist and deny it the same treatment that other similar industries are given.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate longer. There are many details I could go into; but I think that the time has come when perhaps Senators have made up their minds, and I am not disposed to indulge in a more protracted discussion when the result will be the same whatever is said and conclusions have already been reached.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I am much opposed to this enormous increase of duty upon pineapples, but I do not wish to delay the Senate by repeating the arguments which have already been so ably presented.

The pineapple industry of Florida appears to be a flourishing and growing industry, and I am glad of it. It appears to furnish none of those indicia of necessity for further protection which should lead us to change the judgment that fixed the original protective rate. My object, sir, in speaking at all upon this paragraph is to insert in the RECORD and interpose in the discussion a suggestion of the established and traditional policy of the United States in respect of its relations with the island of Cuba, which is involved in the discussion of this duty.

We have a treaty with Cuba, made in 1903, under which, in consideration of a 20 per cent reduction upon Cuban products, American products have a reduction in Cuba. I do not think that my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] does full justice to the operation of that treaty, for under it the exports from the United States to Cuba have increased, since the making of the treaty in 1903, from $27,000,000 to $47,000,000. Our exports to Cuba have increased 84 per cent in the five years since the treaty was made, while our imports from Cuba have increased but 9 per cent in the same period.

But, Mr. President, it is not a mere balancing of advantages which seems to me to be the most important. Under the traditional and unvarying policy of the United States, the island of Cuba is recognized as being, first, essential to the protection and the prosperity of our country; and, secondly, as being by a necessary corollary, through the exercise of that protection, entitled to be brought within the circle of the benefits that our strong and vigorous Government can give and does give to all who contribute to her strength and perpetuity.

Long ago, before any of us were born, the ablest statesmen of the Democratic party announced as a principle of American policy that the island of Cuba should never be permitted to come within the authority and control of any foreign power. It was because Cuba, standing at the gateway of our southern country, must be under American influence, and could never be, with safety to us, put under the influence and control of any other power, that we went to war with Spain. The arrangement under which we surrendered the possession of that island was based upon our right to control the destiny of the island, and upon our recognition of a duty to see that Cuba was made peaceful and prosperous. To-day we have upon the island of Cuba American naval stations, under a treaty, for the common protection of Cuba and the United States.

To-day we prohibit Cuba by treaty, by our legislation, and by the provisions we have required her to put into her constitution, from borrowing money beyond the limit that we say is permissible. We prohibit her from making any arrangements with foreign powers that will be to our detriment, although they might be to her benefit. And as a part of the arrangement by which we imposed those limitations upon the free conduct of Cuba, we have assumed to protect Cuba. As a part of that arrangement we have entered into a treaty by which we give to her a portion of the benefits of our protective system.

Mr. President, whatever may be the policy of a country, no policy can be so bad as vacillation and uncertainty.

The policy of the United States toward Cuba is established, and every act that we perform should be in accordance with it. I submit, sir, that it would not be in accordance with that established policy to assume that we are to protect the people of the United States against Cuba as we would protect them against a foreign country with which we had no special relations, and that the question as to the amount of duty to be imposed upon this Cuban product must be a question in which we are not to reverse the decision of our country in giving a 20 per cent differential to Cuba, but to assume that she is entitled to that, that our policy is to be maintained, and that she also is to have her share of our protection in regard to this as to all other products.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question in regard to our protection of Cuba?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I notice the Senator stated that our policy is established. We are at a juncture in the management of our national affairs where economy is demanded, and it has been given out that the allowances for the army and navy and other departments must be largely cut. It seems that we have been supporting a large army in Cuba and charging nothing of the extra expense to Cuba. Happily, the army is not there now. Would the Senator have us understand that if we should send the army there again, as we did a few years ago, to preserve peace, we would not make a charge against Cuba for whatever might be the extra expense of maintaining our army there?

Mr. ROOT. I should hardly care to express an opinion about what would be wise under circumstances which have not yet arisen, but I should say that, in my judgment, the interests which the United States has of keeping Cuba peaceful and prosperous are so immeasurable in importance compared with any expense we have been put to in the past or that we possibly shall be put to in the future that any question of compensation or reimbursement must be treated as of no account.

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to interfere with the flow of the Senator's remarks, but it is a matter about which I have been questioned upon this floor, and I have been unable to say, and I do not know that anyone has yet arrived at a condition of mind where he is willing to say exactly what would be our course, but I wanted to get from the Senator while he was on that subject, if I might, some expression about it, because, of course, it is well to have a little preparation of mind beforehand for what might come to pass in the future; that is, a repetition of what has occurred in the past.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ROOT. Will the Senator let me finish my answer to the Senator from Wyoming? The clause of the law, familiarly known as the "Platt amendment," operating in our statutes and in the Cuban constitution and in the treaty between the two countries relating to intervention, declares that the United States shall have the right to intervene. It is not a privilege to Cuba; it is a right of the United States. We intervene in our own right because we claim to be entitled to keep peaceful and free the island that with our treasure and our blood we took from under the dominion of Spain, and that right is, in view of the attitude of the United States toward the Caribbean, toward the Panama Canal, toward all the countries about the Caribbean, a right of immense importance to the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator from New York think that the Cubans are giving us a fair preference in buying goods of our manufacture when, from the latest reports we have had, they are buying two or three hundred thousand dollars' worth of arms from Germany?

Mr. ROOT. I do not know from whom they bought arms. I know they bought $49,000,000 worth of goods from us in 1907 and $47,000,000 worth from us in 1908, and that their purchases from us in the five years since the treaty was made have increased 84 per cent. When you consider the fact that all their commercial relations had grown up under the dominion of Spain, so that their credit system and their business alliances were with Europe rather than with the United States, I think they have done very well toward turning over their trade to us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from New York tells us that we have increased our trade with Cuba from $27,000,000 to $47,000,000. That has been an increase of $20,000,000. But we have given to Cuba in the neighborhood of $7,000,000 per annum out of our Treasury. Let us assume that the importers or the exporters of the United States to Cuba have made a profit of 10 per cent upon the goods that they have shipped to Cuba, which I think is a very fair estimate to make; that would be $2,000,000 per annum. Does the Senator from New York think that it is a profitable transaction for the United States Government to give to Cuba out of its Treasury six or seven million dollars per annum in order to enable some exporters along the Atlantic seaboard to make $2,000,000 per annum?

Mr. ROOT. I do not undertake to consider it merely as a reciprocity treaty, without reference to other considerations. I do not think that the reciprocity treaty between the United States and Cuba is profitable to the United States. I think that the United States gets more from that treaty than we get from Cuba in the mere trade. But I have not the slightest question that the profit to Cuba is of greater value to the United States than it is to the Cubans who make it, for we must keep Cuba as a free, independent, and peaceable country, or else we shall face the alternative of letting Cuba go to some foreign power, which we never can permit, or of taking it ourselves, which I hope we never shall commit.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I entirely agree with what the Senator has last said. As far as I am concerned, the United States will never take Cuba with my vote. But I want to ask the Senator this question: Does the Senator think, in view of the fact that there is considerable difficulty confronting us now in the way of raising revenue to pay our expenses, the Government of the United States ought indefinitely to continue to pay out of the Treasury the enormous sum of six or seven million dollars per annum, and a sum which will increase as time goes on? Does the Senator from New York think we are indefinitely committed to that policy?

Mr. ROOT. "Indefinitely" indicates a long time. I think the treaty should be continued now. I think it would be a very great mistake for us to terminate the treaty. I do not know that I can say anything further, Mr. President.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly. I have said substantially what I had to say.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question.

Mr. ROOT. I shall be happy to hear it.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Does the Senator from New York contend that there is anything in the pending amendment violative in any way of the present treaty or the spirit of the present treaty with Cuba?

Mr. ROOT. My impression is, and it is a very strong impression, that the pending amendment would be violative of the spirit of the treaty. I think that for us to make a treaty, under which we agree to reduce by 20 per cent the duties on Cuban products, and then to turn around and make an increase of 128 per cent in the duty upon a product which comes to us from no other foreign country than Cuba, would, in substance, be a violation of the spirit of that treaty.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I should like to ask the Senator from New York if he has not voted for increases on articles that Cuba purchases from this country that are just as important to Cuba as the exportation of pineapples? I understand that the Senator from New York has voted consistently with the committee on practically all of the high rates of interest to New York which they have placed in the bill, except, possibly, in the case of lemons, and those articles on which he has voted an increase embrace a variety of products and manufactures that go to Cuba and are bought and used by the people of Cuba.

Mr. ROOT. I fail to see what voting to increase a duty on an article that is exported has to do with the subject, unless it makes it possible to sell the article cheaper to the Cubans.

I am obliged to the Senator from Florida for his certificate to my consistency. I was not aware that I was entitled to the privilege.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand the amendment of the Senator from Florida is an amendment to the committee amendment, and therefore I can not offer an amendment to his amendment. But I desire to give notice now that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida is defeated, I shall offer an amendment by striking out "7 cents per cubic foot," line 15, page 84, and inserting "10 cents per cubic foot." In giving that notice I wish to say that that will be virtually an increase of about 48 per cent over the present rate. I fully believe that that increase is justified or I certainly would not offer it. It means 10 cents per cubic foot, and there being 2½ cubic feet in a crate, 25 cents per crate, or 20 per cent off on account of the shipment to Cuba, which would make 20 cents per crate, or an increase of 6 cents per crate over the Dingley rate.

I simply want to give notice that if the rate offered by the Senator from Florida is defeated I shall offer this amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to say that that would mean about 20 cents a crate. That would mean about 20 per cent ad valorem in the duty on pineapples, which is about one-half the rate of duty on all the fruit schedules. It is less than one-half of the duty on the agricultural schedule. It is less than one-half of the duty on biscuits. It is less than one-half the average rate of duties throughout the entire bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I also want to add that I do not propose to offer the amendment on behalf of the committee but upon my own motion.

Mr. RAYNER. Mr. President, I only want to say that the amendment of the Senator from Utah I do not think will satisfy anybody on his own side or on the side that is against him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO] to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By sound the ayes have it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. RAYNER. I ask for a division on the question. I think we ought to have a vote on this important schedule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; we ought.

Mr. RAYNER. I think most decidedly we ought to have a yea-and-nay vote. What reason is there for refusing a yea-and-nay vote on this question, when you give it on a minor, subordinate schedule not nearly as important as this?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is it possible to renew the request for the yeas and nays after one has been denied by a show of hands counted by the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; but it is possible for the Chair to put the question again.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, will the Chair put the question again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this question the Senator from Indiana demands the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BAILEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], who requested me, if not here when the roll was called, to observe my pair. Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

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

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He being absent, I withhhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. He appears to be absent, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN], and I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce the pair of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. SCOTT. I will state that my colleague [Mr. ELKINS] was unavoidably called from the Senate Chamber. If he were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] requested me to observe the pair, but in view of the statement of his colleague, I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—34.

Bailey	Dick	Heyburn	Scott
Borah	Dixon	Johnson, N. Dak.	Simmons
Brandegee	du Pont	Lorimer	Taliaferro
Bulkeley	Fletcher	McEnery	Taylor
Burnham	Foster	Oliver	Warner
Carter	Frye	Page	Warren
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clapp	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Clay	Hale	Piles	

NAYS—30.

Aldrich	Crane	Kean	Rayner
Beveridge	Crawford	La Follette	Root
Briggs	Cullom	Lodge	Smith, Md.
Bristow	Cummins	McCumber	Smoot
Brown	Curtis	Martin	Sutherland
Burkett	Davis	Nelson	Tillman
Burrows	Gamble	Overman	
Burton	Gore	Paynter	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bacon	Daniel	Hughes	Owen
Bankhead	Depew	Johnston, Ala.	Richardson
Bourne	Dillingham	Jones	Shively
Bradley	Dolliver	McLaurin	Smith, Mich.
Clark, Wyo.	Elkins	Money	Smith, S. C.
Clarke, Ark.	Flint	Newlands	Stephenson
Culberson	Frazier	Nixon	Stone

So Mr. TALIAFERRO's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask that paragraph No. 275 may be agreed to as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to paragraph 275 as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I propose a new paragraph in the free list. I ask that it be stated by the Secretary and printed, and I shall offer it when the consideration of the free list is resumed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas will be received, printed, and lie on the table. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. In the free list it is proposed to insert the following:

472½. Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other lumber of whitewood, sycamore, basswood, and all sawed lumber of every kind, whether dressed or undressed, finished or unfinished, shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. I offer a modification of the amendment heretofore reported by the committee to paragraph 402.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. And I also offer an amendment to paragraph 405, which I ask to have printed.

Mr. BROWN. And go over until to-morrow morning?

Mr. ALDRICH. And, at the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, that the amendments go over until to-morrow morning. Then I shall ask for the consideration of these amendments by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire the amendments read?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; I think that is not necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest that they ought to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD and printed as amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

The amendments referred to are as follows:

Amendment reported by Mr. ALDRICH from Committee on Finance:

On page 158, in lieu of the proviso to paragraph 405, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That if any country, dependency, province, or any subdivision thereof shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever upon any pulp wood, wood pulp, or printing paper exported into the United States, the amount of such export duty or charge shall be added to the duty herein imposed upon printing paper valued at 3 cents per pound or less, when imported from such country or dependency; and if any country, dependency, province, or subdivision thereof forbids or restricts the exportation of wood pulp, pulp wood, or printing paper into the United States in any way, and, in the opinion of the President, such prohibition or restriction unduly discriminates against the United States, and the President shall make proclamation to that effect, thereupon and thereafter there shall be imposed upon all printing paper valued at 3 cents per pound or less an additional duty equal to the rate of duty imposed by this section upon such paper when imported from such country or dependency into the United States."

Amendment reported by Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Finance, viz: Insert the following:

"402. Mechanically ground wood pulp, one-twelfth of 1 cent per pound, dry weight: *Provided, however*, That mechanically ground wood pulp shall be admitted free of duty from any country or dependency (being the product of any such country or dependency) when and so long as such country or dependency, or any province or subdivision thereof, does not forbid or restrict the exportation of or impose any import or export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee, or otherwise), upon mechanically ground wood pulp, logs, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp. Chemical wood pulp, unbleached, one-sixth of 1 cent per pound, dry weight; bleached, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, dry weight: *Provided*, That if any country, dependency, province, or any subdivision thereof shall impose an export duty or other export charge of any kind whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, on pulp wood or logs exported to the United States, the amount of such export duty or other export charge shall be added as an additional duty to the duties herein imposed upon wood pulp when imported, directly or indirectly, from such country or dependency: *And provided further*, That in case any such country, dependency, province, or subdivision thereof shall forbid, directly or indirectly, the exportation to the United States of any wood pulp, logs, or wood for use in the manufacture of wood pulp, and the President shall be of the opinion that such prohibition unduly discriminates against the United States, and shall issue a proclamation to that effect, thereupon and thereafter an additional duty equal to the rates of duties imposed by this paragraph upon wood pulp shall be imposed upon any wood pulp imported from such country or dependency."

Mr. ALDRICH. From the Committee on Finance, I now offer a substitute for paragraph 424, which I ask may be read, and I hope that it may be disposed of without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment reported by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 170, in lieu of paragraph 424, it is proposed to insert the following:

424. Coal, bituminous, and shale, 60 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 15 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel: *Provided*, That the rate of 15 cents per ton herein designated for "coal slack or culm" shall be held to apply to importations of coal slack or culm produced and screened in the ordinary way, as such, and so shipped from the mine, and shall not be applied in whole or in part to any importation of coal shipped from the mine or imported as coal, notwithstanding portions or percentages of said shipment or importations would, as a matter of fact, pass through a one-half inch screen; coke, 20 per cent ad valorem; compositions used for fuel in which coal or coal dust is the component material of chief value, whether in briquettes or other form, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*, That on all coal imported into the United States, which is afterwards used for fuel on board vessels propelled by steam and engaged in trade with foreign countries, or in trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, and which are registered under the laws of the United States, a drawback shall be allowed equal to the duty imposed by law upon such coal, and shall be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move to amend the proposed amendment by striking out the word "sixty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "forty." The reduction proposed here is simply 7 cents a ton different from the present duty.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say that, in the absence of a printed copy of the amendment, unless the Senator from Rhode Island indicates what is the nature of the amendment and the effect of it we shall not be able to vote intelligently.

Mr. ALDRICH. The only change from existing law is a reduction of 7 cents a ton upon bituminous coal. The Dingley rate is 67 cents and the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance is 60 cents. The duty at present upon coal, slack, and culm is 15 cents a ton. That duty is retained by the proposed amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This is a reduction, as I understand.

Mr. ALDRICH. A reduction on the present law of 7 cents a ton on bituminous coal, leaving the duty upon slack the same as it is in the present law.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. The House rate was 67 cents a ton on both coal and slack.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What is the present law?

Mr. ALDRICH. Under the present law the rates are 67 and 15 cents, respectively. The House rate was 67 cents on both coal and slack, but there was a provision that if other countries admitted coal into their possessions free of duty, we should admit coal into this country free.

Mr. BURKETT. Is that provision retained in the Senate amendment?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not retained in the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. BACON. The Senator may have given information; but in the confusion and with his face turned in the other direction, I did not catch it. I desire to ask how does this amendment compare with the provision as it came from the other House?

Mr. ALDRICH. As it came from the other House, the duty upon both coal and slack was 67 cents a ton, with a reciprocity provision that, if other countries admitted coal into their territory free, the coal from such countries should be admitted into this country free.

Mr. BACON. What I desire to know of the Senator, briefly, is whether or not the amendment proposes a greater duty than that imposed in the House bill, or whether it is less than that?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is less than that which the House bill proposes, except as to the provision as to reciprocity. The straight duty is less than that contained in the House bill. As I have stated, the House bill imposed a duty of 67 cents on both coal and slack, while the proposed amendment is 60 cents on coal and 15 cents on slack.

Mr. BACON. Now, will the Senator kindly add to that a little statement—as we have had no opportunity of examining the amendment—as to what is the particular feature with reference to reciprocity to which he has just referred?

Mr. ALDRICH. The reciprocity provisions are entirely stricken out. There is no provision for reciprocity in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BACON. What is the effect of striking that out, I ask the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALDRICH. The effect would be to strike out the provision for reciprocity; that is all. There is no provision for reciprocity.

Mr. BACON. Of course I know that is the effect—that is the direct effect—but what is the effect upon the general question of the rate which will be put upon coal?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a practical question, of course.

Mr. BACON. Of course I would not ask the question if I could see the amendment; but I can not see it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendment is just as I have stated. The reciprocity would not affect the duty upon coal in this country unless Canada—for Canada is the only country from which we could get coal—should remove her duties entirely. Whether she would or would not is a question which I am not able to decide, and I presume no other Member of the Senate is able to do so. If she removed her duties, then Canadian coal would come into the United States free of duty; if she did not, coal and slack would pay a higher rate of duty under the House provision than they would under the Senate committee provision.

Mr. BACON. And under the House provision, if I understand it correctly, in case Canada should remove her tariff duty there would be no tariff duty on coal coming from that country into the United States.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right; exactly.

Mr. BACON. To that extent, then, the amendment does make it possible that there may be an increase of duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does. In that contingency the proposed Senate committee duty would be higher than that in the House bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the practice in the Senate would it be in order for me to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]?

Mr. ALDRICH. It would not be in order at the present time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator from North Dakota offered an amendment. Now can I offer a substitute for that?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can offer a substitute for the entire paragraph, to be voted on after the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota is disposed of.

Mr. BACON. May I inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island upon what ground the Senate committee thought it important or proper to strike out the reciprocity provisions?

Mr. ALDRICH. Because the committee thought that they were not wise provisions.

Mr. BACON. I doubt not that is true; but the committee will certainly go further and give us the reasons upon which they base that conclusion. I did not ask for the conclusion; I asked for the reasons.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can give the Senator the reason of one member of the committee who does not believe in striking out that reciprocity provision. The fact is that, if we continue this reciprocity agreement, the chances are a thousand to one that we will have free coal; that is all; but by the Senate amendment we will not have free coal under any circumstances. That is about all there is to it. By the amendment which I propose, we would at least reduce the present duty on coal from 67 cents per ton to 40 cents per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota represents himself, of course.

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly; I said I spoke only for myself.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator spoke as one member of the committee. All of the other Republican members of the committee thought that this reciprocity provision ought to be stricken out, and I will give the Senator, if he desires, some of the reasons which influenced the committee in arriving at that conclusion.

In the first place, personally, I did not believe that Canada would remove her duties upon coal. I think the policy of the Dominion government and the economic conditions in that country would render it impossible for Canada to take the duties entirely off of coal, at the present time, at any rate, and that we should be left with a duty of 67 cents on coal and slack, as compared with 67 cents on coal and 15 cents on slack, as in the present law. Beyond that, the committee believed that if the duties were entirely removed both by Canada and the United States, the coal producers of the United States, especially in Wyoming and to a considerable extent in West Virginia and in other sections of the country, would be subjected to unfair competition from the Canadian coal producers and the Canadian mines.

As the Senate already knows, coal has been the subject of a duty from time immemorial. The Democratic Wilson tariff law of 1894 fixed a duty upon coal; and I think the Democratic party, or what might be called the controlling element of the Democratic party, has always been for a duty on coal. The States of Virginia and West Virginia, and, in fact, a great number of States, including Alabama and other Southern States, have always been opposed to the free admission of coal into the United States.

Of course the interests of New England upon this question are somewhat different from those of other parts of the country. It has been assumed in some quarters that New England would be benefited by removing the duty on coal. I do not think so, to any considerable extent. The coal which comes to New England, or would come to New England from the Maritime Provinces, especially from Nova Scotia, is not of a quality which can compete, or which does compete, with the coal of West Virginia for steaming or any other purpose. New England is buying to-day coal from West Virginia, and to some extent from Virginia and some other States, in competition with Canada and with Nova Scotia, when they could lay down coal in Boston, or at almost any other part of New England, at least a dollar a ton, and, in some cases, as much as $1.65 a ton less than we are obliged to pay for West Virginia coal, showing that the question of coal in New England is more a question of quality than of anything else, or of the tariff.

There were a number of people, coal producers of western Pennsylvania and of Ohio, and to some extent of Indiana and Illinois, who were very anxious to have this reciprocity provision adopted. To-day the Province of Ontario and certain other portions of the Dominion of Canada get their coal supply from the United States, which is the natural source of that supply; and it undoubtedly would be true that the coal producers and coal miners of extreme western West Virginia, of western Pennsylvania, and of Ohio, and perhaps some parts of Indiana, would be greatly benefited by this reciprocity treaty provision, provided it went into practical effect. I think they are the only people in the country who are really actively for this reciprocity provision.

The people of New England, I think, those who are not indifferent, would perhaps be willing to have the experiment tried. But I think there is no representative of New England who desires to have the duty entirely removed from bituminous coal, as it might be under the provisions to which I have referred.

After you leave this middle belt of the States I have named, to whose interest it would be to have reciprocity with Canada, you strike another part of the territory of the United States, perhaps the territory which is included in the States of North and South Dakota, and possibly Minnesota, which are now, I think, required by existing conditions to buy their coal from other parts of the United States. They may believe, and possibly it may be true—I think not, however—that they would be able to buy their coal lower if coal were on the free list, or if the duty were very largely decreased.

There is another section of the country, consisting of the States of Wyoming and Utah, that have large coal deposits of a very good character; and the free importation of coal into this country would be absolutely destructive of the mining interests of those States, especially of the State of Wyoming. I think I do not misstate matters when I say that they would have no possibility of competition with the coal mines directly north of them if the duty were entirely removed.

Again, on the Pacific slope, the coal producers of Washington would have no possibility of competition with the coal miners of British Columbia, Vancouver, and that section of Canada. So that, with the exception of a small territory in the center of the country and another comparatively small territory directly west of that, I think the interests of almost the entire country are against the free importation of coal here.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. ALDRICH. And as long as those of us sitting upon this side of the Chamber are in favor of the protective principle, it is impossible, in my opinion, to resist the conclusion that a reasonable duty ought to be maintained upon bituminous coal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If we abolish the distinction between slack and coal, is it the opinion of the Senator that we will raise additional revenue by our course?

Mr. ALDRICH. We do not abolish the distinction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I beg pardon; I think you do.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no. The House abolished the distinction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Exactly. Do we not unite them in one grade to avoid fraudulent classification?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no. We report a duty of 60 cents a ton on coal and 15 cents on slack.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One further question: When we took the duty off of bituminous coal a few years ago we did it on the theory that we would lower the price of coal to the consumer, did we not?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And it did not operate to lower the price, as I recollect?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; it did not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. So the attempt we made was an utter failure, and neither yielded revenue to the Government nor coal to the consumer at a reduced price; nor did it solve the vexed question then confronting the country growing out of the coal strike?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is true.

Mr. HALE. And lost the revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. And lost the revenue. The Senator will remember that there is no duty imposed by this act, and none under existing law, and none proposed, upon anthracite coal; and I think the section represented by the Senator from North Dakota is more dependent upon anthracite coal than bituminous coal. Of course, I assume that the manufacturing establishments in that country use bituminous coal, which perhaps comes from the coal fields of Illinois, or possibly the western coal fields; I think not, however, from Wyoming. I think it comes from Illinois and the country around there.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And Michigan.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; Michigan. But anthracite coal is on the free list, and that is the coal that these States I have alluded to use mainly. They use it, of course, entirely for domestic purposes, and I think they use it largely for all purposes except pure manufacturing.

Mr. McCUMBER. It is not used for any other than domestic purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. So that the coal question of itself is not a very important one for these States, so far as it relates to bituminous coal.

These are, very briefly, some of the reasons which led the committee to conclude that there should be a duty maintained upon coal.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate briefly on this subject.

I hope the House provision will be retained. There are many substantial arguments in favor of placing coal on the free list. Anthracite coal is already free; and similar arguments could be made in favor of removing the duty on bituminous coal. From this standpoint the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is much better than the substitute offered by the Finance Committee. But it is not probable that any considerable quantity of coal—I might say any appreciable quantity—will come into the United States except from the British possessions to the north of us. There is no supply in sight in Mexico; and when the proposition is made to bring coal from Wales, or from other places across the ocean, although it is true that some cargoes are brought from Australia and also some Welsh coal is imported, it is not probable that such importations will assume any considerable magnitude.

Another reason why, save from British North America, the free entrance of coal is not necessary in order to lower the price is that we surpass all countries in our coal supply and in the variety of the locations in which it can be obtained. In the working out of those conditions in the year 1908 we exported 11,853,000 tons, against imports of only 1,504,000 tons, our exports being about seven times as great as our imports. In 1907 the proportion was somewhat less, but the total trade was larger, exports amounting to 13,152,000 tons and imports to 2,126,000 tons. In all recent years the exports have far exceeded the imports, though up to 1890 the imports were greater than the exports. This shows the growth of the industry of mining coal in this country. One great advantage to be derived from the House provision would be the opening up to the north of us of a very large market for our coal, extending from near the Ottawa River almost to Winnipeg. This is a growing section. There is a steady growth in population and in industry. They are importing now large quantities of coal mined in the United States, and the quantity which they would import would no doubt be very greatly increased if there were reciprocity in the coal trade between the United States and Canada.

One objection raised is that reciprocity will bring in a large quantity of coal from Nova Scotia. I will call attention to the statistics on that subject.

The total quantity of coal imported from Nova Scotia in 1907 was 616,000 tons. The annual average for seven years has been 723,000 tons. In order to save time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place some of these figures in the RECORD without reading them in detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Chair hears no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Imports of Nova Scotia coal.

	Tons.
1901	590,086
1902	751,382
1903	968,832
1904	713,170
1905	652,538
1906	769,775
1907	616,812

Importations of duty-paid coal into Montana and Idaho.

	Tons.
1904	159,488
1905	174,511
1906	258,466
1907	272,532
1908	410,120

Mr. BURTON. We had an object lesson in what would be the effect of free coal from Nova Scotia after the great coal strike in the autumn of 1902, at which time Congress passed a resolution allowing the free entry of coal. In that year, ending June 30, 1903, when, as everyone knows, there was a most distressing scarcity of the domestic supply, the total quantity imported from Nova Scotia was only 968,000 tons, or about 245,000 tons more than the average for seven years. If that was the case at a time when everyone was feeling the hardship of the strike and the scarcity of domestic coal, if the increase was so comparatively slight, amounting to barely 33 per cent, we may conclude with tolerable certainty that under free coal no such quantity would enter as to interfere with the sale of coal mined in West Virginia, in Pennsylvania, or in any other State.

Another objection is that the coal mines of Wyoming will suffer from Canadian competition.

Let us look for a minute at the coal that is imported from Canada into Montana and Idaho, as included in the statement given. The quantity has increased somewhat; but it amounted to only 410,000 tons in 1908. There is a feature in connection with these importations to which I wish to call especial attention.

A part of the coal of Wyoming is hauled 532 miles—in fact, at one place, Missoula, 562 miles; at another, Phillipsburg, 535 miles—at a cost of $4.25 per ton. I question most decidedly

whether the waste of energy required to carry that coal more than 500 miles, at an expense of more than $4 a ton, considerably more than double the cost of the coal, is worth while, when there are coal mines right across the border in Canada. The following table illustrates this peculiar situation:

Distances and rates on coal, carload, from Cumberland, Elkol, Glencoe, Diamondville, and Kemmerer, Wyo., to points in Montana and Idaho.

To—	Lump, nut, and run of mine.	Slack.	Distance from Cumberland.
			Miles.
Firth, Idaho	$3.00	$2.50	223
Idaho Falls, Idaho	3.25	3.00	238
Pocatello, Idaho	2.00-[a]1.75	2.00-[a]1.75	188
Montpelier, Idaho	1.75	1.60	89
Boise, Idaho	4.00-[a]3.75	4.00-[a]3.75	452
Butte, Mont	3.25	3.00	450
Anaconda, Mont	3.25-[a]3.00	3.00-[a]2.75	476
Missoula, Mont	4.25	4.25	562
Phillipsburg, Mont	4.25	4.25	535
Garrison, Mont	4.00	4.00	488
Monida, Mont	3.25	3.00	318

[a] Summer rate, effective June 1, 1909, to August 31, 1909, unless sooner revoked.

Distances computed from Cumberland, this being farthest distant mine from destination.

Above table from figures furnished by Interstate Commerce Commission June 9, 1909.

Let us now compare the amount of the possible loss in the localities described with the magnitude of the trade in the Lake region from the United States to Canada.

In 1906 the amount of bituminous coal carried into British Columbia, almost all of which was in this middle section, amounted to 5,357,000 tons—more than twenty times the amount imported that year from Canada into Montana and Idaho, and seven times the average amount brought in from Nova Scotia. In 1907 the exports were 7,194,000 tons, or eight times the combined amount imported from Canada into Montana and Idaho and from Nova Scotia into New England. Thus it appears that by reciprocity our shipments of coal would be approximately eight times as large, and the benefit proportionately as great, as against that degree of disadvantage which would fall upon the Wyoming section, or would rise from the possible decrease of coal shipped from Pennsylvania or West Virginia to New England. I submit, Senators, that there is so great a preponderance of advantage in favor of reciprocity, both in the buying and the selling of coal, that we should adopt the House provision.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator takes his seat, I simply wish to draw his attention to the fact that the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota does not embrace a reciprocity feature, but is simply one looking to the reduction of the rate of duty; and that the point that he desires to accomplish can only be reached by subsequent enactment. There is nothing now pending which will reach it.

Mr. BURTON. It can be reached by adopting the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota in place of the substitute offered by the Finance Committee. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that I am intending to vote for the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota as a step in what I regard as the right direction.

Mr. BACON. I shall vote that way myself. But the defeat of the House amendment, in case the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota were defeated, would have the objection, to my mind, that so far as the amendment goes it is an improvement, in the fact that it reduces the duty. So that it seems to me that with the views entertained by the Senator from Ohio, the proper course would be to endeavor to retain the favorable part of the substitute of the committee and amend it by restoring the reciprocity feature; because outside of the change in regard to the reciprocity feature, the only feature of the amendment is that it reduces the duty.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, I will state to the Senator from Georgia, as a practical method of gaining what is desired, that I expect to vote for the first amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Simply for the purpose of ascertaining just what the situation is here, I wish to ask if the Senator from North Dakota, in the amendment which he has offered, leaves the situation as to this countervailing provision as the House left it? Or is that out of the section as he proposes an amendment to the amendment offered?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I can answer that by stating that I did not think that the two amendments ought to be joined. I am in favor, first, of a reduction to 40 per cent. I am in favor of free coal if I can get it. If I can not get free coal, I should like to get it at 40 per cent. Then, whether this prevails or not, I should move to amend by reinserting the House reciprocity provision——

Mr. ALDRICH. That will not be necessary, Mr. President——

Mr. McCUMBER. But as a separate proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I will state for the benefit of both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Dakota that it will not be necessary to vote to insert the House reciprocity provision. Senators can vote for that by voting down the committee amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the course suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, to offer it as a separate proposition, is absolutely the right one.

Mr. BURKETT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the committee that I am not one that favors putting everything, or very many things, on the free list. I have always thought that, as a general proposition, every industry ought to pay its due proportion of whatever is raised by a revenue tariff. But it has occurred to me that if there is one thing that ought to be placed on the free list, it is coal. I am not going into the figures, as was done here, with reference to imports. I doubt very much whether free coal would make much difference with the imports. Coal is an article the cost of which to the consumer is very largely a matter of transportation. Coal is not very expensive where it is gotten out of the ground, but it is very expensive to transport; and I have always believed that the people ought to be permitted to buy coal at the nearest possible place where it is taken out of the ground, and thus avoid the expense of a large amount of transportation.

The amount of tariff we may put upon coal will make very little, if any, difference in itself in the price of coal, but it may force a long haul that will add very much to the price to the consumer.

I live in a State that does not produce any coal, and I am not certain that retaining the tariff on coal or taking it off of coal would either of them affect the price of our coal supply. I doubt very much if they would. We shall always have to pay for a long haul. Free coal could not lessen the haul to our consumers. I am rather inclined to believe that the more we build up the coal mines of Wyoming the better it will be for the other industries of our State; and I understand how anxious the Senators from that State feel about retaining the tariff on coal. But there are sections of this country, in my opinion, as I have looked at the coal map—which I have here, but which I am not going to take the time to exhibit—that are closer to the coal mines in Canada than they are to ours, that would receive very great benefit if we should take off the tariff between this country and Canada, and save the present enormous cost of transportation.

Free coal would be beneficial to some portions of the country. I think it would have a tendency to build up industries in some sections of the country, and thus distribute the manufacturing industries of the country which must always depend very largely upon the fuel supply.

I think the people of the country quite generally would welcome the taking off of the tariff on coal. I have gone through the hearings, I will say to the chairman of the committee, and I observed that the people from New England were practically unanimous in asking for the removal of the tariff on coal, believing that it would help them in their industries. I observed that the people, quite largely from Pennsylvania, were here asking that the tariff be taken off of coal, believing that they were closer to certain markets in Canada, and by reason of decreased transportation free coal would open up a market for their coal in certain portions of Canada. That same thing would apply in certain sections of our country in opening up a market, no doubt, to foreign coal. As I said, getting coal at the nearest mine on either side of the line would save an enormous amount of transportation in some instances, and it would tend to distribute industries.

This is one of the reasons why I should like to see coal on the free list. I have been in hopes that the committee could find it in their judgment, after deliberating upon the matter, to reduce it at least so as to give to the people the benefit of the cheapest possible transportation of coal.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire simply to say that the people of New England are not in favor of free coal or reci-

procity with Canada. There are certain gentlemen in New England, some manufacturers and some owners of coal mines in Nova Scotia, who want free coal. We had free coal not many years ago, for one year, and imported coal into the port of Boston—nearly a million tons—and it was not sold at a penny less than it sold before the duty was removed.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. Is it not a fact that at the time of that importation there was a most unusual scarcity in the production of the mines of the United States?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true.

Mr. BURTON. Some of them having ceased entirely. So that year is by no means a fair test as to whether the price would be reduced or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true; but it shows that the gentlemen who were so anxious for free coal at that time did not find it in their hearts to deduct from the price of the coal the amount they had been paying formerly in duties when it came into New England—they simply added that to the price of the coal. If we had reciprocity with Canada, we would exchange good coal for poor coal; that is all. Our coal is very much superior to that of Nova Scotia. We do not want to go into a bargain of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to ask the chairman of the committee what is the ad valorem equivalent on coal as reported now by the committee? My own impression is that it is something like 20 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a little less than 20 per cent on the importations of 1907.

Mr. BAILEY. Upon that rate the Government collected, I believe, $695,000. The result would be that if a reduction of more than one-third should be made in the duty the Government would lose something like $230,000, and the benefit of it would go to the people who live at a convenient ocean delivery and the other people who live along the Canadian border. The same people who have been asking for an increase of duty on bread are now asking for a decrease of the duty on coal.

As far as my own constituents are concerned, whether the duty be much or little, it is a matter of no consequence, because transportation rates in this case, as in many other cases, render it immaterial to them whether one or another rate of duty shall be levied.

But I am not unmindful that if the Government remits to people who live at convenient distances to the coal mines of other countries the $250,000 which it now collects, it must collect that $250,000 on something else, and I suspect that it will collect it on something that my people do buy and use; whereas it now collects it on something that my people neither buy nor use—not that they do not use coal, but they use coals produced in mines situated nearer to their homes; and it would be impossible for this Canadian coal to find its way to our markets if we had free coal or even if a bounty were paid upon it. As my people do not pay any part of the $700,000 which the Government now collects, and as they would be certain to pay a large part of any amount which the Government remits, I believe I will let the manufacturers pay this moderate duty on their coal, and especially as they exact upon the manufactured goods which they make with this coal a much higher duty. In other words, as long as the manufacturer demands a duty of 30 and 40 and 50 per cent upon the product of his mill, I think he can well afford to pay the Government the very moderate duty of 20 per cent on the coal which he uses to supply his mill.

Of course, Mr. President, I do not complain that people who have to buy coal want it as cheap as they can get it. That is natural; and perhaps the Senator who represents a constituency of that kind might fail in the performance of his duty if he did not attempt to reduce the rate to the lowest possible point. Neither am I to be understood as saying that I would lay the same duty on every article, because I would not. In fact, coal is one of those necessaries of life that if the repeal of a duty on it would operate equally in every State and in every community, I would vote to put it on the free list, because people must keep warm. I would love to see coal so cheap that no part of this country would be compelled to heat itself with the products of the forests. I would like to conserve the forests in that way.

But knowing as I do how utterly impossible it is to distribute the amount that the Government would lose by the remission of the duty on coal among all the people alike, I am rather inclined to leave each community to enjoy as I would leave each community to suffer the advantage or the disadvantage of its natural location.

If the farmer in South Dakota wants a duty of 30 cents on every bushel of his wheat, then he ought not to complain that he pays a duty of less than 20 per cent on his coal. If he protects himself in the sale of his wheat against the competition of his neighbor across the Canadian border when he comes to sell his product to his own people, he ought not to complain that the rule which he applies to others in the sale of wheat is applied to him in the purchase of coal.

Neither am I inclined to still further increase the advantage of our New England friends by allowing them to bring their coal from Nova Scotia by water and thus minimize the cost of their production until they will consent to reduce the tariff and transmit to the people at least a part of the benefit of this reduced cost of production.

Mr. President, it is not a question with me of protecting coal mines. We have none to protect; or, rather, we have none which can be protected. We have some coal mines in western Texas, but they are so far from the balance of the country that we do not ship it where it would come in competition with imported coal, and therefore it could not affect its price.

So I am in this happy circumstance, that what my people sell could not be enhanced in price and what my people buy could not be reduced in cost, and I am at liberty—and whether I was so circumstanced or not I would still pursue my rule—to look at this question purely as one of revenue. I think the people who import coal ought to contribute to the support of the Government, at least as long as people who import clothes are compelled to do so.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if there was nothing more in this question than the simple one of revenue or a simple question of protection, then I would be perfectly free to admit that the duty of 60 or 67 cents would be a reasonable duty. But, Mr. President, there is no more similarity in the argument of a duty upon grain and a duty upon coal than there is a similarity in a beautiful marble statue and a bale of hay. They have no relation whatever to each other. If we could go right on producing coal, and that which we produce this year could be reproduced another year, then there would be no question but that the duty would be a very reasonable duty.

I am not going into the question of the extent of our coal fields again, nor how soon they are liable to be exhausted. That subject was discussed over and over again. I have my convictions upon the question of oil. I believe in free oil, not because I do not believe in protecting oil if we could reproduce it again in the well and take out as much next year as we take out this year, but I know that every barrel we take out means the exhaustion of the quantity in the United States, and is to that extent an exhaustion forever.

That applies equally to our coal. I stand upon the broad proposition that those great natural resources which once utilized become forever exhausted should be protected and shielded as long as possible, and especially where it is evident that the exhaustion will take place in the near future.

For that reason, Mr. President, I have been in favor of free coal, for that reason I am in favor of free oil, for that reason I am in favor of free lumber, because the field of supply is rapidly being consumed to-day, and it will be still more rapidly consumed next year.

Mr. President, it is useless to go over this question again. I shall vote for any measure for free coal not because the duty is excessive in any way, but simply because when once exhausted we can not reproduce it, and because my opinion is that the supply is far more limited than most people believe.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, one word. The view which the Senator from North Dakota has suggested produces on my mind exactly the opposite impression. I can not comprehend how we can make people more careful to preserve any commodity by making it cheaper to them. Indeed, unless I misunderstand human nature entirely, the way to make people take care of a thing is to increase its price. I know perfectly well that any man will waste coal worth a dollar a ton when he would take great care of it worth $10 a ton. So if it be true that our mines are at the point of exhaustion, you will not delay the evil hour by reducing the price.

Now, Mr. President, I do not mean to suggest that high coal is a good thing. I know to the contrary. I would love to see fuel so cheap that the poor would never suffer from the cold. But I know that if you look at it merely as a matter of exhaust-

ing the mines, you can not prolong the supply by reducing the price of coal, because it is true of coal, as it is of everything else in this world—as you make it cheaper you make men less careful in preserving it.

So it seems to me the argument advanced by the Senator from North Dakota would have exactly the opposite effect. I have, perhaps, no right to say that it would have that effect on everybody else; but I know that in my own case, the more I have to pay for a thing, the better care I take of it, and I submit to the Senate and to the country if that is not true of everybody?

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the people of the world do not waste fuel. The people of the United States do not waste their coal whether it is cheap or whether it is dear. The people need to be warm. They want to use such coal as will be sufficient to warm their homes. They want to use such an amount of fuel as is sufficient to do their cooking. They will not use any more because it is cheap. It is a bare possibility if it gets so high that they can not purchase it they will go cold rather than buy coal. I do not want to put them in that position. My point is this simply, that we will import more from a foreign country and will not exhaust our own mines quite as rapidly.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I agree with the argument of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] in reference to the consumption of coal, but I am not surprised that the Senator from North Dakota is very uneasy at the exhaustion of the coal supply. I find by the Geological Department estimate made in 1907 that they estimate we have in this country only about 3,147,025,000,000 tons of coal in sight, or enough to last the country four thousand one hundred and fifty years, consuming what was consumed in 1907.

I am not going to discuss this matter at any length whatever at this time. I may do so somewhat later in the session. But I desire to say that if we have free coal, it means a loss to the markets of the miners of this country in all the Pacific coast cities; that the market will be taken by the Canadians. It means the closing of many of the Washington state mines and throwing out of employment thousands of our miners and a stoppage in the development of the almost inexhaustible supply of coal that we have in our territory.

It may be that if you put coal on the free list you would help some sections of this country and give it a little greater trade; but I do not believe it is the policy of the Republican party or that it is the desire of the people of this country that the trade of any particular section shall be built up at the expense and to the detriment of any other section of the country.

Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Mr. F. A. Hill, of the State of Washington, with reference to this question; also a protest on the part of the people of the State of Washington; a table showing the wage scale in Washington and in British Columbia mines; also resolutions of the Federation of Labor of the State of Washington; and a letter, together with a statement, from the Delegate from Alaska with reference to the coal possibilities of Alaska.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Early last month I prepared a brief on coal duty, addressed to Mr. PAYNE, chairman of Ways and Means Committee; to-day I have a letter from Mr. Houston, of this city, sending me copy of the brief submitted, which left out what I consider a very important fact and on which part of the argument is based.

The omission is as follows:

For the year 1907 there were imported into the United States 2,103,711 tons of bituminous coal.

British Columbia shipped in 651,076 tons, or 30.9 per cent. San Francisco receives annually from all foreign points, except British Columbia, 350,000 tons, or 16.7 per cent. Boston received 545,650 tons, or 25.9 per cent. To all other points would be left 26.5 per cent.

Not having seen Mr. Houston, I can not say why this should have been left out of the brief, when considerable of the argument in the brief would not be understood without the above facts being set forth.

In detailing matters therein I undertook more to furnish the Washington legislators facts on which to base arguments at any time the matter is discussed, and most of the facts are record matters that can be proved by statistical matter or published facts scattered throughout United States statistics as well as British Columbia.

The more that I consider this duty matter the more I am convinced that its removal will work hardship on all the commercial mines, and especially on the employees. As consulting engineer, I have charge of the Renton mine, employing 350 men, and have several smaller operations in my care, and have for twenty years been closely identified with coal mining as an employee. During that time have inspected British Columbia and Alberta mines, and developed them, so am able to talk on the costs of mining in both localities. I only suggest this matter to you, as personally being a stranger it is best you may know where and what source the facts come from that are given in the brief.

A number of parties are now looking to open mines in this State, but will not do so if the duty is removed, as it would be the height of folly to invest a dollar unless an exceptionally fine, easily mined property should show up, and in the last case I have a commission to buy one of that kind, but after two years looking for it, almost despair finding such a one in this State.

I am sure you will do everything possible in this matter, and the operators that I have talked to, which is nine-tenths of the tonnage, feel that you will give this matter special attention and win victory.

Yours, very truly,

F. A. HILL.

JANUARY 14, 1909.

Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I beg leave to submit statement of facts relating to the coal-mining industry of the State of Washington; also arguments presented herewith by the mine operators of that State to show why, in their opinion, the duty on coal should not be removed. I hope that your honorable committee will give this matter due consideration, because it has a vital bearing in the development of a large industry in our State.

The coal mines of Washington produced in the year 1907, 3,680,532 tons, of which amount the Northwestern Improvement Company produced 1,782,964 tons, practically all of which went to the Northern Pacific Railway. This leaves for the commercial mines 1,897,568 tons.

The total cost of all this coal mined was $7,678,801, or $2.04 per ton. Eighty per cent of this cost is labor, or a pay roll of $6,143,840. There were 5,945 employees in the Washington mines in 1907.

The employees engaged in coal mining in the coast district of British Columbia, and the proportion of each class are as follows:

	Number.	Percentage.
Supervision and clerical	117	3.1
Whites:		
Miners	1,160	30.8
Miners' helpers	440	11.7
Laborers	632	16.8
Mechanics and skilled labor	314	8.3
Boys	166	4.4
Japanese	174	4.6
Chinese	743	19.7
Indians and Hindoos	23	.6
Total	3,769	100.0

Of the numbers scheduled above, 20.3 per cent are boys, Japanese, Chinese, Indians, and Hindoos, receiving $1.35 to $1.75 per day, as against $1.75 to $2.75 per day for the same class of labor in the State of Washington.

In the matter of miners, helpers, and laborers, the same class of men receive 10 to 15 per cent more in Washington than they are paid in British Columbia. No Asiatic labor is employed in the Washington mines.

The cost of producing coal from the Washington mines has steadily increased the past five years. Advancing wages, greater depths in mining, eight instead of ten hours for a day's work, have all had their effect on increased cost.

In the matter of wages, the average earnings of mine employees in 1903 was $2.46 per day of ten hours; in 1907, $3.19 per day of eight hours, an advance in wages of 30 per cent, a decrease in hours of 20 per cent, so that the advanced cost represents at least 40 per cent to the mine owners.

The miners of this State are exceptionally fine men, and as miners can not be excelled. They are justly entitled to receive the best wages paid in the country.

Unlike all the other coal fields of the United States, the Washington fields are badly faulted and contorted, and there is no comparison between the Washington fields and those of British Columbia and Alberta, Canada.

The physical conditions surrounding our coal mines make them very difficult and costly to operate; this is applicable to all the commercial mines.

The coal from the Washington mines is bituminous, semibituminous, and lignite, very much lower in B. T. U. than the high-grade bituminous coals of British Columbia and Alberta.

The mines of British Columbia can produce coal at a cost of $1.40 to $1.80 per ton, those of Alberta at a cost of $1.10 to $1.30 per ton.

The freight rate on coal from Vancouver Island points is 75 cents per ton to Puget Sound points.

The freight rate from the Fernie fields in British Columbia to Spokane is $2.25 per ton, and from the Alberta fields to Spokane is $2.25 to $3.15 per ton.

The freight rate from the Roslyn district, Washington, to Spokane, Wash., is $2.50 per ton, and from the western Cascade district to Spokane $3 per ton.

The commercial coal mines of the State of Washington produce less than 20 per cent of lump or house coal. The coal, being very friable, breaks up in handling, and will, when shipped by vessel, reach dealers in San Francisco 65 per cent lump and 35 per cent screenings, and on board cars to any Washington dealers 85 per cent lump and 15 per cent screenings.

The Vancouver Island coals are hard and reach dealers with less than 10 per cent screenings.

The wholesale prices of foreign coal in San Francisco during the years of 1902–3 were as follows:

	1903.	1902.
Wellington, screened	$8.00	$8.00
Wellington, screenings	4.50	4.25–4.50
Wellsend, average	6.50	6.50
Hetton, screened	7.00	7.00
Hetton, average	6.50	6.50
Gretta, screened	7.00	7.00
Gretta, average	6.50	6.25
Cannel	9.00	9.00
Welsh anthracite, average	9.00	8.50
Welsh anthracite, egg	13.00	13.00
Welsh anthracite, lump	11.50	11.50
Cardiff	9.00–9.50	9.00
Lelaw-Main or Richmond	7.50	7.50

No duty 1903. Who received it?

Which shows that that duty being off in 1903 did not lessen the selling price of coal.

All coal shipped from one port in the United States to another must be sent in United States registered vessels. From any foreign port to United States ports it is shipped in foreign registered vessels.

It has been shown that the people of San Francisco did not receive any benefit in 1903 by reason of no duty, the price of coal remaining the same as it was in 1902.

The mines producing the largest tonnage in the Fernie (B. C.) field, 876,731 tons in 1907, are controlled by United States railroad owners.

The exports and imports of coal between the United States and Canada are as follows (see Mineral Industry):

	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.
Exports	4,468,953	6,535,863	6,577,954	6,964,630	7,533,346
Imports	1,678,919	1,613,426	1,211,304	1,331,292	1,427,731
Difference	2,790,034	4,922,437	5,366,650	5,633,338	6,105,615

The exports are 95 per cent by way of the Great Lakes. The imports from Canada are one-half into Washington markets and the other one-half into New England points.

House or lump coal sells in Seattle by the ton at $5, nut coal at $3.75, and screenings for steam use at $2.25. The proportion of these coals as mined and shipped are 40 per cent lump, 20 per cent nut, and 40 per cent screenings. The mine owner realizes at the mines for the principal coals of this description as follows:

40 per cent lump, at $3.75	$1.50
20 per cent nut, at $2.25	.45
40 per cent pea, at $1.25	.50
Total	2.45

These coals cost f. o. b. mines $2 to $2.30 per ton to produce.

It costs two to two and one-half times more to put commercial coal f. o. b. in the State of Washington than it does in Pittsburg or the Middle-West district.

To produce, open, develop, and ship 500 tons of coal per day from Washington mines requires approximately an investment of $500,000.

There is an abundance of good cooking coal in the State undeveloped.

ARGUMENT.

The above are facts. The State of Washington mine owners and employees submit that the reasons given above fully entitle them to ample protection for the coal industry, and that the present rate of duty on coal and coke should remain.

It has been shown that fully one-half of the coal coming into the United States comes in direct competition with Washington, Montana, Oregon, and Wyoming coal.

For the commercial coal mines of the State of Washington to compete with the British Columbia and Alberta coal, if the duty is removed, means that all the small mines will have to close down, that the wages paid in all the other mines will be cut at least 30 per cent, and with this cut in wages nothing like the capacity of the mines, as they are now producing, can be expected. Where there is now a contented and well-paid lot of employees, there would be poorly paid employees, distress and dissatisfaction, as the mines would be run fewer days in the year.

The best mine employees would leave their homes for the neighboring Provinces or cut into other lines of work, and the country would lose desirable citizens.

The State of Washington coal mines would then be left in such condition that if an active demand came for coal, as it did in the winter of 1906–7, the supply could not be met, and the people of Washington would pay more additional money for their fuel in one year than the benefits accruing to all the rest of the country would amount to in five years.

During the winter of 1906–7, while the temporary shortage occurred, the British Columbia mines would not sell any coal for the market in this State, and their coast mines would not take care of coal depots in Alaska that they had been supplying for years.

You will ask why they refused to furnish this coal, and I will answer by saying that their agent in San Francisco had raised the price of coal from $12 to $15 per ton, and they wanted that extra $3, and they did not have the nerve to tell us that we could have it by paying the extra $3; they simply told us that they did not have it to spare.

In view of these facts it does not look as though the removal of the duty on coal would have the effect of protecting the consumer as regards prices or supply; it appears to me that the only way to do this would be to keep the duty on coal and encourage the development of the mines in the United States. In that way our country would be developed and enough coal would be mined so that local competition would keep prices down to where they should be.

It is a well-known fact that had the duty been off of coal from 1891 to 1897 all of the mines in Washington would have been forced to close down, as the British Columbia mines would have flooded the market with their product at a price that the Washington operator could not meet, as they were even then selling their coal at so small a margin of profit that they could hardly continue to operate. At the present time British Columbia coal is being sold to the consumer in Seattle at $7 per ton, but certain retail dealers get a rebate of 75 cents per ton, with an ironclad agreement that they will not sell to the consumer for less than $7. In view of these facts, who would benefit by a reduction in the duty? Not the consumer, nor the retail dealer, but the British Columbia mine operator. He would pocket the 67 cents and smile at making money so easy, and then he could smile again because, on account of Washington mines closing down, large numbers of miners looking for work would go to British Columbia, and that would enable the British Columbia operator to reduce wages.

In order to keep the coal price stable on the Pacific coast, Washington mines must be protected so that the coal mines can be kept open and working regularly. It is impossible to let our mines lie idle for a year and then reopen quickly and go to work. Physical reasons prevent this, and to keep miners that can do work in the mines of this State, the mines have to be regularly worked.

Washington coal will not stock, hence accumulation of stocks of coal can not be made to take care of sudden emergencies or demands for coal.

It has been shown that the freight rate from the Alberta coal field is $2.75 to $3.15 per ton to Spokane, Wash.; from the Washington field it is $2.50 to $3 per ton. The cost of producing coal in the Alberta district is $1.10 to $1.30 per ton, while it is $2.04 in the Washington field. The Alberta mine owners have largely increased their shipments to Spokane the past year, and are, with the duty on, competing successfully with Washington and Wyoming coals.

The free duty of 1903 had no effect on Washington, for one reason only. Early in 1903 a strike of the Wellington Collieries Company's employees occurred, which lasted a number of months, and the lost ground was not recovered until late in 1903. The Wellington Collieries Company mines four-fifths of the product of the coast mines of British Columbia. Had the strike not occurred Puget Sound points would have been flooded with the Wellington product.

Remove the duty on coal and the loss to the State of Washington would not be less than $2,500,000 annually in wages alone. British Columbia mines can produce coal at less cost than the mines of Washington and Oregon. During normal or depressed times they would have a surplus and flood the Washington and Oregon markets and close up our commercial mines. As soon as there was a brisk demand they, with such mines in this State as could be kept open, would immediately raise the price of the product to a high point, being in position to do so, as the mines of this State would not be able to supply the market. If the 67 cents duty remains on coal the tonnage of this State will be increased to meet the demand as it may grow. New mines will be opened and are now being opened. Development of new coal mines have been proposed the last sixty days, which will be abandoned should the duty on coal be removed.

Removing the duty on coal could not possibly benefit the New England States to offset the loss to this State. Should the New England States receive six times as much foreign coal with no duty and they receive the benefit, it would only benefit them $2,193,521 annually, while the loss in wages alone to this State would be $2,500,000 annually, with a loss to the operators in invested capital of fully $6,000,000.

No reciprocal advantage can be gained with Canada. The mineral industry shows from three to five times as much export of American coal into Canada as the imports are from Canada. What advantage does Pittsburg or the Middle West expect to gain by reciprocal arrangement? They now have every advantage in prohibitive distances and freight rates into that part of Canada along the Great Lakes where their product is shipped. The Canadian coal fields lie in the extreme east and west of Canada.

The coal-mine employees of this State realize that it means distress to them, a breaking up of home ties and friends, if the duty on coal is removed or materially changed.

Below is a summing up of a few of the salient facts contained in this article.

SUMMARY.

It has been shown that if the duty is removed from coal that the State of Washington will lose in salaries paid miners $2,500,000 annually, with a loss to the operators in invested capital of possibly $6,000,000 and should Canada reciprocate and remove the duty on coal going in there the operator of the Middle West and the eastern portion of the United States will be benefited to the extent of $2,193,521 annually.

It is shown that the country at large will gain nothing by the removal of the duty, because the mine operators of the Middle West and of the East are well protected on account of freight rates—that is, they have a market that can not be touched by anyone else. This shows very plainly that these operators and they alone would be benefited by a reciprocal removal of the duty on coal, and this ought to make plain to your committee the reason why the operator of the Middle West and the East are willing that the duty should be removed.

It has been shown in these arguments that the consumer of coal in the State of Washington will not be benefited by the removal of the duty and that the only one that would be benefited is the mine operator of British Columbia.

The removal of the duty would also allow the British Columbia operators to supply all the government posts on Puget Sound and in Alaska, as on account of our shipping laws transportation is so much less from British Columbia ports than they are from United States ports.

I believe your committee will see the inconsistency of passing laws that debar the mine operator of Washington from using cheap Asiatic labor in the mines and at the same time remove the duty on coal that is mined by these Asiatics and allowing it to compete with coal that is mined by high-priced white labor.

The removal of the duty would also affect our shipping on Puget Sound, as it would place the British Columbia operators in a position where they could ship their coal in foreign vessels to all Pacific coast ports.

It has also been shown that the removal of the duty will retard development of a great industry in the State of Washington, for the reason that quite a farm and dairying industry is dependent upon these mines for their market.

I take the liberty of attaching herewith letters from different mine operators of Washington indorsing all that has been said in this argument. I also attach a petition from the miners who work in the coal mines at Renton, Wash. These miners, not having a union, thought best to sign a petition to your committee. I am expecting every day a resolution from the Mine Workers of America, which resolution is to the effect that they as mine workers are bitterly opposed to the removal of the duty, as they are perfectly well aware that if it is removed a great many of them will be compelled to give up their homes and seek employment in British Columbia. As soon as this resolution arrives I will hand it to you.

Yours, respectfully, F. A. HILL.

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON'S PROTEST AGAINST FREE COAL.

Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois ask for free coal not to save their home market, but to enlarge their foreign market. Their home market is in no danger whether a tariff is placed on coal or not.

Washington, Wyoming, and Montana beg for the retention of the present tariff on coal in order to save their home market from destruction. They do not ask for any action by Congress that will enlarge their trade, but only pray for such action as will enable them to keep the trade they have.

The present tariff on bituminous coal can not injure the trade of Pennsylvania, Illinois, or Ohio. The abolition of this tariff would destroy the present trade of Washington, Montana, and Wyoming.

BRIEF ON BEHALF OF BITUMINOUS COAL-MINE OPERATORS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AGAINST THE PROPOSED ABOLITION OF TARIFF ON BITUMINOUS COAL.

The operators of bituminous-coal mines in the State of Washington protested against the provision of the Payne bill providing for free coal importations from all countries that make American bituminous coal free of duty.

We most earnestly call the attention of the committee to the fact that the advocates of free coal, every one of them, who appeared before the committee admitted that the States of Washington, Wyoming, and Montana would be injured by the abolition of the tariff on coal. We hope that the committee, in the contest between West Virginia on one side and western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois on the other, will not forget the perilous position of the above three Western States, neither one of which can possibly gain anything whatever by reciprocity with Canada. Neither one of these States can obtain any of the trade of middle southern Canada that is now divided between western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia; therefore we submit that we should not be sacrificed to benefit either one.

We assign the following reasons for our position:

I.

COAL IMPORTATIONS.

There were imported into the United States in the year 1907 2,103,711 net (1,689,376 gross) tons of bituminous coal. Of this amount 1,297,376 gross tons came from Canada, and of this 432,455 tons, or one-third, were shipped into the United States from British Columbia. Of this amount 378,504 net tons, or 337,940 gross tons, or one-sixth of the entire importations into the United States, were imported into Pacific coast ports. This amount, in 1908, was 567,264 tons. In other words, one-sixth of the entire bituminous importations into the United States were from British Columbia, and came into competition with mines in western Washington. This does not include importations from Japan, Australia, and other countries.

In the year 1908 there were shipped into Puget Sound, Oregon, and California ports the following amount of coals from foreign countries, all of which were bituminous:

	Gross tons.
Into San Francisco from Australia	238,314
Into San Francisco from British Columbia	153,178
Into Eureka, Cal., from Australia	1,294
Into Eureka, Cal., from British Columbia	1,078
Into Portland, Oreg., from Australia	18,413
Into Portland, Oreg., from British Columbia	2,908
Into Puget Sound ports from British Columbia	68,530
From various other countries	188

This makes a total of 258,221 tons imported from Australia, 225,694 from British Columbia, and 188 tons from other countries, a total of 584,103 tons. This does not include importations into Alaska. There could be added for Alaska importations of 75,000 tons, making a total into Pacific coast ports of 658,103 tons during the year 1908.

In the year 1907 there were imported into San Francisco 194,400 tons from British Columbia and 386,700 tons from Australia. This was a decrease from the year 1907. This decrease is explained as follows:

The importations of Australian, Japanese, and British Columbia coals into San Francisco for the years 1907 and 1908 were as follows:

	1907.	1908.
Australia	386,700	238,314
British Columbia	194,400	153,178
Japanese	38,040	18,250

In 1906 the importations from Australia were 60,525 tons, whereas the imports from British Columbia were 307,991 tons. There was some trouble in the British Columbia mines in 1907, which caused a shortage. This shortage continued during 1907, and the British Columbia importations fell off to 194,400 tons, whereas the Australian importations were increased to 386,700 tons, and there were imported 38,040 tons from Japan. The British Columbia importations decreased in 1907 and 1908, as against 1906, whereas the Australian increased. During 1907 and 1908 there was considerable more Australian coal imported than was required, and the surplus will not be worked off until 1909. As the owners of the British Columbia mines had the largest stock of Australian coal in San Francisco, they, naturally, in order to protect it, had to reduce their importations of British Columbia coal. This caused an extreme pressure of British Columbia coals against the more exclusive markets of the western Washington mines on Puget Sound during 1908, and we may expect this pressure to continue during 1909.

Free coal with reciprocity would certainly be accepted by Australia, whether accepted by Canada or not, as the United States can not possibly export any coal into Australia.

II.

AMOUNT OF PRODUCTION OF BITUMINOUS COAL IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE YEAR 1908.

The State of Washington produced 2,975,407 gross tons—3,332,456 net tons—of bituminous coal in 1908, of which 1,564,444 gross tons—1,752,177 net tons—were produced west of the Cascade Mountains.

III.

LABOR COMPETITION.

In 1907 there were 5,945 laborers employed in coal mines in the State of Washington, about one-half of them being employed in the mines west of the Cascades. The same figures apply generally to the year 1908.

There was and is no Asiatic labor employed in the Washington mines, and but few boys.

In the Vancouver Island mines, British Columbia, 1907, there were 3,769 persons employed, of whom 4.6 per cent were Japanese, 19.7 per cent Chinese, 0.6 per cent Indians and Hindoos, and 4.4 per cent boys, making 29.3 per cent. Of this Vancouver Island labor, this 29.3 per cent of Asiatics and boys received only a part of the wage paid for the like service in the Washington mines—that is, from $1.35 to $1.75 per day—as against $1.75 to $2.75 a day paid in the Washington mines, the latter paying from 10 per cent to 15 per cent more for miners, helpers, laborers, and skilled labor than is paid in the Vancouver mines.

Pickers, screen men, firemen, and dumpers are part Asiatic and part white men in the British Columbia mines. Asiatics receive from $1.25 to $1.50 per day and the white men from $2 to $2.75 per day. White boys receive from $1.25 to $1.50 per day.

The following tables show an interesting comparison of the wages paid in the Washington mines with those paid in the British Columbia mines:

The difference in conditions of work prevent complete comparison of the yardage or tonnage between the mines of the two countries, except that the Roslyn and Cle Elum mines in Washington have conditions closely aproaching the British Columbia mines, and the rates of these mines are as follows:

Washington mines: Roslyn, 97 cents per ton; Cle Elum, 90 cents per ton.

British Columbia: Extension mines, 75 cents per ton; Pacific Coast Coal Mines (Limited), 65 cents per ton.

In 1903 the average earnings of employees in the Washington mines were $2.46 per day. In 1907 it was $3.19 a day, the former being the pay for ten hours' work and the latter for eight hours' work.

In October, 1907, a new scale of wages went into effect, increasing the cost of mining over 25 per cent.

IV.

COST OF PRODUCTION FOR THE YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1907.

The average cost of production of coal in the State of Washington in the year ending June 30, 1907, was $2.244 per gross ton f. o. b. cars at the mines.

The average cost estimated for the year 1908, owing to the above increase in wages was $2.622 per gross ton f. o. b. cars at the mines.

Against this cost are the following estimated figures for the British Columbia mines, to wit:

	Per gross ton.
Crows Nest mine	$1.45
Extension mines	1.50
Comox mines	1.25
Nanaimo mines	1.25
Pacific Coast Coal Company (Limited)	1.25

The last four mines are on Vancouver Island. The first one is on the mainland of British Columbia. We have not the actual figures of these British Columbia mines, and can not obtain them. The above estimates are based upon what it would cost to do this mining in the Washington mines on the wages paid in the British Columbia mines.

V.

FREIGHT RATES.

The British Columbia mines are practically all at tide water. The Wellington Extension mines are situated on Vancouver Island, 13 miles from Ladysmith, their shipping point at tide water, and the mines own the short railroad between the mine and tide water.

The Pacific Coast Coal Company (Limited) mines are on Vancouver Island on the Esquimault and Nanaimo Railroad, at South Wellington, and 10 cents per ton would be the extreme cost to bring the coal from the mines to tide water. The Nanaimo and Comox mines are on Vancouver Island, on tide water. None of the Washington mines are located less than 25 miles from tide water.

We therefore summarize as follows:

A ton of coal from the Washington mines, west of the Cascades, landed at Seattle, would cost, including 65 cents freight and 15 cents bunker charges, $3.42.

A ton of coal from the British Columbia mines landed at Seattle would cost, including 85 cents freight and 67 cents duty, as follows, to wit:

From Extension mines	$3.02
From Comox mines	2.77
From Nanaimo mines	2.77
From Pacific Coast Coal Company (Limited)	2.77

This is an excess of from 40 cents to 55 cents of the cost of the Washington over the British Columbia coal.

A ton of coal from the Washington mines, west of the Cascades, landed at San Francisco, would cost, including $2.50 freight, $5.12.

A ton of coal from the British Columbia mines landed at San Francisco would cost, including $1.10 freight and 67 cents duty, as follows, to wit:

From Extension mines	$3.27
From Comox mines	3.02
From Nanaimo mines	3.02
From Pacific Coast Coal Company (Limited) mines	3.02

This is an excess of from $1.85 to $2.10 of the cost of Washington over British Columbia coal.

The above cost prices for the British Columbia mines cover coal at least 85 per cent lump, whereas the Washington coal is not over 15 per cent lump. It will thus be seen that there is no possibility of competition between the mines in western Washington and the Vancouver Island mines on account of the cheaper labor in Vancouver, cheaper freight rates from Vancouver mines to San Francisco, and the superior quality of the coal. A great advantage in freight rates that the British Columbia coals have is that they come to Puget Sound and San Francisco in foreign bottoms, and, therefore, for lower freight rates than the Washington coals, which are compelled to come in American bottoms.

The rates for coals from the British Columbia mines to San Francisco do not exceed $1.10, although many shipments are made from $1 up to $1.10, while the rates from the Washington mines are $2.50.

In addition to competition with the Vancouver Island mines, there is, as I have stated, competition with the Australian mines. The figures that I have given previously show large importations from Australia. We have not the freight rates from the Australian mines to tide water, but from the fact that the coal can be bought from $2 to $2.50 per ton, mostly lump, at shipping point, indicates a low freight rate. The freight rates from shipping point to Pacific coast ports are low, because the owners of ships are willing to bring over coal as ballast, in place of waste material, in order to take cargoes at San Francisco, Columbia River, or Puget Sound of Washington and California products. If they are allowed to bring in this coal free, they will naturally bring in a much larger amount of this coal at such rates as not only to control the coal market in San Francisco and Puget Sound, but even to affect the oil market.

Oil is now being extensively used for steam purposes in California, the oil being produced in California. The railroads in California use it exclusively, even as far south as El Paso, as far east as Ogden, and as far

north as Portland. With a much larger importation of the Australian coal, with the tariff removed, the oil men may well be concerned.

The more Australian coal that is imported into San Francisco and Portland the more heavily will British Columbia coal be forced to compete with Washington coal in the Puget Sound territory, and also east of the Cascades with the Wyoming and Montana coal, and I therefore regard the Australian competition as a very great menace to the American miner.

In this connection I desire to place before you some figures showing how surely the coal from the Washington mines is being driven out of the California markets, even with the present duty on, and therefore how necessary it is for the existence of these Washington mines that their remaining territory, to wit, the Puget Sound country, should be preserved to them. These figures are taken from the San Francisco Merchants' Exchange, and though differing a little from and not quite as accurate as those I have elsewhere given, that were obtained from the records of the collectors of the various ports, yet they are sufficient to illustrate my point as to the decreasing sale of the Washington coal in the San Francisco market, even with the duty on.

Importations of coal from British Columbia, Australia, and the State of Washington into San Francisco during the years 1903 to 1808, inclusive.

	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
British Columbia	259,092	304,181	324,229	274,979	186,241	164,442
Australia	271,068	141,670	86,066	55,007	351,976	219,240
Washington	384,060	274,060	146,075	83,656	82,142	21,023

VI.

QUALITY OF COAL.

An important fact that operates against the Washington mines is the quality of their coal.

Vancouver mines produce from 80 to 85 per cent of lump coal and only from 15 to 20 per cent of slack. The Washington mines, of the better grades of bituminous coal, produce not to exceed 15 per cent lump and 85 per cent of slack and fine coal.

The lignite mines in the State of Washington produce about half of lump and half of fine coal. The best Washington coal will evaporate as much water per pound of coal as the Vancouver Island coal, and is, therefore, as good steam coal—but there is not much of this—but on account of the heavier cost of production and the fact that such a large output of the Washington mines as compared with the British Columbia mines, is fine or slack coal, the latter can not obtain as good a price as the British Columbia coal.

The difference in quality counts very much against the Washington mines, being the competition of a high percentage of lump coal against a low percentage of lump coal. In the eastern market this is not a disadvantage at the present time. Formerly the same prejudice existed in the eastern market against fine coal as now exists in the western market. At the present, however, in the Pacific coast market fine coal is very badly handicapped as against lump coal for steam as well as domestic purposes.

VII.

GEOLOGICAL CONDITION OF THE MINES.

Another item of increased cost of production in the Washington mines is the broken nature, geologically speaking, of the country, the veins not being continuous, but breaking off or bending on each other, thus rendering the production the more expensive, while those in British Columbia have a more regular and unbroken character and can be more cheaply worked.

An expert writes me as follows:

"The conditions between the Washington and British Columbia fields are dissimilar.

"Reverting again to the question of cost of production: There are no mines in the State of Washington that can produce coal as cheaply as the mines in Vancouver Island, or the Nicola coal fields on the British Columbia mainland. The conditions in the Washington and British Columbia mines are dissimilar. In Washington, where we find the conditions good, with the fields reasonably extensive, with fairly good roof and bottom, the coal is almost exclusively a lignite coal, the grade being such that, without protection, it can not compete. The bituminous and subbituminous coals, with the exception of one mine in western Washington, are in broken country, having innumerable faults and heavy pitching veins standing at from 45 to 70 degrees of a pitch, making mining very expensive, and reducing the quality of coal produced. With such dissimilar conditions we can not make a comparison, but the general conditions are that the lignite or poorer coals in the State of Washington can be produced at about the same general average cost as the British Columbia and Australian coals; on the other hand, the bituminous coals, some of which are almost equal in quality to the British Columbia coals, produce so little lump that they must also have a duty in order to protect them. The bituminous mines of western Washington not only have a heavy cost of operation, but the cost of development, on account of the broken country, is excessive. Very few mines can be placed on a basis of output aggregating 750 tons per day at a less cost than $500,000. The mine owners in the western portion of the State have in the past, at different times, run their mines at a loss rather than close down, for the reason that such closing down would entail a much greater loss than running on part time. But, on the other hand, if in running the loss would be greater than by closing down, they would naturally close down. On account of the broken ground and poor roofs, closing down would entail the loss of considerable coal which might be opened up. In fact, the loss of a market is a greater blow to the mine owners of western Washington than to any similar business in other portions of the United States, as they can not close without an exceptionally heavy loss, and should they run they also have a loss staring them in the face."

VIII.

SELLING PRICE.

The present price made to dealers at San Francisco for the Vancouver Island coal is $6.96 per gross ton, lump coal. The average selling price for fine or slack coals is $5 per gross ton. Taking the average of 15 per cent slack and 85 per cent lump, that would give an average price of $8.45 per gross ton in San Francisco. The average selling price of this coal as it comes from the vessel in large quantities (mine run) for steam purposes at San Francisco is about $6 per gross ton. The average selling price of both kinds, for domestic and steam purposes, is about $7.45 per gross ton. Deducting 67 cents for duty, $1.15 for freight (though $1 is obtained), and 40 cents for handling, it would leave the selling price $5.23 f. o. b. at Ladysmith, or practically at the mine, for shipment to San Francisco. Vancouver Island mines, however, sell for export to Puget Sound ports (Seattle, Tacoma, and other places) at only $3.90 per gross ton f. o. b. at Ladysmith ($1.33 less than for shipment to San Francisco). The freight from Ladysmith to Seattle, including handling, does not exceed 85 cents per ton, which is almost as cheap a rate as the Washington mines can obtain (about 80 cents). In other words, British Columbia coal, to meet American competition at Seattle, can be profitably sold for $1.33 f. o. b. mines less than when sold for shipment to San Francisco.

As against the above selling prices of British Columbia coal in San Francisco, Washington bituminous steam coal is offered for sale in San Francisco for $6, and yet can not compete with the foreign coal.

Foreign coal, as a rule, sells in San Francisco to-day at $2 per ton more than Washington coal. The elimination of the duty, therefore, would not lower the selling price to the consumer, as these foreign coals have a margin of $2 upon which to work. Therefore, during the year 1903, when coal came in duty free, the consumer did not obtain any benefit therefrom.

The following are the selling prices of Washington coal f. o. b. vessels at Tacoma and Seattle:

Lump coal, $4.50 to $5 per gross ton.

Steam coal, $2.75 to $3.50 per gross ton.

Lignite lump coal, $3 to $4 per ton; and the following are the selling prices of Vancouver Island coal f. o. b. vessels in Tacoma and Seattle:

Lump coal, $6.25 to $7 per gross ton.

By comparing these selling prices with the cost of Washington coal, landed in Seattle, given on page 9, it will be seen that there is a margin of profit to the Washington mine operator of from $1.08 to $1.58 on bituminous lump, and a margin of only 8 cents of profit on steam coal, with a possible loss of as much as 67 cents on said steam coal, and a margin of 58 cents profit on lignite lump, with a possible loss of as much as 58 cents on lignite lump. Inasmuch as in the bituminous coal there is only 15 per cent of lump and 85 per cent of fine coal, and in the lignite of 40 per cent of lump and 60 per cent of fine, it will be seen that the possibility of loss is more than the possibility of any large profit.

By comparing the selling prices of Washington coal in San Francisco ($6), as given on page 16, with the cost ($5.12) of the same coal landed in San Francisco, page 9, it will be seen that there is a possible margin of 88 cents, and yet the British Columbia coal, having a margin of $2 in selling price above the Washington coal, has managed to almost run the Washington coal out of the San Francisco market, as appears on page 12 (the sale of Washington's coal having fallen from 384,060 tons in 1903 to 21,023 tons in 1908).

We therefore submit that if the duty of 67 cents on the foreign coal will enable the Australian and British Columbia mine owners to have a margin of $2 in selling price above the Washington mine owners, the removal of this duty of 67 cents would enable them to wipe out any possible profit the above figures show that the Washington mine owners could possibly earn under the present tariff.

IX.

MINES IN EASTERN WASHINGTON.

In eastern Washington the coal averages about 40 per cent to 50 per cent lump, and yet the competition with the British Columbia mines is so great that the mines in eastern Washington are practically unable to compete. The town of most importance in eastern Washington is Spokane, with about 80,000 inhabitants. The freight rate from the eastern Washington mines to Spokane is $2.50 on net tons of 2,000 pounds. The freight rate from the Fernie and Mitchell mines in British Columbia to Spokane is only $2.15 per ton, a difference in favor of the British Columbia mines of 35 cents. The difference in cost of production gives the British Columbia mines another advantage of 30 cents. Add to this the difference in the quality of the coal in favor of the British Columbia mines, and as a consequence the British Columbia coal has crowded out the eastern Washington, Wyoming, and Utah coal from participating in any of the steam-coal business in Spokane, and should the duty be taken off it would force the eastern Washington mines entirely out of the territory within a radius of 100 to 150 miles west of Spokane, a territory which at the present time is absolutely necessary to keep the mines operating in eastern Washington for even a limited number of days.

I beg to submit the following extracts from letters written by mining superintendents in Washington upon the present situation.

The superintendent of the Renton mine, situated 13 miles from Seattle, writes:

"This mine could not ship coal into Portland, Oreg., as against the British Columbia coal if the duty were taken off, as there is now very keen and close competition with the British Columbia coals in Portland.

"We are able with the tariff on to ship to Bellingham and Everett. If the tariff were taken off, it would shut us out of that market, and instead of producing, as we now do, 140,000 tons annually, we would probably either have to shut down or produce about 75,000 tons, and that without profit, unless we should reduce the pay of our men at least 30 per cent."

The superintendent of the Pacific Coast Coal Company's mines writes as follows:

"For the past several years it has been impossible for this company to ship any lump coal mined at our mines in the State of Washington to the San Francisco market or to any California market, or to the Oregon market in competition with Wellington coal from Vancouver Island and the Australian coals shipped from Australia. Neither can we ship lump coal to the Spokane territory in eastern Washington, on account of the competition of coal mined in British Columbia.

"I will also state that should the duty be taken off coal that we shall be unable to ship our steam coals, which are mined in the State of Washington, to any of the above points in competition with the British Columbia steam coals.

"It is also true that we can not ship lump coal to Bellingham in competition with the Vancouver Island coal."

The superintendent of the Commonwealth Coal Company writes as follows:

"At the present time, with a 67-cent tax on foreign coals, our market is limited to the territory taking low freight rates from our mines. Columbia River and California markets are largely supplied with Australian and British Columbia coals, and even in Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, and Bellingham foreign coals find many buyers for domestic use.

"With the high cost of production in this field some protection is absolutely necessary. In our opinion, the removal of the present duty would mean the closing of many properties, loss of capital invested, and throwing of hundreds of men out of employment. It would be a calamity. Don't let it be done."

The superintendent of the Carbonado coal mine writes as follows:

"The cost of coal and physical conditions of the mines of the State, and the effect of the removal of this duty, are all very truthfully set forth in your letter. We here at Carbonado, with about 450 miners working, most of them Americans and English-speaking people, with a town of a population of about 1,500, and being purely a commercial mine, feel this duty probably more than any camp in the State, as we are entirely depending upon the local market for our existence.

"We are now paying the highest scale of wages that has ever been paid in the history of this mine; with a reduction of the tariff, I do not see how we could continue to operate as against the British Columbia importation without duty."

The manager of the Maple Hill Coal Company at Seattle writes as follows:

"I beg leave to state that with the present duty on coal we are unable to make shipments of coal to points outside of the Puget Sound country proper, let alone the fact that it is impossible to obtain a market in California for lump coal. If the duty should be removed, we would not even be able to ship steam coal into San Francisco markets, and it would let foreign coals into the Puget Sound country except where freight rates are low at points near the mines. To points where the freight rates are high it would not be possible to ship in competition with the British Columbia coal to Bellingham and Everett particularly, and points on the Columbia River. The British Columbia coals coming into the Spokane territory, which belongs to us at the present time, takes up practically three-fourths of our trade there. If the duty is taken off, we will be entirely shut out of our own domain in that section. Likewise Comox and Wellington coals, nut and steam, are now running after our trade in the Puget Sound territory."

Manager of the Roslyn Fuel Company writes as follows:

"In reference to the proposed removal of tariff on coal I believe that this will result very disastrously for coal mining in the State of Washington. With the present duty on coal we are unable to ship any lump coal to points outside of Puget Sound, and have not been able so far to market any of our lump coal in California. Should the duty be taken off, it would be impossible to ship even steam coal to San Francisco. It would place us at a further disadvantage with the foreign coal in Seattle and other Puget Sound points, coal from the far British Columbia points not paying as much freight as we have to pay into Seattle. If this duty is removed, it can only result in the delayed development of Alaskan coal mines, and they will be placed at a disadvantage in competition with British Columbia coals in San Francisco and other markets."

Wage scale.

Occupation.	Washington mines (8-hour day).	Comox and Extension mines, British Columbia (9 hours).
INSIDE.		
Miners	$3.60	$3.00
Timbermen	3.60	2.75
Timbermen helpers	3.00	(a)
Trackmen	3.60	2.75
Trackmen helpers	3.00	(a)
Drivers	3.15	2.50
Drivers' helpers	3.00	
Parting boys	1.80-2.30	(b)
Greasers boys	1.75	(b)
Trappers boys	1.50	(b)
Rope riders	3.20	
Hoist boys	2.40	
Rockmen	3.00	2.75-3.00
Cagers	3.20	2.00-2.75
Couplers boys	1.75	
Shoy lighters	3.75	
Bratticemen	3.60	
Bratticemen helpers	3.00	
Timber packers	3.00	
Loaders	3.00	2.50
Pumpmen	3.00	
Shovelers	3.00	2.50
Inside labor not specified	3.00	(c) 1.50 and 1.2. (d) 2.00 and 2.50
OUTSIDE.		
Cagers	2.90-3.10	2.50
Engineers	3.25	3.00
Blacksmiths	3.50-3.75	3.00
Horseshoers	3.45	
Helpers	2.75	
Carpenters	3.50	3.00
Slate pickers	2.10	
Screen pickers	1.50	
Screen men	2.00	
Firemen	2.75-2.80	
Dumpers	2.60	
Outside labor not classified	2.50	

[a] Asiatics.
[b] Asiatics or boys.
[c] Chinese.
[d] Whites.

Where rates are shown for Washington mines and not for British Columbia mines it is because the latter do not segregate different classes so closely as the former do.

Comparative rates of wages per hour in Colorado, Montana, Washington, Wyoming, and western Canada for certain inside occupation in coal mines.

Occupation.	Colorado.	Montana.	Washington.	Wyoming.	Western Canada.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Bratticemen		47	45		37½
Brattice helpers			37½		31¼
Cagers	37½		40		32¾ / 37½
Drivers	37½	45	40	42½	34½ / 37½
Inside laborers		40¾	37½	38¾	31¼
Loaders			37½		32¾
Machine runners	43¾	48¾		48¾	43¾
Machine helpers	37½	42½		42½	37½
Miners	37½	47	45	42½	37½ / 43¾
Motormen	37½	43¾	37½ / 39½	42½	34½ / 36¾
Pumpmen	37½	47	37½	38¾	31¼
Rope riders	37½	42½	40	42½	34½
Shot lighters		47	47	48¾	37½
Track layers	37½	47	45	42½	37½
Track layers' helpers		40¾	37½	38¾	31¼
Timbermen	37½	47	45	42½	37½
Timbermen's helpers		40¾	37½	38¾	31¼

Average price per short ton for coal at the mines since 1903, by States and Territories.

State or Territory.	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.
Alabama	$1.22	$1.20	$1.21	$1.34	$1.29
Arkansas	1.51	1.54	1.49	1.61	1.68
California	[a] 2.86	[a] 4.74	[a] 4.97	[a] 2.55	[a] 3.81
Colorado	1.23	1.31	1.22	1.26	1.40
Georgia	[b] 1.26	[b] 1.22	[b] 1.29	1.28	1.38
Idaho	3.10	[c] 3.95	[c] 3.03	[c] 3.93	[d] 4.10
Illinois	1.17	1.10	1.06	1.08	1.07
Indiana	1.23	1.11	1.05	1.08	1.08
Iowa	1.65	1.61	1.56	1.60	1.62
Kansas	1.62	1.52	1.46	1.49	1.52
Kentucky	1.06	1.04	.99	1.02	1.06
Maryland	1.48	1.19	1.14	1.19	1.20
Michigan	1.97	1.81	1.71	1.80	1.80
Missouri	1.61	1.63	1.58	1.63	1.64
Montana	1.64	1.61	1.72	1.77	1.94
New Mexico	1.37	1.31	1.33	1.34	1.46
North Carolina	([e])	([e])	([e])		
North Dakota	1.50	1.43	1.34	1.54	1.61
Ohio	1.29	1.09	1.04	1.09	1.10
Oklahoma (Indian Territory)	1.82	1.82	1.76	1.92	2.04
Oregon	2.43	2.18	2.58	2.63	2.34
Pennsylvania bituminous	1.18	.96	.96	1.00	1.04
Tennessee	1.25	1.18	1.14	1.22	1.25
Texas	1.62	1.66	1.64	1.66	1.69
Utah	1.20	1.30	1.35	1.36	1.52
Virginia	.96	.86	.88	.98	1.02
Washington	1.69	1.63	1.79	1.80	2.09
West Virginia	1.17	.88	.86	.95	.99
Wyoming	1.24	1.30	1.31	1.31	1.56
Total bituminous	1.24	1.10	1.06	1.11	1.14
Pennsylvania anthracite	2.04	1.90	1.83	1.85	1.91
General average	1.41	1.26	1.21	1.24	1.28

[a] Includes Alaska.
[b] Includes North Carolina.
[c] Includes Nebraska.
[d] Includes Nebraska and Nevada.
[e] Included in Georgia.

The above table from Geological Survey Bulletin, "The Production of Coal in 1907."

Average price per short ton of coal in the United States for twenty-eight years.

Year.	Anthracite.	Bituminous.
1880	$1.47	$1.25
1881	2.01	1.12
1882	2.01	1.12
1883	2.01	1.07
1884	1.79	.94
1885	2.00	1.13
1886	1.95	1.05
1887	2.01	1.11
1888	1.91	1.00
1889	1.44	.99
1890	1.43	.99
1891	1.46	.99
1892	1.57	.99
1893	1.59	.96
1894	1.51	.91
1895	1.41	.86
1896	1.50	.83
1897	1.51	.81
1898	1.41	.80
1899	1.46	.87
1900	1.49	1.04
1901	1.67	1.05
1902	1.84	1.12
1903	2.04	1.24
1904	1.90	1.10
1905	1.83	1.06
1906	1.85	1.11
1907	1.91	1.14

The above table from Geological Survey Bulletin, "The Production of Coal in 1907."

WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Tacoma, Wash., January 18, 1909.

Hon. W. L. JONES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find a copy of a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the Washington State Federation of Labor at Walla Walla, with delegates present representing the organized labor of the State.

This resolution voices the sentiments of our workingmen regarding any proposed reduction of the duty on coal, one of the great products of our State, and makes plain the serious injury such a reduction of duty would work to employer and employee alike in the coal industry.

We trust you may be able to successfully oppose, on our behalf, any reduction of the duty on coal, and we shall highly appreciate your assistance to this end.

Very truly, yours,

WASHINGTON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
[SEAL.] Per CHARLES PERRY TAYLOR, *Secretary.*

Resolution 36. Title: Removal of tariff on coal. By Delegate Thomas Raymond, Union No. 2257, United Mine Workers of America, Black Diamond, Wash. Committee concurs in resolution. Adopted by convention.

Whereas there has been considerable agitation in favor of the removal of tariff on certain articles imported into the United States, and feeling that removal, wholly or in part, of this duty on some commodities is going to injure the interests of American workingmen, and knowing full well that if, as proposed at this time, the duty on coal is removed it will work an injury upon the miners of the State of Washington, causing an increased importation from the neighboring Provinces of British Columbia and Canada, surfeiting our markets with foreign coal, eventually closing some of our mines altogether, and giving fewer workdays in the operating mines; and the further fact that if any part of the tariff on coal is removed it will place us in direct competition with cooly labor, and owing to the American capital taking such concentrated action in its removal, and owing to the fact that the Canadian press has in different instances remarked that in case of its removal it would settle the question of market for all time to come: Be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor go on record against any reduction or removal of said tariff; and we do hereby register our protest with the Ways and Means Committee of the United States Senate, our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

Resolution adopted.

Attest:

CHARLES PERRY TAYLOR,
Secretary of Convention.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 9, 1909.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate.

SIR: On April 8, at the request of Senator ELKINS of West Virginia, I prepared for him a brief statement of the coal-mining conditions in Alaska, a copy of which I send you herewith.

Nature made Alaska the coal reserve of the Pacific coast. There is no anthracite coal on that coast except in Alaska. There is no naval coal on that coast except in Alaska. There is no high-grade coal on that coast except in Alaska. There is no great body of undeveloped coal on that coast except in Alaska. Alaska has more high-grade coal than Pennsylvania and West Virginia, and its development will support a million people and create great coal and copper mining cities.

Free trade in coal will bring these great undeveloped mines in direct competition with the mines of British Columbia, which have the advantage of present development, cheap labor, and nearness to market, as well as of tramp transportation. One-fourth of those engaged in coal mining in British Columbia are Chinese, Japanese, and Hindoos.

Alaskan coal must, under our law, be mined by American miners, carried in American ships manned by American seamen, and handled by American labor. These ought to be paid American wages. Free coal will reduce these wages, by the inevitable laws of trade, or close the mines.

The development of Alaskan coal is just now begun by American capital and American labor. Eight million dollars have already been spent in building railroads toward the Katalla and Matanuska fields. The removal of the present duty will greatly cripple, if not wholly destroy these efforts, and will retard the development of Alaska for a decade at least.

Washington, Oregon, and California are interested in this development. These three great States now have a trade of nearly $50,000,000 per annum with Alaska, and the development of her coal and copper, which must go hand in hand, will treble the trade. Your merchants, your shipping men, your bankers, and your laborers are interested. No Pacific fleet can permanently be stationed on your coast for want of Alaska's naval coal, and your prosperity and safety both demand that you encourage its development.

The Delegate from Alaska can neither speak nor vote upon this vital question. In the name of the Territory and her American miners, however, I appeal to each Senator and Representative from Washington, Oregon, and California to come to her aid by speaking and voting for the maintainence of the present duty of 67 cents per ton on coal so that her mines may be opened by American miners at American wages.

Respectfully,

JAMES WICKERSHAM,
Delegate from Alaska.

Alaska has large areas of high-grade coals, and larger areas of the lower grades. There are fields of high-grade anthracite coal and of all grades, from the highest grade of anthracite down to the lowest of lignite. The veins crop out upon the seacoast and there are large areas in almost every portion of Alaska. Coal is more generally distributed in Alaska than any other mineral. It may be considered as belonging to three great areas, each of which has an effect upon the transportation of coal. These areas may be called:

1. The Pacific area.
2. The Yukon area.
3. The arctic area.

THE PACIFIC AREA.

The Pacific area of coal is embraced within that region whose waters flow directly into the Pacific Ocean. There are coal veins in southeastern Alaska—in the Panhandle extending down toward the State of Washington—but so little development work has been done that information is not obtainable. But in the region around Copper River and Cooks Inlet the Geological Department of the United States Government has made some detailed surveys and much valuable information is obtainable.

The Katalla, or Bering River, field lies immediately east of the delta of the Copper River. The Geological Department reports 26⅔ square miles of high-grade anthracite coal at that point, and officials of that department say that, owing to local conditions, this area may be increased many times upon prospecting. At that same point the surveys locate 20 square miles of semibituminous coal, being a high-grade naval coal, and the department is also responsible for the statement that this area may extend to 620 square miles.

This coal lies about 25 miles from the sea, but, for the want of a good harbor at that point, railroad engineers have advised the building to Cordova, making the distance to the sea 90 miles without grade. The Copper River and Northwestern Railroad Company is now building its line from Cordova to this point and has spent more than $5,000,000 in construction work to date. Several thousand men are now engaged in building that line, and it will be completed within a year.

Another large field of coal in this Pacific area is known as the Matanuska field. It lies along the Matanuska River, 25 miles northwest from the head of Cooks Inlet. There are small areas of high-grade anthracite coal at that point, and the information is that, owing to the overburden, future surveys may greatly extend the area. There are also fields of semibituminous and bituminous coal at this point, there being more than 20 square miles of the higher grade and 22 square miles of the bituminous already surveyed by the Geological Department, while the department advises that this bituminous field may extend to 900 square miles.

A railroad is in process of construction from Seward, on Resurrection Bay, into the Matanuska field. Some $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 have been spent upon this road, and it is now being reorganized for the purpose of finishing construction to the mines. This coal is also largely a high-grade naval coal.

There are large areas of coal on the Alaska Peninsula, and the surveys have disclosed 69 square miles of good bituminous coal, with a probability that the area will be increased to 667 square miles. This coal crops out on both sides of the Alaska Peninsula and is most easily accessible to good harbors all the year round. All the coal mentioned so far comes out to harbors open all the year round and of unsurpassed character and depth.

On Cook's Inlet there is a large area of lignite coal. This coal crops out along the seashore in great blanket veins and is easily worked and very cheaply put into boats. It was worked in the old Russian days and is a good fuel coal. The Geological Survey gives 304 square miles in this known coal area, with a probability that this area will cover more than 2,500 square miles.

THE YUKON AREA.

The Yukon area includes the watershed of the Yukon River, and all this coal lies over a range of mountains from the Pacific coast and from 200 to 1,000 miles from Bering Sea. The bituminous area in the Yukon Basin is known to contain 167 square miles, and it is advised by the Geological Department that it may cover 2,500 square miles. The lignite field covers 216 square miles, according to the survey, and may extend to more than 1,500 square miles. Large portions of this area have not been examined at all, and special attention is called to that statement of the Geological Department that but one-fifth of the area of Alaska has been thus far examined even slightly.

THE ARCTIC AREA.

The Arctic area extends from Cape Lisburne on the west to the Colville River on the east. It embraces the great Arctic slope from the Rocky Mountain range, north of the Yukon River, to the Arctic seashore. The Geological Department reports 205 square miles of bituminous coal at Cape Lisburne in this area, with a possibility that it may extend to 1,200 square miles and more. Other fields in this region are noted by the Geological Department, though they are largely lignite.

GENERAL STATEMENT.

The Territory of Alaska has an area of nearly 600,000 square miles. The Geological Department has examined less than one-fifth of that area, and, generally, the examination has been hurriedly made and is in no sense conclusive. An official of the department gives it as his opinion that coal will be found to underlie some 50,000 to 60,000 square miles of territory and almost wholly outside of the area surveyed by the department. Miners and prospectors report large areas of coal entirely unknown to the Geological Survey.

WAGES.

Herewith attached and marked "Exhibit A" is a sheet showing the rates of wages per hour paid to different classes of labor in the Treadwell mines, Douglas Island, Alaska. It is drawn from the transactions of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, New York meeting, 1903, at page 28, and the statement was made by Robert A. Kinzie, assistant superintendent of the mine.

Also attached is the wage schedule paid by the Copper River and Northwestern Railroad Company for 1908, in the vicinity of the Katalla field, and also the wage scale paid by the Kennicott mines during the same season and in the same vicinity. Also attached is a statement from the Bureau of Labor showing the comparative rates of wages paid labor in the States of Colorado, Washington, Montana, Wyoming, and western Canada in coal mining, per hour.

The coal miner in British Columbia receives less wages than any American Territory mentioned. This arises somewhat from the fact that Chinese, Japanese, Hindoo, and other foreign labor is employed.

COMPETITION.

Between the coal mines on the Pacific slope of Alaska and the States of Washington, Oregon, and California are the British Columbia coal mines on Vancouver Island. These are worked by cheap labor; they are near the sea, and hence transportation is cheap, since British Columbia coal may be carried in any tramp steamer, while American coal must be carried in American vessels. The British Columbia coal is of a higher grade than is that of Washington.

California and Oregon have no coal, and the limited areas in Washington are inferior to British Columbia coal, while both these are inferior to Alaska coal. Vessels plying between Puget Sound and Alaska now purchase large quantities of British Columbia coal, and many thousands of tons of British Columbia coal are imported into Alaska.

The Alaskan mines are yet undeveloped. Considerable areas are now owned by American mine owners, who have spent millions in building

railroads and opening the mines preparatory to supplying the cities of Oregon, Washington, and California, and using coal in the smelters in Alaska. Tributary to the Copper River Railroad is more coal than there is in Pennsylvania, and more copper than there is in Montana. That road is a "Y," one upper branch of which reaches the copper mines and the other the high-grade coal fields of Katalla, while the base at 90-mile reaches a harbor of unsurpassed character, wide open the year round. If the British Columbia coal is allowed to enter the ports of Oregon, Washington, and California duty free it will destroy the millions of enterprise already put into Alaskan coal fields and set the Territory back a decade at least.

COMPETITION.

There is no anthracite coal west of the Mississippi River, except a small tract in Colorado. There is no naval coal on the Pacific coast, except that in Alaska. There is no high-grade coal on the Pacific coast in the States of Oregon, Washington, and California. There is no coal in Washington, Oregon, and California which reaches a seaport, except over a longer line of railroad than that required to deliver Alaskan coal.

Alfred H. Brooks, geologist in charge of the Alaska geological survey, has reached this conclusion and has caused the same to be published over his own signature:

"There is no reason to suppose that the cost of operation in the Bering and Matanuska coal fields, when a large industry is established, will be much greater than in fields in States where coal beds occur under similar conditions."

If Congress will maintain the present rate of duty upon bituminous coal, within five years the United States Navy will have an inexhaustible supply of coal for centuries; American miners will have opened up the high-grade coals of Alaska to the seaports of Oregon, Washington, and California. The Alaska trade now amounts to about $50,000,000 per annum, and it is supplied exclusively by the merchants of Oregon, Washington, and California. The trade will grow as the mines of Alaska are developed. The copper mines in the same vicinity will be developed side by side with the coal mines, but not otherwise. The merchants of Oregon, Washington, and California will have this enormous trade added to that which they now have. The Territory of Alaska is without a voting Representative in Congress, and the Senators from Oregon, Washington, and California will vote for their own best interests in voting to maintain the duty on coal so that their greatest and best customer, the miner of Alaska, may develop new fields and new business for their States.

Rates of wages paid different classes of labor in the Treadwell mines, Douglas Island, Alaska.

OCCUPATION.	Rate per hour (cents).
Machine driller, summer rate	33
Machine driller, winter rate	38
Machine helpers	30
Mine laborers	28
Mine laborers, Indians	28
Blacksmiths	48
Tool sharpeners	43
Blacksmith helpers	28
Machinists and helpers in machine shops	28–68

Wage scale for the Kennicott Mines Company for 1909.

(Employees pay board at the rate of $1.25 per day.)

Occupation.	Per day.	Per month with board.	Per hour overtime.
Boss carpenter	$6.25	$150.00	
Skilled carpenters	5.25		$0.40
Rough carpenters	4.25		.30
Blacksmith	5.25	120.00	
Laborer	4.25		.30
Engineer	5.25	120.00	
Sawyer	5.25	125.00	
Boss logger	4.75	112.50	
Swampers			
Horse tenders			
Assistant sawyers			
Loggers	4.25		.30
Sled tenders			
Railway tenders			
Lumber handlers			
Muckers			
Teamsters		100.00	
Cooks	4.25		
Miners, rockmen	4.25		
Blacksmiths and timbermen	5.25	120.00	
Mine foremen	6.25	150.00	

Copper River and Northwestern Railroad. Wage schedule, season 1908. Master mechanic's department.

OCCUPATION.	Rate per hour.
Master mechanic, per month and board	$300.00
Assistant master mechanic	.75
Locomotive engineer	.60
Steam-shovel engineer, per month and board	250.00
Locomotive fireman	.40
Steam-shovel fireman	.40
Train conductor	.50
Train brakeman	.40
Machinist	.50
Machinist helper	.35
Car repairer	.50
Car-repairer helper	.35
Craneman	.50
Carpenter foreman	$0.70
Pile driver:	
Foreman	.60–.70
Engineer	.50
Fireman	.35
Carpenters (skilled)	.50
Carpenters (rough)	.45
Carpenters (helpers)	.35
Logging:	
Foreman	.65
Hewers	.50
Hook tenders	.45
Head swampers	.45
Fallers and scorers	.37½
Axmen	.35
Grading:	
General foreman, per month and board	250.00
Grade foreman	.50–.60
Subforeman	.40
Powdermen	.35–.45
Track:	
Track foreman	.50–.60
Heelers	.37
Head spiker	.35
Strapper	.35
Section foreman	.40
Telephone and telegraph:	
Foreman	.60
Assistant foreman	.40
Blacksmith:	
Headquarters blacksmith	.50–.60
Other blacksmiths	.45
Blacksmith helpers	.35
Common labor	.30

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the amendment of the committee, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. BEVERIDGE (when his name was called). I am paired upon this question with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. If he were present he would vote "nay," and I should vote "yea."

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a regular pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY]. I am not certain how that Senator would vote, and I notice he is not in the Chamber. I announce my pair with him, and will say that if permitted to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	Clay	Gamble	Nelson
Bristow	Crawford	Gore	Overman
Brown	Cummins	Hughes	Paynter
Burkett	Curtis	Johnson, N. Dak.	Rayner
Burton	Davis	Johnston, Ala.	Root
Carter	Dolliver	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Clapp	Fletcher	McCumber	Stone

NAYS—45.

Aldrich	Daniel	Jones	Simmons
Bailey	Depew	Kean	Smith, Md.
Borah	Dick	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Dillingham	Lorimer	Smoot
Briggs	Dixon	McEnery	Sutherland
Bulkeley	du Pont	Martin	Taliaferro
Burnham	Elkins	Oliver	Tillman
Burrows	Foster	Page	Warner
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Perkins	
Crane	Hale	Piles	
Cullom	Heyburn	Scott	

NOT VOTING—19.

Bankhead	Culberson	Money	Shively
Beveridge	Flint	Newlands	Stephenson
Bourne	Frazier	Nixon	Taylor
Bradley	Frye	Owen	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	McLaurin	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. McCUMBER to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move to amend the substitute offered by the committee by inserting before the provision relating to the use of fuel on vessels, the House provision, which is as follows:

Provided, That any of the foregoing, when imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony which imposes no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be imported free of duty.

I do not care about arguing the subject at all.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will accomplish the same purpose by voting "yea" or "nay" upon the committee amendment. That is the same question exactly.

Mr. McCUMBER. But there are other questions connected with that; and I want this in a separate proposition.

Mr. CLAPP. You can not do that, because the Senate committee has reduced the rate over the House bill; and we would not want to vote against that.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are too many other propositions connected with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. After the words "ad valorem," in the proposed committee amendment, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That any of the foregoing, when imported from any country, dependency, province, or colony which imposes no tax or duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be imported free of duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask for a division on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is demanded. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island on behalf of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I understand that the question upon which the division is demanded is upon the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota. Has that been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Was the division denied?

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the vote was announced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The demand was not insisted upon, the Chair understood.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understood that a division was demanded by a Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana insist upon a division?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not demand a division——

Mr. DAVIS. I do, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But I understand a division was demanded. All I wanted to know was where we were. A division is demanded by a Member, and I suppose it has to be ordered.

Mr. DAVIS. I insist upon a division, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will again put the question to the Senate. Is the demand for the yeas and nays seconded?

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand that the Senator from Arkansas demands a division on the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is demanded.

The question being taken, there were on a division—ayes 24, noes 47.

So the amendment of Mr. McCUMBER to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] on behalf of the Finance Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee, I move to strike out lines 13 and 14 and the words "80 pounds to the bushel," in line 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the words, "coal, bituminous, and coal, slack, or culm, shall be imported free of duty," and to strike out the proviso in lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, that being the countervailing clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraph as amended be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paragraph as amended will be agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. From the Committee on Finance, I report certain amendments to the leather paragraph. I am not sure whether or not it will be possible to dispose of them to-night. I move to amend, on page 178, in line 26, by striking out "five," and inserting "ten," which increases the duty on sole leather from 5 to 10 per cent.

Mr. BAILEY. I hope the Senator will state all the amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will state what the other amendments are. On line 21, page 179, strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty;" which will make the duty upon boots and shoes 20 per cent ad valorem instead of 25 per cent, as in the existing law.

Mr. BAILEY. I know we can not dispose of those amendments to-night. I suggest that the Senator have them printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. In lines 17 and 18, on page 179, I ask that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the committee, which has heretofore been adopted, striking out the words "glove leather," so that glove leather would be restored at 20 per cent ad valorem. The effect of these amendments is to increase the duty as proposed in the House bill from 5 to 10 per cent on sole leather; from 15 to 20 per cent on boots and shoes; and to restore glove leather to the duty which was imposed by the House.

Mr. HALE. Let them be printed and go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be printed and go over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I request that the amendments offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the leather paragraph be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let them be printed in the RECORD, and I ask that they also may be printed as amendments. I give notice that I shall ask to take them up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed in the RECORD, and go over.

The amendments reported by Mr. ALDRICH from the Committee on Finance are as follows:

On page 178, line 26, strike out "five" and insert in lieu the word "ten;" also.

On page 179, line 21, strike out the word "fifteen" and insert in lieu the word "twenty;" also.

On lines 17 and 18, page 179, disagree to the committee amendment proposing to strike out the words "and glove leather."

Mr. BULKELEY. I offer a proposed amendment to the pending bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that order is made.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

Paragraph 423, page 170, after the words "ad valorem," insert the following: "buttons of metal, embossed with a design, device, pattern, or lettering, 45 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. PENROSE. I have a concise statement here of some statistics concerning the hosiery paragraph, which I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Here are the actual figures to prove that hosiery will not increase in price to the consumer:

25-cent stockings—$3 per dozen.

	Dingley bill.	New Payne bill.
Foreign cost ..... per dozen	$1.00	$1.00
Ad valorem duty	.15	.15
Specific duty	.50	.70
Freight and charges	.05	.05
Total importer's cost	[a]1.70	[b]1.90

[a] Or 14⅛ cents per pair. [b] Or 15⅝ cents per pair.

Difference, 1⅝ cents per pair.

50-cent stockings—$6 per dozen.

	Dingley bill.	New Payne bill.
Foreign cost ..... per dozen	$2.00	$2.00
Ad valorem duty	.30	.30
Specific duty	.70	1.00
Freight and charges	.05	.05
Total importer's cost	[a]3.05	[b]3.35

[a] Or $25\frac{5}{12}$ cents per pair. [b] Or $27\frac{11}{12}$ cents per pair.

Difference, 2½ cents per pair.

Consumer's cost, the same.

NOTE.—Twenty-five cents and 50 cents are the popular selling prices of hosiery in this country. These prices are as firmly established as is the 5-cent price for bread.

In addition to the proven fact that hosiery will not increase in price to the consumer by granting the Payne-bill rates, you are supporting the American workmen, American industry, and American capital.

There were entered for consumption at the port of New York alone during January, February, and March, 1909, 12,874,224 pairs, although many American mills are working part time only.

APRIL 23, 1909.

THE COLLAPSE IN FOREIGN HOSIERY PRICES.

The following is a statement of importations in hosiery at the port of New York in the first three months of 1909 as compared with the corresponding period of 1908:

Importations at port of New York for January, February, and March.

	Dozens.	Value.	Average cost per dozen.
1908	997,474	$1,590,453.00	$1.59½
1909	1,072,852	1,294,670.00	1.20
Reduction in average price per dozen in Germany			.38⅞

This would mean with the difference in duty a reduction in the landing price of 50 to 67 cents per dozen, according to classification, to offset which the Payne bill grants but an increase of 20 cents per dozen.

There has been no reduction to the consumer.

What the American workingman and the American working woman has to compete with.

[From the Daily Evening Telegraph, Philadelphia, Wednesday, April 28, 1909.]

WANAMAKER, ORIGINATOR—THE NEXT GREAT EVENT AT WANAMAKER'S—HAVE YOU SHARED IN HOSIERY SALE?—IF YOU HAVE NOT, YOU HAVE MISSED ONE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE SEASON—SELLING HAS BEEN BRISK.

More hosiery to-morrow, only because the original quantity was so large.

Selling has again been brisk to-day.

It isn't to be wondered at, however, because in the face of a threatening tariff we cleared up the markets of Germany at a price that hasn't been possible before in years and years. We secured another lot to sell at an average half price. Here are the items:

Women's 35-cent and 50-cent stockings, 25 cents a pair.

Men's 25-cent and 35-cent socks, 18 cents a pair; 3 pairs for 50 cents.

Men's 50-cent socks, 25 cents a pair.

Children's 25-cent socks, 12½ cents a pair.

Black and tan, plain and fancy, cotton and lisle hosiery, all of it the best that Germany produces, fashioned feet, seam back.

There is nothing more to say about it except that Philadelphia seems to be laying in a supply, and the west and main aisles are piled high with different values.

Selling continues unabated because "all the king's horses and all the king's men" couldn't have carried away the entire purchase in one day.

Every city, town, village, and hamlet have a board of trade offering special inducements for the introduction of manufacturing establishments.

Hosiery rates contained in the Payne bill would be an incentive for the establishment of additional hosiery mills employing American workingmen and American working women.

At the present time American hosiery mills are working short time and importations of foreign hosiery are increasing.

Wanamaker advertisements in Philadelphia papers May 13 and May 14.

GERMANY KNOWS HOW TO MAKE STOCKINGS—GERMANY SENDS THIS NEW HOSIERY.

When we get a new shipment like this, straight from the Kaiser's land, you may know they are strong, sturdy stockings worth coming to Wanamaker's for:

For women, there are black, tan, and bronze lisle with self-embroidery, at 50 cents and 75 cents. White lisle with embroidered figures, at 50 cents, 75 cents, and $1. Gray, tan, black, and white lisle with self-embroidered clocks, at 50 cents. London smoke, white, tan, bronze, and black openwork, at 50 cents. Striped lisle stockings, violet, pink, sky, tan, mode, cadet, navy, and black stripes on white grounds, at 50 cents. Polka dots on cadet, black, and tan grounds, 35 cents, or 3 pairs for $1. White and tan lisle in eyelet embroidery, at $1.

For men, at 50 cents, are gun, plum, garnet, peacock, navy, champagne, and olive, in self-embroidery. Tan and cadet in self and colored embroidery. Tan, myrtle, gray, old rose, navy, and black, with self-embroidered clock and stripe effects. Polka dots in white on garnet, black, tan, and navy grounds. Self-colored polka dots on cadet, tan, violet, green, and mode grounds. Cadet, tan, violet, and mode in vertical stripes—imitation of French styles.

The good, staple kinds are also among them.

Fresh from the custom-house, a splendid company of the best German stockings for men and women:

For women, black, tan, and bronze lisle stockings with self embroidery, 50 cents and 75 cents pair.

White lisle with embroidered figures, 50 cents, 75 cents, and $1.

Gray, tan, black and white lisle with self-embroidered clocks, 50 cents.

London smoke, white, tan, bronze, and black openwork, 50 cents.

Striped lisle stockings, violet, pink, sky, tan, mode, cadet, navy, and black stripes on white grounds, 50 cents.

American hosiery manufacturers can not compete with above prices under Dingley rates of duty, and are running their mills on short time.

Rapid fulfillment of prophecy!

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 19, 1909.]

MADE IN GERMANY.

Senator HALE spoke true words when he informed the Senate that Germany is watching the pending tariff bill with more interest than any other nation.

"We are increasing the tariff on goods usually bought of that country," he said, "because we are threatened with an invasion of her products that our laws permit to come in on a low duty. It is high time we recognize the fact that our most dangerous commercial competitor is Germany. Her labor is cheap. We must soon come face to face with her manufacturers in a bitter competitive war."

Even the most unenlightened in tariff details can have no difficulty in accepting that statement regarding Germany. "Made in Germany" is a label which is everywhere met with. It has practically inundated England, where tens of thousands of workingmen are out of employment. It is threatening to play havoc in the United States.

"Few people are leaving the shores of Germany," says Senator HALE. "They are staying at home, building new factories, extending trade, grasping at the very heart of the commerce of the United States. Let this tariff go through as the Democrats would have it and the happiest manufacturers in the world will be those of that Empire."

Manufacturers of goods menaced by the "Made in Germany" products know that this is all so. Recently Washington has been visited by working girls of Philadelphia and of Pennsylvania employed in the hosiery mills. These workers have carried the tale that their wages are endangered by the low duties on certain lines of hosiery—and doubtless also by the undervaluations that are so grave a feature of the commercial treaty with Germany. The Payne bill increased the duties. The Senate bill restored the Dingley rates.

It is to be hoped that while Senator HALE is engaged in the laudable task of protecting American manufacturers from the inroads of the German, he will insist upon the acceptance of these American working girls' pleas.

WHAT HAPPENED.

Seven hundred cases, or about 1,000,000 pairs of hose, were landed at the port of New York on May 19 from steamship *Prinzess Irene*.

Eighty cases, or about 192,000 pairs of hose, were landed at the port of New York on May 19 from steamship *Pallanza*.

If this continues, the American manufacturers of hosiery will be compelled to reduce wages or close their mills.

Dingley rates in force.

Importations of foreign hosiery rapidly increasing under Dingley law.

MILLS WORKING SHORT TIME.

When you throw American labor out of work by importing foreign merchandise, you are destroying your own market. The basis of national prosperity is the high wages paid American working men and women.

The middleman's profit, which runs from 60 to 100 per cent, should convince any fair-minded man who has the prosperity of the country at heart that the small advance in duty granted by the Payne bill will not increase the price of hosiery to the consumer and will take but little from the large profits of the middleman.

There were entered for consumption at the port of New York alone during January, February, March, and April, 1909, 17,789,688 pairs, although most American mills are working part time only.

Importations of hosiery at the port of New York.

We recently submitted figures showing the collapse in the landing price of foreign hosiery to be 55 cents per dozen for January, February, and March, 1909, as compared with the same months of 1908.

This average low price continues for the month of April.

There were entered for consumption at the port of New York alone during the month of April, 1909, 4,915,464 pairs; importations for April, 1908, 3,009,060 pairs; difference, 1,906,404 pairs.

Importers claim there is no increase in importations of hosiery, but the above official figures prove an increase of 63 per cent.

Within a few days 40 American manufacturers of hosiery have made affidavit that their mills are working on short time or on stock.

A question of veracity as to wages of German hosiery operatives.

Which will you believe, the sworn statement of American hosiery and underwear manufacturers, which has been more than confirmed by the independent report of United States Consul James H. Norton at Chemnitz, Germany, or the irresponsible and anonymous statement of an interested body of German manufacturers?

The German Government has forwarded this anonymous statement to the United States Senate, giving figures as to German hosiery wages entirely at variance with those sworn to by the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, showing that the ratio of German to American wages in the hosiery industry is as 30 to 100.

United States Consul Norton's report, dated Chemnitz, October 19, 1908, an unbiased and disinterested representative of our Government, shows the contention of the American manufacturers to have been most conservative.

COTTAGE INDUSTRY.

Consul Norton makes a careful, detailed report regarding the cottage industry, which, according to the statement forwarded by the German Government, does not exist. He must have a vivid imagination to make such a report, if not true. The anonymous report of German hosiery manufacturers wisely ignores the fact that following the strike wages of German hosiery workers were reduced to the low-wage scale of 1897.

The middleman's profit.

DINGLEY LAW.

[Per dozen pairs.]

Foreign cost.	Rate of duty.	Duty.		Middleman's profit.		Consumer's price.	
			Per cent.		*Per cent.*		*Per pair.*
$1.00	15 per cent and 50 cents	$0.65	65	$1.35	82	$3.00	$0.25
2.00	15 per cent and 70 cents	1.00	50	3.00	100	6.00	.50
3.00	15 per cent and $1.20	1.65	55	4.35	92½	9.00	.75
PAYNE BILL.							
$1.00	15 per cent and 70 cents	$0.85	85	$1.15	62	$3.00	$0.25
2.00	15 per cent and $1.00	1.30	65	2.70	82	6.00	.50
3.00	15 per cent and $1.50	1.95	65	4.05	82	9.00	.75

The small increase in duty granted by the Payne bill is no more than proved protection, making it possible to run our mills full time and give profitable employment to American workingmen and American working women, which we can not do under the Dingley law.

The Wayne Knitting Mills prefer the Dingley rates on hosiery to the Payne schedule because they desire to reduce wages.

[See affidavit subjoined.]

The Wayne Knitting Mill has declared itself in favor of the Dingley rates and lower wages.

The National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers favor maintaining the present wage scale and slightly advancing the duty, to enable them to compete with German manufacturers who have returned to the low-wage scale of 1897, and have reduced their prices 40 per cent in eighteen months. (See custom-house figures.)

Wages of German expert hosiery knitters:

Men, $295 (1907) reduced to $240 (1908) per year.

Women, $165 (1907) reduced to $124 (1908) per year.

Mr. T. F. Thieme, head of the Wayne Knitting Mills, favors a reduction of wages and the retention of the Dingley rates. (For proof of this, see affidavit subjoined.)

Mr. T. F. Thieme, secretary and manager of the Wayne Knitting Mills, Fort Wayne, Ind., at a meeting of the tariff committee of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, expressed as his deliberate opinion that American manufacturers could compete with German manufacturers if they reduced the wages of their labor, and that it would be better to reduce the wages of the hosiery-mill operatives than to increase the tariff over the protection afforded by the Dingley bill.

JOS. S. RAMBO.
W. PARK MOORE.
FRED W. SIMONS.
GEORGE D. HORST.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, *County of Philadelphia, ss:*

On the 25th day of May, A. D. 1909, before me, a notary public for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, residing in the city of Philadelphia, personally appeared George D. Horst, W. Park Moore, Fred W. Simons, and Joseph S. Rambo, who, being duly sworn, did depose and say that the statement above set forth was true.

W. ELWOOD LOCKE, *Notary Public.*

(Commission expires January 16, 1913.)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOSIERY AND UNDERWEAR MANUFACTURERS.

American hosiery manufacturers reply to the importers.

They base their plea for the Payne tariff schedule upon conditions that have arisen within eighteen months. (See Pars. I and III below.)

The importers of hosiery base their case upon conditions that have ceased to exist.

IMPORTERS' SIDE.

I. The sole request made by the importing houses is that the Dingley rates be retained. There is no adequate reason why the manufacturers should secure a greater protection than is accorded them by the act of July 24, 1907, the percentage of protection thereunder ranging from 55 per cent to 85 per cent. As a matter of fact, the sole class of hosiery involved is the so-called "full-fashioned," all seamless hosiery consumed in the United States being the product of this country. It is especially upon the cheap class of goods that the manufacturers are endeavoring to secure an increase, the rates of duty under the Payne bill thereon ranging from 65 per cent to 115 per cent.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURERS' ANSWER.

I. The sole request of the American manufacturers is for a measure of protection much lower than contemplated by the framers of the Dingley schedule, who never foresaw the collapse in foreign hosiery prices of the last eighteen months. (For figures see below.) Had they foreseen it they would have framed a schedule much higher than the proposed Payne rates. This condition is aggravated in the landing price by a drop to the low tariff classification never dreamed of when the Dingley bill was framed. The following shows the importations at the port of New York for January, February, and March:

	Dozen.	Value.	Average cost per dozen.
1908	997,474	$1,590,453	$1.59½
1909	1,072,852	1,294,670	1.20⅞

Reduction in average price, per dozen, 39⅞ cents in Germany. This would mean, with the difference in duty, a reduction in the landing price of 50 to 67 cents per dozen, according to classification, to offset which the Payne bill grants but a partial equivalent.

It has been stated that this collapse is due to the panic. The panic brought to a focus conditions which have been maturing for eight years, but which were staved off by the "boom" which enabled the German manufacturers to reap the entire benefit of cheapened cost of production, because there was a greater demand than supply at the old prices. When the demand stopped there came a fall in six months that should otherwise have come gradually in the eight years before. There was also a sharp reduction in wages. The prices that are now current in Germany are the logical outcome of normal conditions uninfluenced by either boom or panic. They have come to stay within narrow fluctuations.

II. This means that the consumers of cheap cotton hosiery will be compelled to pay increased prices. The popular stocking retailing at 25 cents per pair at present pays 65 per cent, and under the rates proposed by the Payne bill they would be raised to 85 per cent. The schedule attached hereto shows completely the variation between the equivalent Dingley rates and the equivalent proposed Payne rates.

III. The campaign of the manufacturers has been based upon serious misrepresentation. It has been stated that the hosiery industry was in a languishing condition, all due (as claimed by the manufacturers) to the Dingley rates of duty. The following figures expose, we think, the falsity of any such statement: In 1900 the domestic output of hosiery amounted to $27,233,616; in 1905 it amounted to $43,590,857, and in 1908 (upon the basis of the estimates of the domestic manufacturers) the output was between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000. This shows an increase in eight years of 100 per cent, which is hardly an indication of a languishing state of business.

IV. Compare the above growth of the output of the domestic manufacturers with the following table, showing the amount of importations of hosiery during a period of eighteen years:

In 1890, total imported _ $6,604,835
In 1900, total imported _ 4,016,435
In 1908, total imported _ 6,645,570

It would thus appear that there was no increase whatever in the importations during a period of eighteen years.

V. It has been stated also by the manufacturers that their mills were shutting down in consequence of their inability to compete. This seems particularly strange in view of the fact that they at present control about 90 per cent of the total consumption. The real and honest reason, however, for the shutting down of any mills is not brought forward by them. These reasons are:

First. The fact that certain mills are adapted only to the production of fancy and embroidered hosiery, a kind which at present has gone out of style. The style at the moment is for solid, plain colors.

When so-called "full-fashioned goods" are landed cheaper than so-called "seamless," they compete even more seriously with these than with the American full-fashioned. The cry, therefore, that the Payne schedule is in the interest of but 20 manufacturers of full-fashioned goods is for the purpose of befogging the issue (as a matter of fact, there are 75 instead of 20). It is not "especially upon the cheap class of goods" that a fair measure of protection is asked, but upon those which American mills are fitted to make, if adequately protected.

II. During the recent boom yarns and other items of cost and also labor advanced sharply, and yet the retail price of the domestic 25-cent stocking could not be advanced. The increased cost was divided between the manufacturer, the jobber, and the retailer. The same will happen to the importer and the retailer when the stocking costs 1⅞ cents per pair more to land. That is why the importer and retailer are fighting so hard. The consumer need not worry.

III. The American hosiery manufacturers claim that their industry is languishing now, owing to new conditions that have come within the last eighteen months. They do not claim that their industry did languish during the years preceding 1908. The Payne schedule concerns itself with the present and with the future, and not with the past. It aims to meet new conditions with a new remedy. Had German hosiery remained at the prices antedating 1908, no American manufacturer would have asked for the increase.

The growth of the domestic hosiery industry from 1900 to 1908 shows the beneficent effect of adequate protection. This protection has ceased to be adequate within the past eighteen months. During the past decade the consumer has fared better and better. The prices of domestic seamless hosiery have been cut in half during the past twenty years, in the face of nearly double the price of cotton, a largely increased cost of other items, and a very large advance in the wage scale. This result has been made possible by improvements in machinery, and by the economies of enlarged output developed under a system of adequate protection, now no longer adequate. There has been no grosser misstatement than that circulated in the press that "the price of hosiery has been going up by leaps and bounds."

IV. These figures should show the number of dozens, as well as the value. The lower the value of imports concurrent with increasing numbers of dozens, the more serious the competition. An example of this is shown in Paragraph I. Why do the importers not publish the figures for 1907 and compare these with the imports of the first four months of 1909?

In 1907 importations were $7,019,334.

All of these figures are cost prices in Germany.

V. It is not true that certain mills are closed on account of a change in fashion. It so happens that some of the mills that are closed or running on part time did make goods now out of fashion, but they are equipped to make goods that would be in active demand but for ruinous foreign competition, and they would at once run on full time under the Payne tariff. They were compelled to shut down before the change in fashion made itself felt.

Embroidered hosiery is not out of style. As to the temporary neglect of Jacquards, the mills equipped to make these can just as well make "two-toned" and solid effects, which would find a ready market but for the disastrous foreign competition. But, as a matter of fact, not only the full-fashioned industry, but the makers of all seamless goods made to retail above 15 cents per pair were saved from complete annihilation

VI. Second. Is the fact that all business has in the past year or so suffered in consequence of the financial panic, from the effect of which no merchants nor manufacturers have been exempt.

only by the sudden vogue of mercerized fabrics, which the foreigners could not at once supply in sufficient quantities. A change in this situation or a return to "lisle finish" (both already talked of) would aggravate the present disastrous condition tenfold.

VI. The panic did force some mills to suspend operations, but the panic is over, and, while the days of the "boom" have not come back, general business conditions are such that the mills now idle could be run on full time did not the German manufacturer have the advantage of 20 cents per dozen in the cost of production under the Dingley rates. And if the idleness of American mills is due to general stagnation and not to insufficient protection, why are importations larger than ever. (See figures in Par. I.)

VII. It has been stated upon the floor of the House by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that the importers are interested financially in the manufacture of hosiery in Germany. Attached hereto is a copy of an unqualified denial of such statement, the original of this denial having been forwarded to the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE.

VII. This is a quibble over terminology. In Germany the term "manufacturer" is used to designate a dealer buying goods from what the Germans call "factors." The fact remains that these importers can eliminate this so-called "manufacturers' profit," which the smaller American wholesaler can not do. It gives these houses an advantage over their smaller competitors which they do not possess in domestic goods.

IX. As to the methods pursued by the manufacturers in order to create what they call "public opinion," we attach hereto copies of letters emanating from the National Association of the Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, which, readily enough, show how this so-called "public opinion" has been created. In addition, they have sent to Washington a delegation of 10 female mill operatives for the purpose of working upon the sympathies of Senators and Members of the House. They have stated that these 10 operatives represented some forty to fifty thousand hosiery workers who would be affected by a failure to increase the rates upon hosiery from the Dingley schedules to those proposed in the Payne bill. The fact is that such a statement is an entire misrepresentation. Of the total operatives employed by hosiery manufacturers in this country, less than 10 per cent are engaged in the manufacture of full-fashioned hosiery, the only kind upon which the Payne bill proposes any increase of duty. The remainder are employed in the manufacture of seamless hosiery, upon which no increase over the Dingley rates was proposed in the Payne bill.

IX. The importers and retailers should say nothing about the manipulations of "public opinion." There never has been anything more unscrupulous than the misrepresentations by the press of the country manipulated by the bargain-day department store advertiser at the instigation of the importer.

As the 10 female operatives representing hands, of whom "less than 10 per cent are engaged in the manufacture of full-fashioned hosiery," it has already been shown that when full-fashioned goods can be landed cheaper than the domestic seamless, they affect these even more than the full-fashioned. (Par. I.)

X. The largest manufacturers of full-fashioned hosiery in the United States are the Fort Wayne Mills, of Indiana, and we are advised that they are fully satisfied with the Dingley rates of duty and have made no effort in behalf of an increase thereon.

X. Mr. T. F. Thieme, secretary and manager of the Wayne Knitting Mills, declared in favor of lower wages for the hosiery-mill operatives rather than an increase in tariff. (See attached affidavit.)

XI. It has been stated that the business of hosiery manufacturing has been a losing one, but, in contradiction to this, we attach hereto mercantile reports in relation to a few of the manufacturers of this merchandise:

Richmond Hosiery Mills, Chattanooga, Tenn.; net worth, 1897, $50,000; December, 1906, $329,330; January, 1903, $363,354.

Brown Knitting Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, April 30, 1908, $315,000; January, 1909, $750,000; capital increased.

German-American Hosiery Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, 1901, $100,000; August, 1904, $200,000; June, 1908, $248,000.

Glenn Knitting Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, 1902, $50,000; September, 1907, $121,000.

Thomas E. Brown & Son, Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, 1901, $20,000; September, 1907, $404,500.

Nolde & Horst Company, Reading, Pa.; net worth, 1897, $250,000; present surplus, $300,000; capital, $250,000.

Rambo & Regan (Incorporated), Norristown, Pa.; net worth, 1902, $400,000; September, 1907, $499,930; August, 1908, $518,531.

Harry C. Aberle & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, April, 1905, $94,000; April, 1907, $137,129; April, 1908, $159,972.

Brown-Aberle Company, Philadelphia, Pa.; net worth, January, 1907, $699,964; May, 1908, $720,252.

Sulloway Mills, Franklin, N. H.; net worth, 1897, $100,000; January, 1909, $295,686.

Durham Hosiery Mills, Durham, N. C.; net worth, 1898, $100,000; June, 1908, $822,627.

XI. Here are picked 10 conspicuous successes out of 600 mills. And this during a period of prosperity unprecedented in extent and in duration. And even these figures, twist them as one may, show not a single millionaire! Indeed, it would be hard to find one individual millionaire among hosiery manufacturers. Can this be said of any other industry of like importance? Among the dealers opposing the Payne schedule are hundreds of millionaires and many multimillionaires. In many of these cases the increased capital is in the shape of machinery which only has value as long as it can be operated at a profit. Besides, these reports do not state that this increase of capital is from earnings. It is evident from the figures of the Brown Knitting Company that the increase is merely subscribed capital.

XII. All of the above indicates no lack of prosperity, but quite the contrary. As a matter of fact, the leading manufacturers are behind in their deliveries at the present moment to a very troublesome extent, and we can hardly conceive that such would be the state of affairs if their business were in the languishing condition which they claim.

XII. If the leading manufacturers are behind in their deliveries, it is due to two factors:

First. In normal times customers anticipated their wants. Of late they have operated from hand to mouth. Mills can not turn out in three months what requires six months to manufacture.

Second. A reduced capacity consequent to a disorganization caused by insufficient business can not be repaired temporarily or at once. As a matter of fact, the majority of the leading hosiery manufacturers are not working their plants to their full capacity, and a great proportion of the goods being made to-day are for stock.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALDRICH. I 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 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 24, 1909, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 1909.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Orlando V. Hurt to be collector of customs for the district of Yaquina, Oreg.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Samuel G. Mortimer to be receiver of public moneys at Bellefourche, S. Dak.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. Albert A. King to be captain.

Second Lieut. Milton G. Holliday to be first lieutenant.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Walter W. Merrill to be first lieutenant.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Harold K. Hines to be a commander.

Ensigns Chandler K. Jones and Herbert H. Michael to be lieutenants (junior grade).

Lieuts. (Junior Grade) Chandler K. Jones and Herbert H. Michael to be lieutenants.

Surgeons Robert E. Ledbetter and Charles St. J. Butler to be surgeons (to correct dates).

Passed Asst. Surg. Fred M. Bogan to be a surgeon.

POSTMASTERS.

HAWAII.

Arthur Waal, at Lahaina, Hawaii.

IDAHO.

Orin H. Barber, at American Falls, Idaho.

John T. Witty, at Shoshone, Idaho.

INDIANA.

James E. Zook, at Howe, Ind.

IOWA.

W. G. Haskell, at Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

MICHIGAN.

Gilbert H. Hudson, at Bloomingdale, Mich.

NEW YORK.

Charles J. Quick, at Lestershire, N. Y.

NORTH DAKOTA.

J. Wells Brinton, at Beach, N. Dak.

PENNSYLVANIA.

R. K. Godding, at Kane, Pa.

Jerome B. Lahr, at Millerstown, Pa.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Albert H. J. George, at White Lake, S. Dak.

Charles E. Tenney, at Summit, S. Dak.