CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 1909.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF NEW MEXICO.

Merritt C. Meecham to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of New Mexico.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

William H. Pound to be register of the land office at Sterling, Colo.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Charles H. Dehart, at Arthur, Ill.

OHIO.

George P. Bumgarner, at St. Clairsville, Ohio.
William L. Maddox, at Ripley, Ohio.

WEST VIRGINIA.

T. G. Arnold, at Thurmond, W. Va.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *July 31, 1909.*

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

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 1438, the tariff bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up the conference report on the tariff bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from New York whether the report is very lengthy?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I shall reserve the right to object.

Mr. PAYNE. It is quite lengthy.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have the report read for the information of the House, and I shall object.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects, and the Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk proceeded to read the conference report.

[For conference report see RECORD of July 30, 1909.]

The Clerk read as far as section 13, on page 53 of the report, when,

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the report of the conferees and the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to reserve the right to make a point of order against the report, and, with that reservation, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from New York would not interfere with that right. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report (H. Rept. No. 21) from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 103, have had the same under consideration, and herewith report the following in lieu thereof:

House resolution 104.

"*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this order the House shall proceed to consider the report of the managers of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes; that none of the provisions of said report shall be subject to a point of order; that general debate shall continue until 8 o'clock p. m. of this day, unless sooner concluded, and that immediately upon the conclusion of general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to agree to the report; and that general leave to print on the subjects of this report shall be granted for ten calendar days."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of that resolution, I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLARK of Missouri) there were—ayes 154, noes 98.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is entitled to twenty minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to twenty minutes.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this order is to enable the House to take up for immediate consideration the conference report upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments on the tariff bill. The order provides that general debate on the consideration of that report may continue until 8 o'clock this evening, at which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered and a vote taken, unless in the meantime general debate shall have been closed. It provides further—and that is really the material part of the order—that points of order shall not be in order to any provision in the bill. The bill as it went from the House to the Senate provided that "hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled," should come in free. The Senate bill struck that provision from the free list and inserted under the dutiable list the following provision:

Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That upon all leather exported made from imported hides there shall be paid a drawback equal to the amount of the duty paid on such hides, to be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

The conference committee adopted a new provision, which conforms neither to the House provision nor to the Senate provision, and which is in these terms:

450. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, shall be admitted free of duty: *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1909, sole leather made from such hides shall pay a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem; that grain, buff, and split leather made from such hides shall pay a duty of 7½ per cent ad valorem; that boots and shoes, the upper leather of which is made wholly or in chief value from such hides, shall pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem; that harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather made from such hides, shall pay a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

It will be observed that in the provision adopted by the conference committee an amendment to the hide paragraph is made which is not germane to that paragraph, but which relates to the subject of leather. It will also be observed that the rates of duty imposed by the provision adopted by the conference committee are lower than the rates of duty provided either in the Senate or in the House bill. Under these circumstances this paragraph is undoubtedly, in my judgment, although I have heard that judgment questioned, subject to a point of order, because it infringes the rule which excludes from the jurisdiction of a conference committee any new matter; a wise rule, a rule absolutely necessary to be observed in general in the making up of conference reports on these great bills with which we have to deal at every session of Congress. But where the reason ceases, the rule should likewise cease, and in this case the provision of the conference committee was made to carry out, as the conference committee believes, the will of the two Houses. Upon the one side the House by a very large vote, a majority of 173, declared in favor of free hides. The managers of the conference committee on the part of the House thought that that was tantamount to an instruction to them to insist upon free hides. Upon the other hand, the Senators from certain Western States, where the cattle industry is an important industry, protested that they could not and would not vote for the bill unless there was a duty on hides. The conference committee therefore was presented with a situation which seemed to imperil any agreement at all, and a compromise was finally made whereby if hides were allowed to remain on the free list, a reduction should be made upon leather and boots and shoes and harness.

And for the purpose of carrying out what I believe to be the will of the Senate under the circumstances, and the will of the House, and bringing the two Houses together so that legislation might be enacted, this provision was inserted, and the House is now asked to waive, to set aside, the ordinary rule which applies in such cases.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DALZELL. I shall be glad to answer the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This rule in its terms is very broad and sweeping. You have had a better opportunity to know what is in this report than I have, because you have had more time; but I will take your word on a question of fact. Now, I want to know whether or not there is any item in this conference report on which the rate in the conference report is higher than the maximum rate in either the House or the Senate bill on the same item?

Mr. DALZELL. There is not, so far as I know, and I believe there is none. I want to be very frank to the House. I do not believe there is a single provision in this conference report that is subject to a point of order except the one to which I

have called attention. I want to say that the conferees on the part of the House and Senate were scrupulous to avoid the insertion in their report of anything that would be subject to a point of order; and the only reason why this rule is made as broad as it is, is because—we do not claim that the conferees are infallible—if it should happen that by some mistake or oversight some provision in this bill of little importance should be subject to a point of order, we do not want to imperil the whole conference report and the tariff bill upon such a point of order. But I repeat, so far as I know and so far as I believe, there is no provision in this report subject to a point of order except the one to which I have called attention, the one that gives rise to the introduction of this rule.

I need not say, I think, anything about the importance of adopting at this time this conference report and adopting this rule to that end. The country has been agitated now for a period of six months at least upon the subject of tariff revision. This House in its committees and in its membership has been engaged during all that time in an endeavor to bring into both Houses a tariff bill that would be acceptable and that might become a law. Of course, this tariff bill does not satisfy everybody. It does not satisfy me in all particulars. No tariff bill was ever passed that did satisfy everybody, and none ever will be passed that will satisfy everybody; but here is a bill that has been agreed to by the representatives of this House and the representatives of the Senate and by the President of the United States, and I think I voice the sentiment of the entire country when I say to-day that it calls upon us to act [applause], to agree to this conference report, to relieve the business situation, and to open up, as I believe it will, a new era of prosperity. I reserve the balance of my time. [Loud applause.]

Mr. KEIFER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I do not rise to debate. I want to know whether paragraph 450 as in the bill is not new throughout? It is on page 220.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly. That is the paragraph we are considering. It is a combination of the House paragraph and Senate amendment, and another amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. That is the one that you read from?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. KEIFER. Then paragraph 451 that follows deals with the same matter largely as to the duty upon leather and tanned skins, and so forth, and fixes a different duty, does it not, and an additional duty, specific and ad valorem, on the same thing?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, not at all. Paragraph 451 deals with the subject of leather generally. Paragraph 450 deals only with the subject of leather which is made from the hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dried, salted, or pickled.

Mr. KEIFER. I only wanted the gentleman's statement about it.

Mr. DALZELL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Is not the differential on lead higher than either body fixed it?

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all. It is the Senate rate.

Mr. GARRETT. It is the Senate rate on pig lead, but not as to lead in sheets.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] says that this tariff bill does not please everybody. The Searcher of all hearts knows that it does not please me.

The situation about this matter is this: Everybody understands perfectly well that this rule, while stated in general terms, is nevertheless intended to apply to only one item, or one bunch of these items, namely, hides, leather, boots, shoes, and harness. It takes away from anybody the power to make a point of order against the 10 per cent rate on boots and shoes. For that reason I will vote for the rule. [Applause.] The only regret that I have about it is that it does not put leather, boots, shoes, and harness on the free list, where they ought to be [applause on the Democratic side], and where I tried to get them put originally, as did all the rest of us over here, nearly.

The New England gang have no more right to a tariff on boots, shoes, and harness than other people have on hides. That is the plain truth about this thing. But I recognize the fact that I can not get all out of this Republican House and Senate that I want, and therefore I am going to get all I can. That seems to me to be the rule of common sense. At any rate, I will not vote against the people having a chance to get cheaper harness, boots, and shoes.

The reason I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the question as to whether there is any item in this conference report on which the rate is higher than it was in the House bill or in the Senate bill is because the Republican conferees had about twenty times as good a chance to find out what is in this report as the Democrats did. The truth is that the Democrats were a purely ornamental addendum to that conference committee. After the Republicans had agreed to everything except the six items that President Taft knocked higher than a kite by a certain mysterious letter that I would give a $5 bill to get a copy of, the Republican conferees called us in and showed to us and gave to me the report, so far as they had perfected it. So I set a man to figure on it. They have all these days been going over this report and getting the straight of it, and I am perfectly willing to take the word of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on a question of fact any time. I asked that question so that Members would not feel that they were being led into a trap on this occasion.

I think this rule ought to be amended, and after the word "order," before the semicolon, these words ought to be inserted:

That nobody shall be permitted to raise a point of order on any item where the conference rate is higher than the lower of the two, the Senate rate and House rate.

If I could beat the previous question, I would offer that amendment.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to a reduction in shoes in the report of the committee. In what respect has the duty on shoes been reduced by the conference report?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Dingley law is 25 cents on shoes; the Payne bill had 15 cents; the Aldrich bill raised it to 20 cents; and the conference report cuts it to 10.

Mr. MANN. I do not so understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what everybody else understands.

Mr. MANN. It is a very incorrect understanding. The conference report leaves it at 15 cents.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is true, what is the sense of bringing this rule in here?

Mr. MANN. The only thing the rule does, and it is the only thing the conference report does, is to reduce to 10 per cent shoes made from raw hides.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You can not make a shoe from anything else.

Mr. MANN. From raw hides?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; raw hides.

Mr. MANN. You make them from tanned hides.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Tanned hides, which are raw hides in a different form.

Mr. MANN. Whether dried, salted, or pickled; that is all there is in it, and there is no such thing as tanned hides in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the adoption of this rule, because it gives the House an opportunity to reduce the rates on boots and shoes and on leather more than was provided either in the House bill or the Senate bill. But I think there is one proposition that should be called to the attention of the country in the adoption of this rule, and that is this: For three weeks past we have been informed day in and day out by the daily press that the President of the United States has been making a strenuous fight before the conference committee for a reduction of the duties for the benefit of the people. The press has informed us that he made that fight on five items—lumber, iron ore, hides, boots and shoes, and oil. I do not think that oil was really in dispute, that it did not require the President's aid to secure free oil.

It is claimed that he has won a great victory for the people by securing this reduction on these five items. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are 4,000 items in this bill; there are 1,500 paragraphs in this bill. The President stood for a reduction of 5 or 6 items. From now on do not let any man go out of this House and say that the President could not have stood for a reduction of the enormous duties on woolen goods and on cotton goods [loud applause on the Democratic side], and on the cost of living of the people of this country. The passage of this rule shows that if he had wished to stand for a revision of the tariff—a downward revision—to keep the pledges that he made to the people of the United States before he was elected, you could have made reductions in order on every paragraph in the bill to-day, and they could have been adopted by the House. There will not be an opportunity for you to hide behind the pretense that the conferees could not reduce the rates. [Applause.] It was not in the power of the conferees to reduce the duty on shoes to 10 per cent ad valorem; but by this rule you make it in order. If you had reduced the rate on blankets, on clothes and underwear in conference, this same rule would have made it in order, and the President of the United States could then have redeemed the pledges that he made to the

people when he was elected, if he had insisted on a reduction all along the line. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed four minutes and yields back the remainder.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Before the misapprehension spreads any further, I wish to set the gentleman from Illinois right, or rather to correct his statement to the effect that this 10 per cent duty on shoes does not apply to any known form of shoes. On the contrary, it covers heavy brogans, farmers' peg shoes, shoes that are known as "Creedmores;" many forms of bluchers; it covers every shoe of which the upper is made of side leather. Such shoes are worn by men and by boys and by youths, by misses, but very seldom by grown women.

Moreover this 10 per cent item covers a grade of men's fine shoes of which the uppers are made of grain leather. All the shoes which I have described meet the specifications which are requisite for the imposition of the 10 per cent duty. The duty on all those shoes, in my belief, has been pared down to the danger point. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is utterly mistaken in supposing that no shoes exist whose upper leathers are made in whole or in chief value from hides of cattle dried, salted, or pickled.

Mr. MANN. Are there any shoes made in this country which are not made of leather?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Why, certainly; a very large number in my State.

Mr. MANN. I am not speaking of rubber shoes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I refer the gentleman, for instance, to the shoes which I have on.

Mr. MANN. What are they made of?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. They are made of canvas.

Mr. MANN. Are there any shoes made from hides in this country which are not made of leather?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Possibly some moccasins are made of rawhide.

Mr. MANN. But on shoes which are made of leather the rate of duty is 15 per cent.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. With the exceptions noted.

Mr. MANN. There is no exception noted in that paragraph.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. After October 1, 1909——

Mr. MANN. When they construe the law, they will construe it most favorably to the Government.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. When two different clauses in a tariff schedule apply to any given article, the law is always construed as imposing the higher rate of duty, if the clauses are equally specific; but the wording in paragraph 450, with regard to boots and shoes whose uppers are made wholly or in part of the hides of cattle, is far more specific than the wording in paragraph 451, which refers simply to boots and shoes made of leather. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How much time is there on a side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has seven minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has six and one-half minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution demonstrates the truth of the saying, "that when thieves fall out, honest men get their due." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those who have been enjoying the benefits of the protective policy having had a radical disagreement, the consumers will obtain some relief from the rates in the boot and shoe schedule. I am heartily in favor of the reductions made in the boot and shoe schedule, and I regret exceedingly that there have not been many substantial reductions in innumerable other schedules in which the people of the country are particularly interested. For the last three or four weeks the people have been receiving a multiplicity of bulletins from the White House as to what would and what would not be done in the tariff bill. People crying for bread frequently have been given a stone, and crying for reductions in this bill, have been given White House bulletins instead. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, this situation illustrates what happens when men cease to trust the representatives of the people. Members upon that side of the House voted for a rule which prohibited and made impossible the consideration of the boot and shoe schedule by the Members of the House when the bill was before it. The Senate, by amendments, increased the rates on boots and shoes. The House is now asked, upon the pretense of further information, to authorize a reduction below the rates fixed either by the House or by the Senate. No one is deceived as to the purpose of this reduction. It has not been made because those in control of the Republican party have had any solicitude for the welfare of those who must wear and buy boots and shoes, but the reduction has been compelled because if it had been made it would have been impossible to get the necessary votes to pass this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If, Mr. Speaker, more votes had been required, it might have been possible to have obtained further reductions on the many articles mentioned by the gentleman from Alabama, particularly upon items in the cotton and the woolen schedules. If the votes of those Senators from the Middle Western States who have been making so much trouble for those in control of the bill had been necessary in the Senate to have this report adopted, the people might have had substantial reductions on many articles of wearing apparel and on many articles of household utility. But the Republican party never unnecessarily wastes its force. From the reports in the press there were taken in—not to use an offensive expression—sufficient Senators, or, to avoid a violation of the rules, I shall say sufficient distinguished citizens and members of another body than this, to make possible the enactment of this bill into law.

I wish to call the attention of the House to one of the peculiar methods followed in the framing of tariff bills by the Republican party. Since 1896 tin, block tin, pig tin, and the manufactures thereof, have been on the free list. In paragraph 691 of the House bill tin and its various products were retained on the free list. But in this conference report there is an extraordinary provision. It provides that as soon as the mines of the United States produce 1,500 tons of tin a year the President may by proclamation impose a duty of 4 cents a pound upon tin and its various products. Last year the importations of tin and its various products were about 100,000,000 pounds. So that as soon as the mines of the United States produce 3,000,000 pounds a duty of 4 cents a pound will be levied on the other 97,000,000 pounds to be imported. This is a complete reversal of the old theory of a protective tariff.

Heretofore the duty has been levied first in order to build up the industry, and when the industry had got beyond the infant stage, if it ever did, in the opinion of a protectionist, then the duty was reduced in the interest of the consumer. In this case the infant industry is to be permitted to struggle along against the competition of the world until it gets a foothold, and when it is built up and able to stand on its own feet without the help of tariff protection a duty of 4 cents a pound is levied for the sole benefit of those engaged in the industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have not time to go into many other details, Mr. Speaker, as I should if I had the opportunity. This side of the House wishes it to be distinctly understood, however, that no Member upon the Republican side of the House will be able in the coming campaign to excuse the failure of the Republican party to make substantial reductions in this bill on the theory that the items were beyond the jurisdiction of the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This side of the House would have willingly voted unanimously to have authorized these conferees to have made substantial reductions in every single item in the tariff bill, whether in dispute or not. We would have welcomed an opportunity to give such authority, or to have compelled such action. And if the managers on the part of the House had brought in a report in which a number of other reductions had been made, no objection on that score would have been made from this side of the House.

This is an attempt to delude the people as to what has been done with reference to two or three articles of this bill. Why, when the President of the United States by a single word to Congress in his message when it convened might have exercised his great influence to have obtained some substantial relief to the people in the way of substantial revision downward, he gave as his excuse that he had been too busy from election day in November until the 15th of March to prepare a suitable message. It would have been much better for the country if he had spent some of his time in his library and less upon the golf courses of the country, as he might then have prepared a message which would have been of substantial benefit to the consumers of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Even after the bill, indefensible as it was, passed the House and went to the Senate, not a single word was heard from the President on behalf of the people; but when it got into conference and the rising resentment of an indignant people, spreading rapidly throughout the country, reached this city the President commenced to agitate for free hides and free oil, which already had been voted by the House, and also made belated efforts for some other insignificant reductions. It is claimed that he has won a great victory because he had the Senate rates retained

in the glove schedule, and yet how laughable it is to prate about such a victory, when all realize that the Senate rates are the rates of the Dingley law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He would have imagined he had won a great victory, I suppose, and have invoked the congratulations and commendation of the country upon his efforts if by any possibility he could have had presented to him for his signature the Dingley Act unchanged in a single word or letter. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, the country will not be deceived by this pretense. The people will have an opportunity to know and fully to understand just what has been done in this bill. Every woman, every child, every wage-earner and supporter of a family will have brought home the fact that there are no reductions in many things that it is essential for them to have in their continuing and difficult struggle for existence. There will come no relief to the people from this bill, but there will come relief and there will follow immense benefits to the great favored class of the Republican party which has grown rich beyond the wildest dreams during the past twelve years under the operation of the Dingley law, no one of whom has been heard to utter a single complaint against the bill which is to be presented to the President of the United States for approval.

Once more, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that at a time when the banks of the country have their reserves as high as 40, and in some instances as high as 60 per cent, when without a single effort having been made to dispose of bonds at 2 per cent, this bill authorizes the issuance of $290,000,000 of bonds for the building of the Panama Canal at an increase of interest rate from 2 to 3 per cent. An examination of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury discloses that practically all of the outstanding interest-bearing bonds of the Government are held by the national banks. This is the only nation of civilized men in which the obligations of the Government are not held largely by the people. They would readily absorb the forty millions of bonds to be issued each year with a 2 per cent rate if given the chance to do so. It will not be given to them. But another sop is given, raising unnecessarily the interest to the great financial interests, in return for past favors and for help which it is confidently expected will be given in the near future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I would like to know if he really believes that the reserves of the banks of the country are from 40 to 60 per cent?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean in Massachusetts. I mean where the people have money. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEEKS. I desire to say to the gentleman that the average reserves of the banks are not 30 per cent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish, in conclusion, to say that what President Taft recently prophesied was likely to happen to the Republican party is about to be fulfilled. Not having lived up to its promises to bring substantial relief, the time is surely at hand when it is to be relegated to the party of opposition. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, is the time on the other side exhausted?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is exhausted.

Mr. DALZELL. Then I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLARK) there were—ayes 361, noes 11.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this conference report, I do it with confidence that it will be accepted by this House and that it will be accepted by the country at large as meeting the full requirements of the Republican platform, as meeting the pledges made by our candidate, now the President of the United States [applause on the Republican side], and at the same time will not stop a single wheel of industry, will close no factory, and will deprive no man of labor at a decent, fair wage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Senate did not agree with the House as to its provisions in the bill. Exercising their prerogatives under the Constitution, and in accordance with the usual practice, they made many amendments. Many of them were substantial. Great was the divergence of thought and great the disagreement as to the provisions of the bill. Your conferees have had no easy task in the past three weeks in striving to maintain the mandate of the House as put forth in the bill which passed the House. We have made concessions. We have exacted concessions from the Senate, and the concessions on both sides are embodied in this report. I am frank to say that many of the concessions which we make to the Senate improve the original bill, and, on the other hand, some of the concessions which we were obliged to make did not improve the original bill. But I think upon the whole the result is one upon which we may congratulate ourselves on having framed a bill which, if it becomes a law, will reflect credit upon the Congress which enacted it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, there was a great diversity of opinion between the two Houses upon the cotton schedule. The Senate has slightly increased the rates generally upon the cotton schedule. The ad valorem for the year 1907 as collected under the Dingley bill was 40.87 per cent. The ad valorem as figured upon the Senate rate was 44.07 per cent, which leaves a difference of 3.20 between the two rates. The House conferees were averse to this proposition, but we went there, as I said, when the bill left the House to inquire and find out upon what evidence the Senate had acted in increasing or amending any rate which went out from the House, and I have been upon that inquiry, and my fellow-conferees, for three weeks, and we made them tell us the reasons for the change of rates before we yielded upon any of them. When the cotton schedule came to the House it was not in the same condition as when it left the House. For four years or more the customs officials administered it according to the intention of the Congress that passed it. The importers were not satisfied. They went to the general appraisers and to the courts for interpretation of the law, and I am bound to say they succeeded, and in almost every instance they have driven holes in the cotton schedule that were very embarrassing to the cotton industry. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the representatives of the cotton industry came before our committee apprehensive that rates might be reduced and said they were satisfied to take the cotton schedule as it was with one or two amendments which had been reported to the committee. The first point of attack in the courts was the clause in the bill of 1897, introduced in the Senate on the advice of General Tichenor, no more able or honest tariff expert than whom ever lived in this country. It was in the definition of the term "cotton cloth," and the terms of that definition included the words "in the piece or otherwise." That was adopted by the conferees of the House believing "or otherwise" meant something less than a full piece, and it went to the court, and they said "or otherwise" included cotton cloth sometimes embroidered, of very high degree of value, until the decisions of the court brought down the ad valorem in one case from 60 to 4 per cent. And that went all through the higher-price goods under the general cotton schedule.

The Ways and Means Committee tried to correct that. We adopted a provision striking out "or otherwise" and put in the words "cut in lengths," but the experts also put into that paragraph a new provision for counting, so that where there were twisted yarns, two or three ply, every single strand was counted. We were not expert enough to take that into consideration. We published our bill and then other experts got out and showed that by this counting provision we had raised the duty on countable cotton cloth from 10 to 100 per cent all through the schedule. When we discovered that, I asked the committee to come together, and we, with some emphasis, cut out that new provision, and in doing so we returned to the Dingley paragraph, and the words "or otherwise" were left in. Now, the Senate placed instead of the words "or otherwise" the words "cut in lengths," so the importers can never more impose upon the customs with that provision of the bill. We went a little further. There was a provision in the bill for duties upon white cotton goods, and general duties were put upon the warp and filling, the number of counts of threads to the square inch. By and by the importers ordered some goods with white cotton warp and filling, but with superadded threads with all the colors of the rainbow, with beautiful artistic figures, and they brought them to the customs-house and demanded that they be admitted at the lower rate as white cotton cloths, and the court so interpreted it; so that they came in as white cotton cloths at the low rate of duty, and broke down our tariff in this respect. The Senate amendment gets rid of that interpretation and allows upon this superadded thread the same duty as though the color were woven into the warp and woof. These cotton cloths are of much higher value than where simply the color is in the warp and woof.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we not only examined the experts individually, but we adjourned the committee for half a day and called in General Shiras, a gentleman whom you all know; Mr. Devries, formerly a Member of the House, one of the general appraisers; and also Mr. Otto Fix, a customs expert at the port

of New York. Our conferees examined them all the afternoon about every item of increase in the cotton schedule from beginning to end, and after we got through with that examination and made further examinations and figures, our conferees were impressed with the fact that the duty was right, if we were going to protect the cotton industry in the United States.

Another amendment of the Senate puts up the ad valorem duty on cotton cloths for a number of sections or paragraphs where the duty in the first place up to a certain price is according to the number of counted threads in the cloth. Not only that, but they add the three and two ply yarn which they weave into it, and they count it for one thread. The two-ply is much finer than the single-ply thread. They saw that that particular part of the cotton schedule was unbalanced, and that of cotton goods, for instance, valued at 16 cents per yard, some of them came in at 25 per cent, some at 40, and some at 60; these experts went to work to equalize the duty according to the price and to put the same duty where they were 16 cents a yard upon all these goods, the three-ply goods costing more in the making, because they had to spin three yarns instead of one and then twist them into the single yarn. They equalized the duty by making it the same upon all this class of goods.

Then, when they got through with it, they found that the general rates of duty upon the cotton schedule were less than the rates of duty collected under the first four years of the Dingley Act. Well, we got them to reduce those ad valorem rates. I call them ad valorem. It depends upon the price of the yarn—a specific rate, a sort of skip, hop, and jump, the worst kind of an ad valorem; and on the lower-priced goods they made a very material reduction in the rate to what it was in the Senate bill.

And then came the process of mercerization, a new process which has come in since the Dingley bill was passed. We considered it in the House committee, and, after the best information we could get, we allowed an additional duty of 1 cent per yard upon mercerized cloths. Our information was that it cost substantially the same to mercerize yarn here that it did abroad—eight cents and a half a pound in Manchester, and eight cents and a half a pound in New York—and we allowed no additional duty. But these gentlemen alleged, and we have found it to be a fact, that after a hundred pounds of yarn was mercerized it was found to have shrunk from 5 to 7 per cent in weight, and that you had only 93 or 95 pounds left upon which to collect the specific duty. And so, when you come to exact the same duty per pound upon the mercerized and unmercerized, you have got a larger duty on the hundred pounds of white yarn than on the 93 pounds of mercerized yarn; or, in other words, there was 7 per cent less of duty and of protection on the mercerized yarn than there was on the other. And it seemed but right and proper to allow the difference. They had suggested a difference of one-twentieth of a cent per pound. I told them that was too much. I made my own figures, and they fixed the duty at one-fortieth of a cent. I say I did this, because I did this talking with the experts of the Senate committee. They reduced it from one-twentieth of a cent per pound to one-fortieth of a cent.

Mr. Speaker, if I had the sole power to make the cotton schedule, I would make a reduction in the rates as we have reported them, but it would not be a very great reduction. But I would readjust them on the same plan on which they have been adjusted in this conference report. Here is a statement made by the Treasury experts on the cotton schedule:

"The changes in paragraphs 310 and 311 by the Senate amendments your conferees found, upon investigation, to represent, except in one particular, reductions in duties. Excepting the changes in phraseology, which did not affect rates, the principal Senate amendments are the two minimum provisions, the special classification for cable-laid yarns and threads, the provision for mercerization of such yarns, and the transfer of the words 'cones and tubes' from one portion of paragraph 311 to another.

"After the reduction by the conferees of the second minimum provision in paragraph 310 from 25 to 20 per cent ad valorem the minimum provisions of both these paragraphs are slightly below the specific rates levied by the paragraphs. It was found that certain very high-class and high-priced yarns were being imported under these provisions at specific rates which represented an exceedingly low equivalent at valorem—as low as 7 per cent in many cases. In order to prevent such and to bring the rate upon the high-priced yarns up to at least that upon the lower-priced yarns, these minimum provisions were agreed to.

"The amendment by the Senate for cable-laid yarns is a timely one to meet a probable decision of the court in a case now pending, wherein these yarns, though of high character and twist, might be classed among the cheapest of cotton yarns.

"The arrangement of the cable-laid yarn provision as drawn represents an increase of about 10 per cent upon about one-tenth of the goods covered by the paragraph, and a decrease from 100 to 150 per cent to about 40 per cent upon the remaining merchandise covered by the paragraph. Upon the whole, this provision represents considerable reductions below the House bill.

"The rate of one-twentieth of a cent for mercerization fixed by the Senate was reduced by the conference to one-fortieth, or one-half. This makes the mercerization rate equivalent to about 7 per cent ad valorem. Inasmuch as yarns lose from 5 to 7 per cent in weight in the process of mercerization, and as the specific duty is levied upon weight, this no more than equalizes that loss and prevents the higher class mercerized yarns from being dutiable at a lower rate than the low-class yarns out of which they are made when mercerized. It represents an equalization of rates.

"It was found that the insertion of the words 'cones and tubes' in the earlier provision of paragraph 311 represented an exceedingly great increase of duties upon these threads so put up. The conference concurred in the Senate changes with an amendment inserting the words 'cones and tubes' in the latter part of the paragraph, where a ratable rate of duty is established. This represents an extensive cut in the rate of duty on that class of goods.

"The minimum provision in this paragraph is fixed upon the same basis as that in paragraph 310.

"Upon the whole, the Senate amendments to paragraphs 310 and 311 as agreed to by your conferees represent substantial reductions from both the Dingley rates and the rates fixed upon the merchandise covered therein by the House bill.

"The Senate amendments to the cotton-cloth provisions, paragraphs 313 to 318, inclusive, 321 and 330, save and except the ad valorems to paragraphs 313 to 317, inclusive, were for the purpose of correcting inequalities and inconsistencies existing in these paragraphs as administered at present. Your conferees found upon investigation of all these provisions, together with the ad valorems, that the basic principle upon which they were drawn was to provide that cotton cloth of equal value per square yard should pay the same rate of duty, regardless of count of threads and regardless of what particular paragraph of the law the same fell for dutiable purposes. Under the Dingley law as administered, cotton cloth of the same value per square yard, requiring the same amount of labor and material in its construction, paid varying duties from 2 per cent to 60 per cent ad valorem, according to the count of threads or other conditions. This manifestly unjust assessment of duty is corrected by the Senate amendments by adopting as a basis of duty the value of the cloth per square yard and throwing all cloth within the provisions so arranged.

"The Senate amendments cut out the higher rate of 60 per cent ad valorem and other provisions classing such cloth at the arbitrary rate of 45 per cent, and so arranged the schedules that all cotton cloth would fall within the countable provisions and be assessed for duty according to value. In the rearrangement of these paragraphs to effect that purpose of necessity the rates provided in the lower paragraphs were increased, while the rates provided in some of the higher paragraphs, such as that formerly in paragraph 339, were greatly reduced.

"There seemed to be sound and indisputable reason why such a scheme should be adopted, and in view of the fact that your conferees are convinced that this plan will not result in the increase of duties above those originally collected by the Dingley law, but in a great reduction of those rates, and in view of the further fact that your conferees are convinced that this arrangement provides duties consistent with the body of the Dingley schedules on the higher values of cotton goods, the Senate provisions, as modified by the conference, were agreed to.

"Under the arrangement of the Dingley schedules, as the development of the cotton industry had progressed since the enactment of that law, and the manufacture and importation of higher grade cotton goods increased, it was found that the equivalent ad valorem rates levied by the higher and ad valorem provisions of that law were less than those levied by the specific and lower provisions. It was further found that upon many of the goods imported, particularly under the lower provisions, the rate of duty upon the yarns out of which they are made was higher than the rate of duty upon the finished product itself. After thorough consideration of the subject-matter, your conferees were agreed that the only possible way that these inconsistencies demanding correction could be changed, in the latitude allowed the conferees for consideration under the rules, was the adoption of the Senate ad valorems as modified. It is perfectly clear that the Dingley provisions providing that lower rates of duty should be assessed on goods of small count on a low basis of necessity resulted in the high-valued goods being assessed at low equivalent ad valorems.

"Cotton yarns are dutiable according to the number in the single yarns, so that No. 40's, which pay one-fourth of a cent

per number per pound, or 10 cents per pound, if of the same thickness, but three ply, would be of the fineness in the singles of 120's, on which the rate of duty would be three-tenths of a cent per number per pound, or 36 cents per pound.

"In other words, cotton yarns are dutiable according to the number of plies in each yarn. That is, a two-ply yarn pays twice the rate of duty of a single of the same thickness in the finished condition, and a three-ply three times as much, a four-ply four times as much, and so on.

"When these yarns, however, are counted in a cotton cloth they all pay the same rate of duty. That is to say, the four-ply will be counted as a single thread under the rule that the rate of duty is determined by the count of threads per square inch, all plies in a thread being counted together as one.

"Cotton cloth is dutiable according to the count of threads per square inch, and not according to the number of plies in each thread. The result is that while the rate of duty increases upon the yarn used in the cotton cloth according to the number of plies, the rate of duty upon cotton cloth does not increase according to the number of plies in the yarn used in its fabrication. Under this rule the cost of the material for the cotton cloth increases where the rate of duty upon the cotton cloth does not increase in a corresponding compensatory rate.

"In order to equalize this condition, it is necessary to increase the rates on cotton cloth according to the value thereof as represented by the increased value in the yarns used therein. The only possible way to do it under the present system is by the added ad valorems in the Senate bill.

"For example, a piece of unbleached cotton cloth valued at 16 cents per square yard pays under each of paragraphs 313, 314, 315, and 316, 6½ cents per square yard, regardless of count of threads. Under the old system of Dingley ad valorems, if such a piece of cotton cloth made of single yarns fell under paragraph 308, which is 316 of the Senate bill, the duty would have been 40 per cent, or 6.4 cents per square yard, its equivalent; under paragraph 307 of the Dingley law (315, Senate bill) it would have been 35 per cent, or its equivalent, 5.6 cents per square yard; under paragraph 306 of the Dingley law (314, Senate bill) it would have been 30 per cent, or its equivalent, 4.8 cents per square yard; and under paragraph 305 of the Dingley law (313, Senate bill) it would have been 25 per cent, or its equivalent, 4 cents per square yard—a different rate of duty in each of the paragraphs, though the value per square yard and condition were precisely the same.

"Under paragraph 316 the count would be exceeding 200 and not exceeding 300 threads to the square inch. We will take, for example, the count is 250 threads per square inch. If the same cloth with the same count of threads, and dutiable at 6½ cents per square yard under paragraph 308 of the Dingley law, were made by twisting two of these threads together, it would count, under the method of counting in the Dingley law, 125 threads per square inch, which would throw the cloth for dutiable purposes in paragraph 306 as unbleached cotton cloth exceeding 100 and not exceeding 150 threads to the square inch, to wit, 125 threads, and the rate of duty would be 30 per cent ad valorem, the equivalent of 4.8 cents per square yard. And this obtains all through the Dingley ad valorems.

"The anomaly and inequality of this condition are better understood in light of the fact that if the threads of the identical cloth were twisted instead of being woven single the article is, if anything, a more valuable article than if woven and not twisted together to make doubles out of singles.

"It is exactly to meet this condition and to correct this lack of uniformity in rates according to value per square yard that these ad valorems are absolutely essential for harmonious rates in the cotton schedules. Under the Dingley law a cotton cloth of the same value might pay four different rates, according as it fell under one paragraph or the other. Under the Senate bill it will pay precisely the same rate, being of the same value and condition, regardless of where it falls; and no other system, except a total change of the plan and scheme of the cotton schedule, can effect an equitable distribution of rates. It will be noted that this is particularly true in the lower counts of cloth, for those are necessarily made up of stronger threads entering into the composition of the more open fabrics, as a stronger thread means a thread of a greater number of plies, and therefore one bearing a higher rate of duty. Hence the greater number of added ad valorems for the lower count of cotton cloths in order to secure the proper compensatory duty for the increased rates upon the yarns before any protection on the cotton cloth is afforded.

"To summarize the situation with reference to the cotton schedule, therefore, your conferees found the following defects:

"1. The same value of goods per square yard was being assessed at rates varying from 2 per cent to 60 per cent ad valorem, without any basis of sound reason.

"2. That the lower valued goods coming in under the specific provisions were paying a higher equivalent ad valorem than the higher priced fabric coming in under the ad valorem provisions.

"3. That the great development of the cotton industry since the enactment of the Dingley law, at which time but little merchandise was imported under the Dingley ad valorems, which were then intended merely as catch-all clauses, had become important factors and were permitting the newly developed branch of this industry to come in at inconsistently low equivalent ad valorems.

"4. That many of the goods imported under the lower counts were receiving less equivalent protection than was paid upon the yarns out of which they were made.

"5. That some of the cotton goods were coming in under low ad valorems of the countable provisions, while others and great quantities of them, estimated at about 12 per cent of the total importations, were paying 60 per cent ad valorem under the provisions of paragraph 339 of that law.

"6. That the completed article made of cotton cloth was paying the same rate of duty as the cotton cloth out of which it was made.

"7. That the same cotton cloth of a high value by reason of clipped threads was paying a less rate of duty than that of unclipped threads out of which it was made.

"8. That the only possible latitude afforded the conference for the correction of these manifest inconsistencies and irregularities, with due regard to the cotton industry of the country, was the adoption of the Senate amendments as modified.

"It seemed to your conferees that the added amendments upon the lower-count goods by the Senate were too high and recessions were insisted upon, at least with reference to this class of goods. Accordingly reductions were made, averaging about 10 per cent, in the rate of duty in this line of goods.

"Your conferees desire to state that the various arguments presented against this schedule have been examined with care and analyzed in the light of truth, and most of them with which the country has been circulated have been found to be without any warrant of fact. In almost all of these arguments rare and exceptional cases have been picked out and emphasized as the true effect of these cotton paragraphs, whereas in truth and fact, when they are examined in the light of careful analysis and their probable application to importations of merchandise of that character, they are without any foundation of fact.

"While there are increases in the rates of the paragraphs on lower-count goods, there are great reductions in other provisions of the law applicable to cotton goods, and your conferees are satisfied after a full and complete investigation that the result reached by the conference is a fair and just cotton schedule, one calculated to build up the cotton industry of the country and at the same time do justice to the consumers of the country."

When we go on the stump we will have no trouble to meet any criticism of the adversary because of the cotton schedule that we have adopted in this report. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Another difficult subject was the subject of paper and pulp. It is not necessary to give a history in this presence of paper and pulp. Two years ago we got into a controversy on that subject, and we would not consent to any specific bill putting it upon the free list, but intended that it should have the same examination that it should receive on a tariff bill, and that it should have due deliberation as to the duty fixed. Well, after a while a resolution of inquiry was adopted by the House. Gentlemen were selected for the duty. I see the chairman of the committee before me now. I have been looking for him for some minutes. Intelligent, honest, able Members of this House were selected and put upon that committee for the purpose of making that investigation. They were gentlemen in whom I have the most explicit confidence, as I knew they were able and willing to do the right and proper thing with this industry. They came before the Committee on Ways and Means, by their chairman, and stated what they would include in their report before it had been presented to the House, and the conclusions which they had reached. I understood the chairman—and that he spoke for the committee—to say that all the people interested, the committee, the publishers of papers, and the manufacturers of paper, were substantially united upon the proposition which he then presented, which was the proposition which he later presented to the House in the report that he made. The committee took his judgment and that of his committee and fixed the rates according to what was proposed by them, and the House adopted those rates. The bill went over to the Senate. They put a duty of $4 instead of $2 per ton upon the print paper affected. They came into conference with it. If there was any item they were more strenuous about than any other, it was the paper item.

If there was any item that absorbed more attention in debate than any other it was upon the paper question, the question of the rate of duty. We did not want to shut up any paper mills in the United States. We are not here for that purpose, no matter who demands it. We did not want to get an undue duty upon paper and wood pulp. We insisted that wood pulp should go on the free list; and that was conceded. We offered a compromise finally upon paper of $3 a ton instead of $2. It could not be accepted. Then we inquired why it was. We made that inquiry before we proposed the raise of the duty to $3. They claimed that the Mann report, which gave the $2 duty upon paper, was based on the claim that it was the difference in cost at the factory in the United States and in Canada. They claimed that he had left out of the calculation the difference in the cost of pulp wood at either factory. They produced a good deal of evidence going to show that the pulp wood on an average in the factories of the United States cost $4 per ton more than in the Canadian factories. A fair average would carry it beyond the $2 a ton. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, we had before us Senator FRYE, of Maine, who had a good deal of personal knowledge and informaion on the subject, in addition to the evidence they had presented; and at the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] and myself we sent for the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee of investigation [Mr. MANN], and heard him before the committee, and I got the idea from what he stated that the low rate of duty of $2 upon paper was largely for the effect that it would have upon the Canadian government in giving us free wood. We held out until the last thing, and finally we put on a duty of $3.75 a ton, the best concession that we could get and still bring a report into the House. I want to say to gentlemen who are here, as a protectionist and as a Republican, I do not think that any protectionist can make a good argument against the rate we have proposed upon print paper of $3.75 a ton. So we bring it to the House in that way.

Another subject involving much debate was coal. The House had left the duty at 67 cents a ton on bituminous coal, with the provision that it should be free from a country that gave us free entrance upon bituminous coal. Well, it is useless to say or to deny the fact that many gentlemen in the other House and many gentlemen in this House were very much opposed to any possibility of free reciprocal coal between the United States and Canada; most of them without reason as to their locality, and some with more reason because of their locality, oppose any such rate as that.

We considered that. Finally we got down to where we could agree upon a straight rate of 45 cents a ton without any provision for reciprocity, but reducing the rate from 67 cents to 45 cents. And so the committee have adopted their report, fixing that rate at 45 cents. From what I can learn of the attitude of Canada, I believe that that is a lower rate than would have resulted from the House reciprocity provision, because I understand that when Mr. ROOT was Secretary of State he attempted in vain to get any kind of an agreement with Canada which he proposed for reciprocal free coal; and if they would not do it then, I do not think they would have done it under our bill. And so I would like to say to my colleague, who was shouting so loudly a few minutes ago and who appears to have disappeared, that this necessity of life, bituminous coal, has been cut a third of the duty upon this bill, and it comes in here at 45 cents a ton instead of 67 cents.

Then we got down to the iron and steel schedule. The House had made iron ore free. The Senate had put on a duty of 25 cents a ton. The present law is 40 cents a ton. They were strenuous about that. They wanted the full Senate rate. Some of them went so far as to say the industry would be ruined out in the Rocky Mountains if we let in free iron ore and free coal from Cuba on the Atlantic border, or let it in at anything less than 25 cents a ton.

Your conferees followed the judgment of the House, and asked for free iron ore. At last we compromised on a duty of 15 cents a ton on iron ore. We were all the more moved to stick, because we had so cut the rate on every product of the iron mill that the people along the Atlantic seaboard were entitled to consideration in the matter of the iron ore that goes into their finished product. We stood by them, to encourage their industry and let it not be wiped out by stronger competition of combinations of capital which own their own ore and bring it to Pittsburg from the western mines. We were dealing out equity and justice to those people, giving them a fair chance for their lives, when we had reduced their pig iron from $4 to $2.50, and in many cases had cut the duties on their finished products 50 per cent or even more. So the report of the committee was for 15 cents a ton on iron ore, and I do not believe that the duty of 15 cents a ton will stop a single pick in any mine in the United States. If it would hurt anybody, it would hurt the mine owners in my own State; and I happen to know that it will not hurt them even to have free ore. It can not hurt anything west of the Allegheny Mountains. It can hurt no industry. On the other hand, it will keep the shops east of the Alleghenies running on full time, because they will not have to submit to undue exactions from ore coming from west of the Allegheny Mountains.

Now, we increased three items, according to my recollection, in all of the great iron and steel schedule. On structural iron or steel we made an increase on the fabricated article. We made no increase upon what has been coming in here, but a decrease. The unfinished structural steel has been coming in in small volume under the Dingley law. We decreased that by 1 to two-tenths of a cent per pound, but we put that which was fabricated into another class. I was surprised to learn, after I became a conferee, that the fabrication is done in another shop and is a distinct industry from the rolling, hammering, or forging. Even the United States Steel Company has a plant for fabrication, which is separated from its forging plant by from 20 to 25 miles, and we have these large fabricating works in many cities of the United States, and the industry is a great one.

Recently, under the depression of times which affected not only us but Germany as well, they have been bringing in some of this fabricated structural steel. In the case of one building even the door frames and window frames were completed and brought in, adding an expense of almost one-half to the cost of the original structural steel. After I found out the facts I was willing to concede that to the Senate and to the Senate conferees.

Then on high-speed steel of the highest class we made one or two new brackets, increasing the rate. This is something new since the enactment of the Dingley law. It is wonderful development in modern steel making, and by this process we are turning out steel of wonderful character, to be used where the very highest class is necessary. And they are getting the higher speed into the article, way up beyond what it was a month ago, and it seemed necessary that on this high class there should be a little addition to the rate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell us what he means by high-speed steel?

Mr. PAYNE. They run it at a very high speed in the machines in which it is used, and it makes a very high-class article of tempered steel, which retains its temper even when run so as to come to a red heat, and will cut the article upon which it is used. The gentleman from Pennsylvania also reminds me that it is made of steel bars with a combination of tungsten ore, and the tungsten ore is a new thing, has come in within the last ten or twelve years. There is nothing in the world that has developed like the steel industry; there is no improvement in any industry equal to that of the steel, and in it the United States is far in advance of the world.

They are paving the way to open up new methods, new achievements in the manufacture of iron and steel of the very highest class. I do not believe there is a man within the sound of my voice that would deny them adequate protection. The other advance on the iron and steel paragraph was a separate enumeration of nippers and pliers and articles of that kind; they are put on specific rates instead of coming in at 45 per cent ad valorem; an advance was made of the rates.

I may return to this schedule a little later and say something about what we have done in the way of cutting rates down. I want the House to understand that in many of the articles of the iron and steel schedule the Senate reduced the rates to even below those in the House, and, as far as my recollection goes, the House conferees agreed to every reduction of rates in the iron and steel schedule proposed by the Senate in their amendments. And they were numerous, as they were on the chemical schedule.

Barbed fence wire has a present duty of 2 cents, and the Senate proposed three quarters of a cent, and we agreed to a reduction to three-quarters of a cent per pound. I only speak of that as a single item because time will not permit, and it is too hot if it would, for me to go into much detail about these things. I will show you what is the general result of the reduction on the different schedules by and by.

The Senate proposed a very heavy reduction on marble and onyx, and the House agreed to all of them, I think, without a single exception. So the Senate has done some good to this bill in the way of downward revision. And yet, after we have agreed to the Senate reductions, not so very great, but reductions, we have left protective rates for the people of the United States engaged in these industries.

Then there was the hides of cattle. We were not all agreed on it here, but 173 majority seemed to agree on free hides. We reduced the rates on boots and shoes and the products of hides and cattle in the House committee all that we thought it would bear. We made the rates on sole leather, reducing it from 20

cents to 5 cents, and reduced it on shoes from 25 per cent to 15 per cent, and we reduced it on harnesses from 40 per cent to 30 per cent, if I remember right. Some of these gentlemen, who did not want free hides and brought up the impossible argument that if hides were free all the productions of those hides should be free, urged that on us. It was not logical. I am not going to repeat my arguments on free hides. If anyone doubts where I stand, he can turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and there it is. But when you come to make a shoe, it is not all of leather. The cloth in the lining bears a high rate of duty. Very often the outward material bears a high rate of duty. It is a matter of labor and skill which goes into it. The item of manufacture is a large part of it. I would not be for free hides if I supposed for a moment a duty protected any American industry. I am not for free raw materials. I repudiate the doctrine now as I have all my life. [Applause on the Republican side.] But my idea is that we do not want to keep a duty on unnecessarily, either for sentiment or anything else. I believe he is an enemy to protection who deliberately goes to work and puts on a protective tariff beyond all reason, nay, beyond protection and necessary protection for American labor [applause on the Republican side]; and when you apply that rule to hides, it puts them on the free list.

When you apply it to iron ore it puts it on the free list, and according to my doctrine it is not raw material. What is raw material? Iron ore? It is the ore in the earth, buried, before a shovelful of dirt has been removed to uncover it. Is not the ore the finished product of the miner? I do not subscribe to any doctrine of free raw material, but repudiate it. It has no place in my political theory. [Applause on the Republican side.] But we finally compromised on boots and shoes, and we went so far as to compromise by deliberately putting into the conference report something we did not have any right to do. We cut down the duty on belting leather and sole leather from 20 per cent to 5 per cent, just as we had reported it in the bill, and we cut down the duty on shoes made of these hides from 25 per cent to 10 per cent, and on harnesses from 40 per cent to 20 per cent, believing that the House would sustain the rule to waive the point of order if left in the bill, and I have never seen the House so united in all my career in Congress as it was this morning in adopting that rule, both sides uniting by an almost unanimous vote in favor of it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If hides remain on the free list, does the gentleman anticipate that boots and shoes are going to be cheaper; and if so, how much?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty difficult question to answer. One of the controverted questions during all of this debate in both House and Senate was whether the wholesaler and the retailer would not absorb the whole of the reduction. I believe they will on the start. It will take time, but by and by some fellow will cut under, and, owing to the competition, some one else will cut under, and eventually I believe boots and shoes will be cheaper, conditions remaining the same.

But I do not expect to see it done next month. Why, great heavens! we have not altered the wool schedule except to reduce three paragraphs—not much, but reduce them—and yet I understand that all of the clothing merchants in the United States are advertising that because of the increase in the rates on wool in both the House and Senate bills, which did not exist anywhere, the price of clothing would go up 20 or 50 per cent after the bill was passed. Thank God, when we write this bill on the statute books it will remain there and its operation will be felt throughout all of this broad land for fifteen months before the next election, and the people will have a chance to see what it does and the relief that it will bring, and know from their own experience what it has accomplished.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves the leather schedule, I would like to ask him a question. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois attracted my attention——

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the gentleman will have to interpret that for himself. This language was drawn with great care. It met with the approval of every conferee, all of whom were in favor of putting all boots and shoes made from the leather of hides, whether wholly or in chief value, at 10 per cent duty, and we thought we had accomplished it. Yesterday, through the suggestion of some one—I do not know whether it came from the gentleman from Illinois or some one else—this matter was brought to my attention, and I gave it as my deliberate judgment that the language would be construed as meaning just what the conferees meant, and there was not the slightest danger but that shoes would come in at 10 per cent under that provision after the 1st of October, as nominated in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we were instructed, I might say, on oil by a vote in the House, and perhaps some of you remember that vote on oil. The House put it on the free list. The House put petroleum, crude and refined, and all its products on the free list. The Senate brought in an amendment putting petroleum, crude and refined, on the free list with a countervailing duty of one-half of the foreign duty. Well, we told the conferees on the part of the Senate that we were willing to have a provision in the bill that would insure the placing of petroleum, crude and refined, including kerosene oil, naphtha, gasoline, benzine, and similar products on the free list, and then we were in favor of wiping out the whole of the rest of their amendment and allowing the medicinal preparations made from petroleum to come in like other medicinal manufactures, at 25 per cent. That was accepted, and that appears in the report, and I believe we carried out the wishes of the House as expressed by an overwhelming vote in the House when we agreed to that proposition on oil and put upon the free list everything that any reasonable man could ask in that respect and left these medicinal preparations with a duty upon them of 25 per cent, the same as that on other medicinal preparations.

I want to speak about a few other things in the internal revenue, and so forth. The House put a provision increasing the tax on cigarettes, internal revenue, equal to the tax that was put upon cigarettes in the Spanish war revenue bill. The Senate added another provision taxing manufactured tobacco equal to the tax in the war-revenue bill, or about equivalent to it, and the House accepted that provision. The House did not have much difficulty in reaching an agreement upon it. That provision altogether will bring in revenue estimated at $9,300,000, and that is quite an addition to the revenues. Then comes the question of the tax on corporations.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. PAYNE. I will.

Mr. STANLEY. What was done with the provision in the House bill in regard to a duty on Turkish tobacco?

Mr. PAYNE. That was stricken out.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like to know why that was done, if the gentleman will be kind enough to inform me?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, the Senate conferees insisted that that was a discrimination against a single kind of tobacco, and that there were strong objections to it, diplomatic and otherwise; the tax was too high and there was no reason for it; there was no reason for picking out that particular class and putting a duty upon it, and the House finally yielded on that.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Why was it that cotton bagging was taken out of the free list and binding twine left on it?

Mr. PAYNE. Binding twine and cotton bagging were put on the free list in the Wilson bill. We found out by experience under the Wilson bill that binding twine, being a very low order of manufacture, made almost exclusively by machinery and very little labor involved, could be made in this country in competition with the world, and we could continue to leave binding twine on the free list. We also found that the manufacture of jute for cotton bagging involved not only the spinning of the yarn, but the weaving of the cloth, and that free cotton bagging would close up the mills in the United States that were engaged in making it. When we came to form this bill, gentlemen representing these mills asked for an increase from six-tenths of a cent a pound up to a cent, to protect their industry. There are three of those mills, employing thousands of men, in St. Louis. There is one in Massachusetts, in the district of Mr. GILLETT. There are three or four in Brooklyn, in New York, my State, and others in the country, employing many thousands of people; and free cotton bagging meant simply the closing of those mills, and so we did not put it on the free list.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House did not put bagging upon the free list, but the Senate did. I have just come in, and I do not desire the gentleman to repeat what he may have said, but I understood the gentleman stated that we would close the mills which manufacture cotton bagging if we put cotton bagging on the free list. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that cotton bagging is made out of jute that is imported, and that it is only in this bill where jute is imported for the purpose of manufacturing cotton bagging that a duty is put upon it?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, jute is on the free list.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Exactly; and it is only when it is imported for the purpose of being manufactured into bagging for cotton that it is made dutiable. Sisal and other grass——

Mr. PAYNE. Jute and jute butts are absolutely on the free list, no matter for what purpose they are brought in.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. And in this bill, and, as I understand, the Dingley bill, sisal grass and jute imported for the

purpose of being made into bagging for the baling of cotton is dutiable.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, now, if the gentleman will study the bill he will find, if he is not willing to take my word——

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I will take the gentleman's word for anything he states is a fact.

Mr. PAYNE. I tell him that jute and jute butts are on the free list without any reservation whatever. I want to say the Senate put a duty on jute and jute butts, I think 2 cents a pound or some large figure, and did put cotton bagging on the free list. Why, I do not know.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. May I say, in answering the gentleman's suggestion as to why, I understand it was put on the free list with the understanding that it was to go off in conference, and it was simply accepted by the Senator from Rhode Island in order not to have any discussion on the subject. It was not intended to be left there.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman, although it occurred in the conference committee, the Senate conferees stood out for free cotton bagging, and the House conferees still more stoutly for a duty on it.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. And you got the duty. Will the gentleman yield to me just to say a word? I recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has undertaken to carry out the view of the House, and I commend him for it, if that commendation is worth anything to him, or if he appreciates it; but I think it is time for the House to stand by the conferees and have something to say in the making of a great revenue bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that these conferees did stand up.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I do not agree with the gentleman on the bagging situation.

Mr. PAYNE. And now I hope the House will stand up for the conferees. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am willing that the gentleman from Georgia should be included in that enumeration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Senate put on a tax on corporations of 2 per cent on the net earnings. It is not for me here to give a history of that legislation in the Senate or why it was brought about, but it was brought about as an amendment to an income tax. I have no use for an income tax, and what use I have for a corporation tax is the fact that you can sometimes get rid of an unconstitutional income tax appended to a bill. It came before the conference committee. It came to the Republican side of that committee as an administration measure proposed by the President of the United States, and we accepted it. We did reduce the tax from 2 to 1 per cent, made some minor amendments, and reported it with confidence to the House. We may have preferred our inheritance tax to that proposition, but under the circumstances we were more than justified in accepting this provision in the bill, which I hope in its workings will yet prove popular to the people of the United States.

Mr. ESCH. As the corporation tax went to the Senate it excluded holding companies, as I understand it?

Mr. PAYNE. It certainly does.

Mr. ESCH. What is the reason for the exclusion?

Mr. PAYNE. There is no reason in the world why a corporation that owns stock in another company should pay a double tax upon those holdings. It is not equitable, it is not right, and it ought not to be exacted. [Applause.] I am in favor of putting every corporation in the United States on an equitable plane in the way of taxation.

I do not believe in making any discrimination between corporations in that respect. When it comes to the breaking up or absorption of a company in order to get rid of competition by another company, I will go the full length in preventing it; but I am not in favor of using the taxing power for that purpose, and, of course, a tax of 1 per cent would not accomplish any purpose in that respect. It would be an additional burden upon the innocent stockholder who had stock in either corporation.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the report of the conferees in reference to life insurance companies? Are they subject to the same taxation as other corporations, or is there any provision in reference to them?

Mr. PAYNE. There is a very carefully drawn provision in regard to them—and so technical that I need not state it to the gentleman—giving them the exemption which they, in equity, ought to have relative to the surplus which goes to the policy holders. A good deal of time was put upon that, and it was finally drafted by the Attorney-General, after consultation with other lawyers of high repute, and I think was accepted by the officials of the insurance companies as being fair and equitable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At that point, before the gentleman proceeds further, may I ask what the provision is in reference to beneficial associations that are largely carried on, but not for profit? I have had several letters from constituents asking about them.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the bill exempted everything that ought to be exempted in the way of fraternal associations, building and loan associations, and associations of that character.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that in the Senate bill the net earnings of banks are decreased by the interest they pay on their deposits, up to an amount equal to their capital stock, and they are taxed only on the remainder. Was that item changed in the conference report?

Mr. PAYNE. There is no change in the conference report; all the interest they pay on their deposit is exempt.

Mr. HINSHAW. I will ask the gentleman whether that would extend to an amount only equal to the capital stock?

Mr. PAYNE. It has no relation to the capital stock; but, however, it comes out of the amount of income as a part of actual expenses. It is unlimited as to that amount, as the clerk informs me, and he no doubt is right about that.

Now, we obtained from the Senate our amendment upon the subject of administration.

Mr. HILL. I have just examined the provisions as to banks, and it exempts all interest paid on deposits, their capital, and on paper.

Mr. PAYNE. The administrative amendments were explained to the House at the time the House passed them, and it is useless to spend any time on that now. The House has obtained its section 11, in reference to valuation, in its integrity. I have no doubt that under it we will have a much more honest administration of the customs laws upon dutiable goods that are on an ad valorem basis than we have ever had before, and it will save millions of dollars to the revenue.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. If the gentleman is now through with the discussion of schedules, I would like to ask him a question. I wish to know his views on the woolen schedule, as I have received more complaints on that than any other part of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Of what nature?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. About the woolen schedule, I wish to know whether or not, in the gentleman's judgment, an ad valorem duty on imported wool would not be fairer and more equitable as between the interests of the worsted and woolen manufacturer than the present specific duties?

Mr. PAYNE. I will say to my colleague that if I had my own way and had omnipotent power to make a new woolen schedule, I think I could make it fairer, juster, and more equitable in protecting the woolgrower and the manufacturer of wool. The report of the Committee on Ways and Means was in favor of retaining the present schedule, with some reduction on tops and on woolen cloths with a cotton warp, and then on some wastes and other materials of that nature. We obtained a reduction on tops and a reduction on cloths with cotton fiber, and a reduction on yarns, but were not able to obtain any of the other reductions. We did the best we could with the bill as it went from the House to the Senate, and so that was the result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Pending that, the real understanding was that the gentleman from New York was to control one-half of the time and I was to control the other.

Mr. PAYNE. I will not make any objection to that proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and the other half by himself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to get a half hour's time from some one; I prefer to have it from this side of the House, but I want to speak in opposition to the adoption of the report.

Mr. PAYNE. Perhaps the gentleman can take half of it from each side of the House. I am in favor of the gentleman having his time, and I want him to use it at the earliest opportunity, so that some one may have a chance to reply to him. So far as I am concerned, I will see that he is taken care of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself a little more time under the circumstances. [Laughter.]

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I was going to ask the gentleman if he had the power to revise the wool schedule, would he put the duties on wool on an ad valorem rather than a specific basis?

Mr. PAYNE. No; I would not.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Would not that be the fairer as between the worsted interests, the woolgrowers, and the manufacturers of woolen goods?

Mr. PAYNE. I could propose something that would be fairer.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Was this specific duty adopted by a combination of the worsted-goods manufacturers and the woolgrowers of the West, and did those interests control the committee?

Mr. PAYNE. No such combination controlled me, and I am not able to say that it controlled any of the members of the Ways and Means Committee; but beyond that, Mr. Speaker, the conference committee had no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Was not this schedule really fixed by a combination of the worsted interests and the woolgrowers of the West against the interest of the woolen-goods manufacturers?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman is aware that this schedule has been in force for twenty years.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I know that it has been wrong for a long time.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. In view of the duties that exist in Canada, the discriminating duties—I want to say I am not clear about it, and I am asking clearly for information, and hope the gentleman will explain—will not this lumber schedule virtually be nullified?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; I think it is very carefully provided against.

Mr. GARRETT. As I understand it, Canada has such discriminating duties or bonuses as will place Canada within the provisions of the maximum clause of this tariff bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I will speak about that later if I do not forget it, when I get to the maximum and minimum tariff, and will discuss it then if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. May I ask the gentleman a question with reference to the oil schedule? Is it a fact or not that petroleum and its products are put upon the free list?

Mr. PAYNE. Petroleum, crude and refined, including kerosene, benzine, naphtha, and gasoline and similar products, are put on the free list. The products that are made for medicinal purposes will bear a duty of 25 per cent, and ought to.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. There has been a change, then, from the House provision.

Mr. PAYNE. There has, certainly, in that respect.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. In that connection, does not the 25 per cent duty include asphaltum?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, no. Asphaltum is separately dutiable by name.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. In connection with the reduction of the duty on print paper from $6 in the present law to $3.75, I have been informed that on account of certain provisions relating to this duty a tariff may be exacted amounting perhaps to $15 or $16 a ton.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that the provisions as adopted were drawn by my friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. SCOTT. I desire to know if they are the same provisions that appeared here in the House bill.

Mr. PAYNE. They are somewhat modified from those, but similar, and, as I say, drawn by the chairman of that committee, in order to strengthen our position.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the modifications which have been made warrant the construction that has been put upon them?

Mr. PAYNE. I think not.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better wait until he hears from me on that point.

Mr. SCOTT. I desire very much to hear from the chairman of that committee, because I know I shall get information from him.

Mr. PAYNE. I give my judgment on it for what it is worth.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate added to the administrative law a provision for a customs court. This provision has been in contemplation by the Committee on Ways and Means for some time. In the last Congress the subject was before us, because of the ridiculous lack of uniformity in the decisions of the courts as to the meaning of the tariff law. We find decisions running every way; and decisions which no lawyer can understand the reason for have been made by judges called in often in one case. Great confusion has arisen and great loss of revenue to the Government because of these conflicting decisions.

This bill contains an amendment, put in by the Senate, providing for a customs court to consist of five judges, who are to have jurisdiction of every appeal from the general appraisers, and not only jurisdiction, but final jurisdiction, so that their decisions are not reviewable anywhere. Now, this is in accordance with the tax laws of the States. There is no appeal from the decisions of assessors. There may be a proceeding where there is fraud or mistake, as there might be in this case, but their decisions as to classification and as to values are final. And in order to produce uniformity of decisions, although three judges may constitute the court, it is provided that at least three judges shall concur in a decision before the jurisdiction of the court becomes binding. So that we shall have absolute uniformity in the decisions.

Another great difficulty in the administration of the customs laws is that the counsel who appear before the general appraisers to try a case there can go no further with it. It is then taken up by the district attorney's office, with a new set of attorneys, not familiar with the case, in the first instance, and with the evidence, and with the witnesses; and the cases are not always tried at their best on the appeal from the customs court to the circuit court of appeals or to the circuit court. This provides for a set of attorneys in lieu of those who now appear before the general appraisers, to have charge of the cases there and charge of the cases on appeal to their final determination, and we think that is a great improvement.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me for a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Has not the custom of carrying cases to the circuit court worked well up to the present time?

Mr. PAYNE. It has not worked well, but most disastrously.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How does the gentleman from New York determine that fact?

Mr. PAYNE. By a pretty exhaustive examination of the decisions of the courts which I find in the reports and in the digest which have been published, many of which are quoted in our Notes and Comments, which we have published for the use of the House.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The decisions of the courts in other classes of cases are conflicting. My colleague will recognize the fact that in almost every other class of cases he will find conflicting decisions.

Mr. PAYNE. The circuit courts seem to regard these cases as a side issue, to be taken up when they have nothing else to do, and at their own convenience. They do not seem to have given them the consideration which their importance demands. We propose a district court that will have nothing else to do but to give its entire time to these questions, and we propose a salary of $10,000 a year, so that the President can select them from those standing highest in their profession, great lawyers, who by the dignity of the position and the salary that is attached to it and the location of the court in the city of Washington will be induced to take these places, that they may become trained experts in tariff law, and so that we may have uniformity of decisions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How many of these judges are there?

Mr. PAYNE. Five.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And what is the salary?

Mr. PAYNE. Ten thousand dollars each, amounting to $50,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That would probably entail a cost of $150,000 a year for the maintenance of the court?

Mr. PAYNE. For the court and attorneys and so forth, I should say $100,000, and I do not know but that it would be $150,000. I do not care; I believe it will save the country many millions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does an appeal lie from the board of appraisers directly to this court?

Mr. PAYNE. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It cuts out appeals from the board of appraisers to any other court?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does an appeal lie from this proposed court to the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. PAYNE. It does not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This is to be the final upshot of the whole thing?

Mr. PAYNE. That is it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman says it cuts off the right of appeal from this court?

Mr. PAYNE. I so stated.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Does not the gentleman from New York think there are a great many cases that ought to reach the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman from New York allow me a question?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand the conference report leaves the board of appraisers in existence and creates this other court?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; the board of appraisers will have all the business that they have now.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand; but this is my question: This new court shall consist of five judges, one assistant attorney-general with a salary of $7,500, one deputy, and four other assistants, and then marshals, clerks, and so forth. What expense will that court be to the Government?

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman had listened to what the gentleman from Missouri stated, he would not have had to ask this question. I can not take up all my time in answering these questions. I said it might cost $100,000.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. All the officials.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman from New York yield to me?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does not the real necessity for this court arise from the fact that it is very difficult to interpret the specific duties, and if we had ad valorem duties instead of specific duties the necessity for the court would not exist?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that the question of value does not go beyond the General Board of Appraisers. Their determination is final on the question of value.

Mr. STANLEY. That is not the question.

Mr. PAYNE. I would say to the gentleman that whether it would require more work or less if it was all specific duties or all ad valorem I do not know, but I can tell him this, that whether it would do away with the great machinery of the Government or not, I would be in favor still of specific duties, wherever they can be applied, rather than ad valorem duties. It takes away the chances of fraud in valuation, makes more certain the collection of duties everywhere, and I should favor specific duties wherever they can be applied.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it not a fact that the great majority of cases which have gone up and in which decisions are complained of are interpretations of these complicated ad valorem schedules?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I don't know whether it is or not.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, there is no appeal now from the circuit courts in customs cases to the United States Supreme Court, as there will be none under the new court?

Mr. PAYNE. There is not, unless the Supreme Court certioraries it, and then they go up like other appeals.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York. And in the case of the customs court to be established, the writ of certiorari would lie so that the Supreme Court might get the cases before it.

Mr. PAYNE. It would not. Now, Mr. Speaker, the House had one plan of a maximum tariff and the Senate had a plan of a general and minimum tariff. The Senate provision was based upon the provision in the McKinley bill and in the Dingley bill, similar in their character, with more machinery to it and involving the whole law. The Committee on Ways and Means examined the subject, and there was presented to that committee by one of its members a provision drawn after the McKinley bill at the first meetings of the committee, but the committee accepted rather the proposition which was contained in the House bill. There is not a great deal of difference in them in principle, although the process is somewhat reversed, but the object is to obtain fair trade relations by imposing a greater duty where we do not get fair trade relations, and bringing things in at a minimum duty where we do get them. That is the whole scheme of the bill. It is necessary in these days of maximum and minimum tariffs; it is necessary when one great country especially mentions the United States in her tariff law and says that certain concessions shall never be allowed to the United States; and it is time we were in the field, showing to these countries what we ought to have in this respect.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is not the essential difference that the Senate provision adopted by the conference committee gives more discretion to the President to determine whether or not this country is being discriminated against?

Mr. PAYNE. I will not say a broader discretion, but a broader judgment as to the facts. He has to determine the facts, and on his proclaiming those facts then the maximum or the minimum, as the case may be, goes into effect.

Mr. MANN. Under the conference report, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman what is the general tariff? I believe we have a definition of the maximum and of the minimum. What is the general tariff?

Mr. PAYNE. There is no general tariff provided for.

Mr. MANN. I find this in the conference report, on page 430:

> Whenever the President shall be satisfied that the conditions which led to the issuance of the proclamation hereinbefore authorized no longer exist, he shall issue a proclamation to this effect, and ninety days thereafter the provisions of the general tariff shall be applied to the importation of articles from such countries. Whenever the provisions of the general tariff of the United States shall be applicable to articles imported from any foreign country, they shall be—

And so forth.

It will be noted that the conference report speaks there of a "general" tariff.

Mr. PAYNE. I will say, what must be obvious to the gentleman, that that is a mistake.

Mr. MANN. I thought myself that that was possibly the fact, and therefore called attention to it so that it might be corrected when the bill was enrolled.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Can not a correction be made in the bill at this time?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, it will have to have a joint resolution passed by the two Houses, but I have no doubt that that resolution would go through after the bill has been passed.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. The gentleman expects to do that?

Mr. PAYNE. I shall endeavor to do it, certainly. It is the first time that my attention has been called to it.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. I have found some other mistakes in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. This bill was carefully gone through by the clerks and all of the conferees except myself, and they went over it very carefully, and still errors may have crept in, and that appears to be one.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will state that this language was used in the statement of the conferees:

> The Senate provision for a maximum tariff and provisions for its enforcement is adopted, with some modifications. The "general tariff" is changed to the "maximum tariff."

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I do not know whether that would not cover it and justify the change in the bill. Is that the statement of the House managers?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. That would not cover it, then.

Mr. MANN. That is correct. The general tariff is made the maximum tariff. We can strike out the word "general" and insert the word "maximum."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Before the gentleman takes up the next subject, will he please explain why the duty was increased on shingles from 30 to 50 cents a thousand? I did not know whether the gentleman intended to take up the wood schedule at all.

Mr. PAYNE. I did, and I do not know how I came to omit it. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to it, because the wood schedule was a bit strenuous in conference. The Ways and Means Committee and the House put in the bill a dollar on rough lumber, sawed boards, and so forth, and kept the House differentials on planed and finished lumber. The Senate increased the duty to $1.50 on rough lumber and cut down the duty on finished lumber and put up a higher duty on shingles and laths. I will not spend the time of the House in saying how much discussion this particular matter took, but finally we got to a point where the Senate was willing to concede $1.25 for rough lumber and their rates on finished lumber, including laths and shingles, which resulted as follows: If planed or finished on one side, from $2.50 per thousand to $1.75 per thousand; if planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved or planed and finished on two sides, reduced from $3 per thousand to $2 per thousand; if planed or finished on three sides, from $3.50 to $2.37½ per thousand; if planed or finished on four sides, from $4 to $2.75 per thousand. Paving posts, railroad ties, telephone poles, and so forth, from 20 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem; fence posts, from 10 per cent ad valorem to the free list; and shingles were increased from 30 to 50 cents. This 20 cents a thousand on shingles seemed likely to dissolve the council of the Nation in regard to the tariff. It was most strenuously insisted upon. Any of you gentlemen who have been on committees of conference know how those things are. Senator So-and-so wants something and must have something. Finally, I told them I was willing in this great trade on the lumber schedule, involving millions of dollars, to throw in a jackknife like shingles and give them the rate at 50 cents, and that was adopted, and that is the way it came about. They claimed it was absolutely essential to the business. I never could see it in that light, but was in favor of the rate in the Dingley bill and——

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman permit a question? I think there is a misunderstanding among some of the Members of the House about the duty on bituminous coal. It is 45 cents a ton. Some of the newspapers seem to have given the impression it was a short ton, but I understand the conferees' report is based on a long ton. Is that correct?

Mr. PAYNE. On the long ton, yes; 28 bushels of 80 pounds to the bushel. Now, in regard to the drawback amendment. The House had to yield upon that, but we obtained an amendment giving the drawback law in the Dingley law, and also a drawback internal-revenue tax placed upon alcohol which is manufactured and sold abroad, and also a drawback upon articles to be used in shipbuilding when they go into ships in the foreign trade so as to enable our shipyards to import their material for shipbuilding and, I hope, greatly encourage them so that they will be enabled to keep the breath of life in them a little longer until some day Congress will wake up

and give us a decent shipping measure that will revive the American merchant marine. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken up more time than I intended to do——

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me again——

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Upon the lumber proposition that I submitted to the gentleman a few minutes ago?

Mr. PAYNE. I have forgotten what it was.

Mr. GARRETT. If I may predicate the question with a brief statement, as I understand, the only competition we have in lumber is with Canada.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, practically, if we have any.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, Canada has such discriminating duties and bonuses as will make the maximum provision of this bill apply to Canada?

Mr. PAYNE. It might be. It is possible.

Mr. GARRETT. And if it does, then the duty on the cheapest grade of lumber will be $3.75, will it not?

Mr. PAYNE. It might be that France and Germany would put this under our maximum tariff.

Mr. GARRETT. I was not speaking of France or Germany. I was speaking of Canada.

Mr. PAYNE. I know, and it might be that Canada would. But I want to say to the gentleman that under this maximum and minimum provision the power given to the President to investigate and find out what the countries are doing, with the influence the Executive can wield with Great Britain, of which Canada is only a colony, I think the danger is greatly lessened of their putting any export duty or any contract that will destroy the lumber business coming into the United States.

Mr. GARRETT. Under existing conditions, however, my statement is correct, is it not?

Mr. PAYNE. No; I think not. There is nothing in the bill that applies to those contracts for stumpage that are made in Canada that would prevent our getting lumber in here at reduced rates, in my judgment.

Mr. GARRETT. But, Mr. Speaker, has not Canada now discriminating duties and bonuses that would bring her under the provisions of the maximum rate?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think so. I have answered the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is it not true that, pending an investigation by the Executive as to the discrimination by a foreign country against America, after the 31st of March, 1910, the maximum schedule is in effect until the President declares otherwise?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. So that you have made all the inertia of the Government in favor of the maximum instead of the minimum tariff?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman can use his own interpretation. It is plain English, and he can not fool anybody about it, either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word about the effect of this bill. We have put upon wines and liquors additional rates that will bring in an increased revenue of over $4,000,000 annually. Some of the schedules will bring in a little more money than on the importations of 1907 and some of them less; but taking all the schedules into consideration, on the goods brought in in 1907, and the net result is an increase of revenue from customs of $3,673,926.45; so that, while the wine schedule brings in an additional revenue of $4,000,000, the reductions are so great in the other schedules that the balance makes a reduction even on this luxury; and the total increase in revenue on the various items of the bill is only this sum of $3,673,000, so that the increase in the bill on the imported articles is generally on the luxuries that are coming into the United States. The gentleman may stand upon the stump and shout that we are not reducing duties on this and that, that we have added to that, and so forth, but when they get the final report on the effect of this bill it will be a complete answer to all demagogism of that kind, and the country will see that our increases of duty are almost a third of a million dollars less than the increase on the liquor coming into the United States.

Gentlemen talk about equivalent ad valorem. The equivalent ad valorem for 1907 under the Dingley law was 42.55 per cent. Upon the same articles coming into the United States under this conference report the equivalent ad valorem will be 41.58 per cent, a decrease of equivalent ad valorem of 1 per cent, even taking that basis of calculation. But, gentlemen, I submit that a fair basis was one suggested by a gentleman upon the other side, if I mistake not, based upon the consumption of the articles in the United States. They have been declaiming that the duty added to the price. Take them on their own ground, and see what the result is under this bill reported by the conference committee. The result is as follows:

Schedule.	Article.	Import value.	Production value.	Export value.	Consumption value.	
					Duties decreased.	Duties increased.
A	Chemicals, oils, and paints	$3,293,537	$448,773,457	$7,861,340	$433,099,846	[a]$11,105,820
B	Earths, earthenware, and glassware	4,708,158	125,836,505	2,186,319	128,423,732	
C	Metals, and manufactures of	30,093,646	1,277,989,356	48,450,578	1,221,956,620	37,675,804
D	Wood, and manufactures of	19,666,983	622,729,556	44,245,217	566,870,950	31,280,372
E	Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	116,060	301,679,243	829,350	300,965,953	
F	Tobacco, and manufactures of (no change of rates).					
G	Agricultural products and provisions	794,340	629,807,503	142,791,163	483,430,637	4,380,043
H	Spirits, wines, and other beverages	21,080,205	444,236,228	3,314,578		[a]462,001,856
I	Cotton manufactures	7,035,395	34,586,629			41,622,024
J	Flax, hemp, and jute, and manufactures of	2,388,074	20,543,516		22,127,145	804,445
K	Wool and manufactures of wool. (No production statistics available for articles affected by changes of rates.)					
L	Silks and silk goods	20,713,081	93,977,133		7,947,568	[a]106,742,646
M	Pulp, papers, and books	6,032,683	146,596,119	3,514,281	67,628,055	81,486,466
N	Sundries	35,810,954	1,884,060,091	98,786,378	1,719,428,069	101,656,598
	Total	151,733,116	6,030,815,337	351,979,204	5,004,365,673	878,756,074

[a] Luxuries, articles of voluntary use.

The following table shows the consumption value of articles on which rates of duty have been increased and decreased in all cases where the amount of production can be ascertained:

Schedule—	Duty decreased.	Duty increased.
A. Chemicals, oils, paints	$433,099,846	$11,105,820
B. Earths and earthenware	128,423,732	
C. Metals, and manufactures of	1,248,200,169	11,432,255
D. Lumber	566,870,950	31,280,372
E. Sugar	300,965,953	
F. Tobacco. No change.		
G. Agricultural products	483,430,637	4,380,043
H. Wines and liquors		462,001,856
I. Cotton		41,622,024
J. Flax, hemp, jute	22,127,145	804,445
K. Wool. No statistics; no change.		
L. Silk	7,947,566	106,742,646
M. Paper and pulp	67,628,055	81,486,466
N. Sundries	1,719,428,069	101,656,598
Total	4,978,122,124	852,512,525

Of the increases mentioned the following are luxuries, being articles strictly of voluntary use:

Schedule A, chemicals, including perfumeries, pomades, and like articles	$11,105,820
Schedule H, wines and liquors	462,001,856
Schedule L, silks	106,742,646
Total	579,850,322

This leaves a balance of increases which are not on articles of luxury of $272,662,203, as against decreases on over six billion dollars of consumption.

[Loud applause.]

I am thankful that this statement has gone all over the United States, and I tell you it will take pretty tall lying and it will have to travel fast to get ahead of the truth in this matter. [Laughter.]

We have revised the tariff and have taken off unnecessary duties, not all along the line, but in our revision of the tariff we have revised the tariff downward, and yet we have held the scales so evenly that we have done no injury to any workman in the United States, to any workshop in the United States,

to any farm or any factory, to any mine or any citizen of the United States.

A word more as to the revenue. These rates increase the revenue from customs less than $4,000,000. The corporation tax is estimated to produce $26,000,000; tobacco, nine and one-third million dollars—about $40,000,000 of increase of revenue—revenue enough, when this bill gets into full working order to supply the necessary demands of the Government; not to build the Panama Canal. We will leave that to another generation. We have provided for bonds that will establish the policy of this Government in that respect. This will meet the ordinary expenditures—and in a few years I think that some of these internal-revenue taxes may be taken off, and I will unite with the gentlemen who desire to do that if I happen to be here in the House. Then we can get along with our revenues from customs and the ordinary internal revenues, keeping our expenditures within our means. The Dingley law during all its period of existence has provided ample revenue, and there is no doubt this law will do the same for another twelve years. Let us pass it, gentlemen on this side of the House. The duty is ours; the time has arrived. Vote against it if you want to drive your party into chaos; vote against it if you want eternal agitation about the tariff. Go on and vote against it if you choose, but do not do that on the idea that you are going back to the Dingley bill or the Dingley rates.

That is a delusion; you will not get it, but you will get agitation instead. There would come in another bill one of these days, and in the meantime the wheels of industry will stop, enterprise will be paralyzed; the country will stand still or will move backward, and you will curse the day when you failed to go with the great majority of your party, almost all of them, your President having lent his approval to this bill, if you fail to stand in the hour of the country's need and of your party's need and vote against this bill. Let us pass it when the hour of 8 o'clock arrives, and give courage and joy and happiness to the people of the United States. Let us start the remaining idle wheels of industry; let us put every man who wants to work at work; let us build up the happy homes in the United States as they will be, and they will bring the great pæans of their applause for your patriotism and statesmanship in meeting this emergency. [Loud and long-continued applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose and was recognized. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report has been heralded and headlined in the newspapers as a tremendous victory for President Taft over the forces of evil in the Republican party, represented by Senator ALDRICH and other distinguished Republican statesmen. We are told that congratulations are pouring in upon him from every side. This reminds me of an old oriental tale: A pious Brahmin made a vow that he would sacrifice a fine sheep to his gods. Three rogues in the community heard of that vow, and they concluded to work a profitable game on the Brahmin. So the next morning when he started out to find his sheep, one of them met him with a blind, mangy dog, and said to the Brahmin, "I understand that you want to buy a sheep." He said, "Yes." "Well, I have a fine one here to sell." The Brahmin said, "That is a blind dog. I don't want it."

While they were talking one of the accomplices came up and addressed the first, and said that he would like to buy that fine sheep which he had. The Brahmin thought they were both trying to swindle him, and said he could not understand why they contended it was a sheep; that it was a dog. Then one of the accomplices agreed to leave the decision of the question whether it was a dog or a sheep to the first man they met. The Brahmin consented to that proposition, which seemed fair. So they ambled down the road and met the third accomplice, and left it to him, and he declared it was a sheep.

The Brahmin bought it, paid a good price for it, and sacrificed it to his gods. That made his gods so mad that they destroyed him utterly. [Prolonged applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] It seems to me that President Taft has been treated, in the matter of this conference report, precisely as that Brahmin was treated in the sheep and dog transaction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I hope that his fate will be a happier one than that of the Brahmin.

It is related that Louis XIV acquired a magnificent reputation as a conqueror in this simple way: He waited until his generals had a fortress ready to surrender. Then they notified the great King, and he appeared upon the scene, in all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war, with everybody shouting and the bands playing Lo! The Conquering Hero Comes. They summoned the fortress to surrender, and it surrendered, and Louis the Grand walked away with the credit for the achievement. That is precisely the kind of a conquering hero President Taft is in this performance. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A man must have a very curiously constituted mind to conclude that the result of this conference is in any reasonable sense a redemption of Republican pledges before the last election to revise the Dingley rates down. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to do President Taft justice. I am his personal friend, and have been since I first set eyes upon him. His laudable desire for the square deal and his love of fame would naturally and inevitably cause him to wish that his pledges be redeemed in such a way that he could look the American people proudly in the face; but he has been grossly misled as to the nature of this report. Those downward revisionists who are congratulating the President uproariously are most assuredly thankful for small favors. No man will begrudge him any glory justly his due; but when we reflect upon the fact that, even according to his most enthusiastic eulogists, he insisted on lowering the rates on only half a dozen items, or thereabouts, when the rates should have been lowered on hundreds of items, and that the conference report still reeks with largesse for the few and extortion of the many, his glory will experience a greater diminution than have the rates of the Dingley law. That he has been deceived as to this conference report being a downward revision in any reasonable sense of the term can, I think, be mathematically demonstrated.

That he was the potent factor in reducing the rates on a few articles there is abundant evidence, which leads to the conclusion that if in a week he could perform that service to the people, had he begun sooner he could have accomplished far more. All the world knows that it is much easier to influence a man's opinion upon any subject before he has publicly asserted it than after, for ordinary human pride makes it difficult for any man to retreat from a position once taken in the open. So in this case, by delaying too long to exercise his influence, the President wrought a small measure of reform by great exertion when he might have accomplished more had he taken time by the forelock.

I have no doubt that experts and near experts have led him to believe that this is a fulfillment of his anteelection promise. Why, they can juggle with figures and bring any result out of them that they please. I can set two men to work on these rates to-day, with instructions to one of them to figure them below the Dingley rate, and with instructions to the other to figure them above the Dingley rate, and each one of them will bring in his conclusions, and one of them can give just about as good reasons as the other. They say that figures will not lie, but, as sure as you live, liars figure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They figure more on a tariff bill than anything else that I know of. Now let us see for a moment just what President Taft accomplished—that is, taking the newspaper reports as true. Of course, I am not in his confidence about this bill. I have not even been permitted to peruse a letter which is in the pocket of somebody around this Capitol, and which is liable to become hereafter as famous as the "Dear Catchings" letter, written in 1894. But, according to the White House statement, my recollection is that he accomplished a reduction on lumber, a reduction on iron ore, a reduction on boots and shoes, and a reduction on gloves, and it is claimed that he procured a reduction on oil.

I deny that last claim. I will tell you why, and I can prove it by every man here. There was such a pronounced vote in this House in favor of free petroleum that no man who had any sense believed that the House could be induced to recede from the position then taken, and there is no justice in giving anybody any credit for free oil except those of us who forced free oil in this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They hung up over there for two or three days as to whether they would place 25 cents or 15 cents tariff tax per ton on iron ore. Now, iron ore under the Dingley bill is 40 cents a ton; the House put it on the free list; the Senate put it at 25 cents; the conferees report it at 15 cents, and that is hailed as a great victory for tariff reform. They juggled for three or four days whether they would have 25 or 15 cents on iron ore. At the same time they left on blankets over 9 feet long, that cost 40 cents a pound and not more than 50 cents a pound, a tax which at the tariff rate in 1905 amounted to 182½ per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What do you think of that? That is a fair sample of it. I do not know what effect 15 cents a ton on iron ore will have. I was willing to put it on the free list to see if it would not put down the price of steel and iron products. My own private opinion is that it

will not make any difference whatever, except to give the American steel trust a little advantage—that is, 15 cents a ton—over the mills on the Atlantic seaboard.

A famous victory has been won for tariff revision downward, so we are told, and yet all the monstrosities and outrages of the woolen-goods schedule remain in the bill and will cause thousands and tens of thousands of people to sicken and die by reason of insufficient clothing. I humbly thank Almighty God that the sin of that sickness and of those deaths will not rest upon our heads.

A famous victory, indeed, when the farmers of the land will still be fleeced unmercifully on every implement they use for the benefit of a lot of trusts already swollen almost to bursting. A famous victory! When the robber rates on cotton goods have been actually increased 10⅝ per cent.

A famous victory for downward revision, when the rates on print paper have been largely increased! How will the printers, editors, and publishers of the land enjoy that item?

A famous victory, indeed! When the men, women, and children of the country have to pay an increased price for hosiery.

A famous victory for downward revision when it came to pass in the Senate that if the rates could only be held down to the Dingley rates they were considered low, though the enormities of the Dingley bill were what caused the crusade for revision downward. Was there ever such a humbug in the wide, wide world as to call this conference report such a revision downward as the people demanded?

I could go through and name 100 similar instances, but these will suffice.

I undertake to say, gentlemen, with all due respect to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that this "statement" which he fathers—because I do not believe he ever wrote a word of it, and that is no reflection on him whatever; he has had an army of experts to help him, and he ought to have them—but I undertake to say that this statement issued by the chairman under his name is the most deceptive thing that has been put into print since Gutenberg invented movable type. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I went home last night and my wife said, "Why, that bill of Mr. PAYNE'S saves the American people $4,978,122,124 a year." She is an intelligent woman. If she could be deceived that way about that misstatement, it will deceive a whole lot of people in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is exactly what it is intended for; and that is precisely what I object to. It is calculated to rope in the public.

I will tell you the truth about this matter. When I got hold of the statement, the first thing I read was the figures on page 1, and I came to the conclusion that this statement was calculated to make people believe that this Payne-Aldrich-Smoot tariff bill saved the people $4.978,122.124 per annum. It made my eyes pop open like morning-glories. [Laughter.] It surprised me so I turned over to the imports into the United States, based on the figures of 1905, and I found that while it looked like the chairman's statement was saving four billions and some odd millions, the total imports into the United States from every source in 1905, the year on which the table is based, were only $1,087,118,133.13. Then I went back and read this modest little sentence:

The following table shows the consumption value of articles on which rates of duty have been increased and decreased in all cases where the amount of production can be ascertained.

Lots of people who read the figures in the table will never read that sentence.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. DALZELL. The figures that the gentleman refers to do not relate to import duties, but to consumption.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was just going to state that. Then I got to puzzling my head as to whether he meant imports only, and at last I figured it out that that table was meant to talk about the amount of things consumed in the United States. Mr. Chairman PAYNE'S statement serves one useful purpose at least; it proves that the consumers have to pay to the domestic manufacturers of any given article the same amount of taxes that they have to pay to the United States Government on the same article if imported. Democrats have always claimed that that was the case; but Republicans have always denied it. Now Mr. Chairman PAYNE practically admits it in his statement.

Now, let us see what the facts are. I am going to read his table and then going to read one that tells the truth. Here is the table from Mr. Chairman PAYNE'S statement:

Schedule—	Duty decreased.	Duty increased.
A. Chemicals, oils, paints	$433,099,846	$11,105,820
B. Earths and earthenware	128,423,732	
C. Metals, and manufactures of	1,248,200,169	11,432,255
D. Lumber	566,870,950	31,280,372
E. Sugar	300,965,953	
F. Tobacco. No change.		
G. Agricultural products	483,430,637	4,380,043
H. Wines and liquors		462,001,856
I. Cotton		41,622,024
J. Flax, hemp, jute	22,127,145	804,445
K. Wool. No statistics; no change.		
L. Silk	7,947,566	106,742,646
M. Paper and pulp	67,628,055	81,486,466
N. Sundries	1,719,428,069	101,656,598
Total	4,978,122,124	852,512,525

I will now read you a table that is the exact truth about this bill.

The first column contains the Dingley revenue for 1907, by schedules, and the second is estimated by applying the rates of the conference bill to the imports of that year. The duties of the conference bill will be largely increased by the changed classifications of the cotton and silk schedules and the many new items of taxation introduced.

Estimated revenues of conference tariff bill upon the Payne-Aldrich bill.

[Increase (+). Decrease (—).]

Schedule—	Dingley duties.	Conference duties.	Percentage of the latter on the former.
A. Chemicals, etc.	$11,186,860	$11,816,214	+ 5.63
B. Earthenware, etc.	15,349,939	15,290,932	— .32
C. Metals, etc.	21,811,184	20,370,396	— 6.65
D. Wood, etc.	3,705,022	3,128,558	—15.53
E. Sugar, etc.	60,338,523	60,335,866	— .004
F. Tobacco, etc.	26,125,037	26,125,037	No change.
G. Agricultural products	19,181,888	20,454,646	+ 6.63
H. Spirits, etc.	16,318,220	20,705,369	+26.88
I. Cotton, etc.	14,291,026	15,835,112	+10.80
J. Flax, etc.	49,900,580	49,776,276	— .24
K. Wool, etc.	36,554,816	36,426,214	— .35
L. Silk, etc.	20,313,706	23,458,747	+15.48
M. Pulp, paper, etc.	4,136,629	4,550,492	+10.02
N. Sundries	29,896,500	26,484,490	—11.41
Total	329,109,342	334,758,344	

Increase over Dingley duties, $5,649,002, or 1.71 per cent increase.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What does the gentleman mean by "duties?" Does he mean duties actually collected?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How can he estimate what the duties actually collected are under a bill that is not yet in force?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, I do it very easily. Base it on the same importations of 1907. Now, for some reason that I never understood exactly, you Republican gentlemen on the Ways and Means Committee always took 1905 as the normal year and based all of your arithmetic upon that. As a matter of fact, the importations in 1907, notwithstanding the Republican panic in the latter end of that year, were greater than they were in 1905; so in all of my calculations, or any that I have authorized, I assume 1907 as a basis.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman assumes, then, that the imports will be the same?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly; of course. You can not assume anything else for the purpose of arithmetic. As a matter of fact, they may turn out to be larger or smaller, but for purposes of estimating probable revenues we must assume them to be the same.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow, I will state that when the chairman of the committee of which my friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is a member reported this bill to the House he calculated the amount of revenue and the amount of tax, and he did it on exactly the same basis that the gentleman from Missouri has based his figures.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true, and that is the only way you can proceed. Of course everybody wishes that the imports will be greater—that is, such people as I—and that they will get more revenues in that way.

Here is the sum total: Under the Dingley bill, $329,109,342 and under this bill $334,758,344, an increase over the Dingley bill of $5,649,002, or an increase of 1.71 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. OLMSTED. The gentleman from Missouri said a little while ago that he could take two experts, and one would figure that the conference report made a great increase over the Ding-

ley rate, and the other would figure that it made a great decrease. I would like to ask the gentleman which of these experts made the figures that he has been giving out?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Neither one nor the other.

Mr. OLMSTED. Was it any expert at all, then?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and he was directed to ascertain the truth, no matter whom it hurt. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Yet it is a little singular that where the conferees' report reduces the rate below the rate of the Dingley bill the expert figures out an increase.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will show you all about that before very long.

Mr. CULLOP. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. CULLOP. In your estimate do you include the 25 per cent ad valorem provided for in section 2 of this bill, the real tariff in it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not do that; I will do that now. But, Mr. Speaker, before I do that I want to make one other remark. These estimates that are made which I have just read did not take into consideration a whole lot of things which were taken from the free list in the Dingley bill and put on the tariff list in this conference report, and when they enter into the calculation it will run the average increase of the conference report above the rates in the Dingley bill by about 2 per cent. The gentleman in control of the arithmetic of the Republican part of the conference, Major Lord, was courteous enough to give me his calculations, for which courtesy I thank him, and here is what he makes out of it. I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] to give me his attention. I say that the expert arithmetician of the Republican conferees gave me his results of ciphering, and they were these: That the average ad valorem per cent carried in the Dingley bill is 42.55, based on the Dingley bill importations of 1907. The ad valorem of the Senate bill was 42.78. The ad valorem of the conferees' report is 41.58, so that the best that the arithmetician can do for you is to bring you out as having made a reduction from 42.55 per cent ad valorem to 41.58 per cent, which would be ninety-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, if the gentleman expects an answer from me——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it was the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

Mr. OLMSTED. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not want to get mixed up with him now. I was addressing myself to the other gentleman from Pennsylvania because he had interrupted me. Now, the very best, recollect, that the Republican arithmetician of the Republican conferees can figure out as a great victory for the President and a great victory for the downward revisionists of the Republican party is that after all of this hullabaloo, after all of the time, delay, sweat, and toil on this bill, beginning on the 10th day of last November and coming down to the present day, you have made the infinitesimal reduction of ninety-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As a genuine tariff reformer, who has stood by his guns in season and out of season, in sunshine and in storm, I say that that is the most pitiful conclusion of a great movement that is recorded in the history of mankind. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A classical scholar like my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] must think of the old Latin sentence, "Parturiunt montes; ridiculus mus nascetur," which, with tense changed, may be freely translated, The mountains were in labor and a ridiculous mouse was produced. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] If we had coats of arms in this country as in the effete nations of Europe I would suggest that Republican downward revisionists should assume "a ridiculous mouse" as their coat of arms. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I want to read you two or three other things later. My friend from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] called my attention to the maximum and minimum provisions of this bill. Somebody ought to talk about that just a little. I want to read you just a part of it, a part that is essential:

SEC. 2. That from and after the 31st day of March, 1910, except as otherwise specially provided for in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States, or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), the rates of duty prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of section 1 of this act, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem, which rates shall constitute the maximum tariff of the United States: *Provided*, That whenever after the 31st day of March, 1910, and so long thereafter as the President shall be satisfied, in view of the character of the concessions granted by the minimum tariff of the United States, that the government of any foreign country imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, which unduly discriminate against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country pays no export bounty or imposes no export duty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, thereupon and thereafter, upon proclamation to this effect by the President of the United States, all articles when imported into the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), from such foreign country shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be admitted under the terms of the minimum tariff of the United States as prescribed by section 1 of this act.

Now, what is the result of that? In a general way it adds to the rates of this conference report 25 per cent ad valorem after the 31st of March, 1910, and then, if the President of the United States concludes that certain things have been done, he has a right to reduce them to the rates set forth in this conference report, but not below them. If you will add that 25 per cent ad valorem to the 2 per cent that I say that this bill raises the average of the Dingley rates, or if you subtract from 25 per cent the ninety-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent which the conferee Republican arithmetician figured out, in one case you have an increase of 27 per cent over the Dingley rates and in the other case you have an increase of 24.3 per cent above the rates of the Dingley law.

Mr. HILL. Does not the gentleman favor a maximum and a minimum tariff?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

Mr. HILL. I hold in my hand the tariff of another country, in which on page after page is this footnote:

The conventional rate does not apply to imports from the United States.

On one item here the conventional rate is 125 marks; the other is 200. That is what we are up against. Ought it not be sufficient to overcome that condition of affairs?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, certainly.

Mr. HILL. What would you suggest?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would suggest this—and it seems to me the only sensible thing to suggest—namely, that the rates of the bill that we pass here ought to be the regular rates, and then say to every nation on earth, "You give us the advantage of your lowest rates, and you will get these rates."

Mr. HILL. That is what the Payne bill does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it does not. I beg your pardon. But we should also say, "If you dare to discriminate against us, we will clap on top of your imports into this country such added tariff as will even things up."

Mr. HILL. Then, the only difference between yourself and the majority is that you would take the bill which was known as the "Payne bill," and went from the House to the Senate, instead of the Aldrich bill, or the bill which the Senate originated in that matter? And that is the only difference?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would think it one of the greatest cruelties ever inflicted on me if I had to vote for either the Payne or the Aldrich bill; but if I were compelled to vote for one or the other, I would unhesitatingly vote for the Payne bill. It would be the lesser of two evils.

Mr. HILL. Of course you would. So would everybody else.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I wish to say to the gentleman that if he had had the making of the Payne bill, it would have been a better bill than it was. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. My understanding of the difference is that the Payne bill provides for the minimum rates to go into effect, the maximum rates to be put on as the differences were found.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is an infinitely better proposition than the proposition in this conference report.

Mr. HILL. Either one will do the trick, will it not?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman must remember that the Payne bill had 25 per cent on certain things and that this has 20 per cent on all things.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Payne bill was a better bill in that respect. If you had called the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee into consultation to help make a tariff bill, you would have gotten a better one than the Payne bill ever was or ever will be.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion? In both the Payne and the Aldrich bills the maximum and minimum provisions are fatally defective in that they undertake to fight brains by a machine; they both provide that certain rates must go into operation whenever discrimination against the United States exists, and without regard to the question of whether the putting of those rates into operation will punish ourselves as well as the other countries.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. And it is possible to draw a provision that will give to the President sufficient discretion to match Amer-

ican brains against European brains, and not a machine provision against brains.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman's opinion upon one thing in the maximum provision?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Payne bill provided only for the enforcement of a maximum tariff in case a foreign country added a higher rate of duty on American goods going into that country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. MANN. The Aldrich bill goes further than that, and provides that a foreign country must accord to the agricultural, manufacturing, and other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, leaving an executive officer to define and determine what is reciprocal and equivalent. I would like to know what that means.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am coming to that.

Mr. HILL. I think the gentleman made a little slip. He did not mean a higher rate, but those who discriminated.

Mr. MANN. A higher rate than upon the goods from a foreign country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Is not this provision unduly discriminatory, leaving solely to the discretion of the President to determine on what rates he will exercise his judgment, and does not this vest in him a legislative power that does not belong to the Executive?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe it does.

A few remarks on the subject of the maximum and the minimum may not be out of place. I have never set up to be a bad man, a dangerous man, or a fighting man, although I have engaged in some personal brawls. But I started out in life with the idea that if a fellow hit me I would not be doing my duty by my country unless I gave him a jolt. [Laughter.] So I kept that up for many years. I accumulated a vast number of enemies. After a while I got to philosophizing about it, and I came to the conclusion that Thackeray was right when he said:

The world is like your image in a looking-glass. Smile at it and it will smile back at you; strike it and it strikes back.

So I quit that business, and I have accumulated friends by a change of line of conduct. Human nature is the same to-day as it was when Adam and Eve wandered in the shade of Paradise. Mark Twain, the greatest living Missourian, and the greatest literary American that ever lived, says that—

Human nature is very strong, and we all have a heap of it in us.

What is true of individuals is true of nations. I am willing to stand up as much as any man for the American flag and American interests, and I think I am as good a patriot as ever lived when I assert it is a wicked and idiotic policy to go out into the world hunting trade with a club and a meat ax. [Applause.] People will trade with us if we trade with them. [Applause.] This maximum and minimum is a square slap in the face of every commercial nation on the globe. They will not trade with us unless we do trade with them. [Renewed applause.]

If I had my way about it, every citizen of this Republic would be forced to commit to memory President McKinley's farewell address to the American people, delivered a few minutes before he was shot at Buffalo, when he declared that—

The day of exclusion is past, and if we want an outlet for our products we must buy other people's products.

That was his wisest utterance. Had he lived the tariff would have been revised downward long ago.

As to this minimum and maximum proposition, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] have asked me questions about it, let us see what this is: This provides, on top of these conference rates, an additional tariff load of 25 per cent ad valorem to go into effect March 31, 1910, and this 25 per cent ad valorem increase goes on automatically. Then what? Then the President of the United States is to investigate, and if, in his judgment, such and such a state of affairs has come to pass, then such and such a thing may happen. Everybody knows how much depends in this life on vis inertiæ. Who knows when the President would come to that conclusion? Who knows how he would come to that conclusion? Who knows who would dig up the information on which he would base his conclusions?

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Just in half a minute. I have implicit faith in the personal integrity of President Taft, but he is subject to the same infirmities as the rest of us, and there will be all sorts of effort made to keep him from ascertaining the facts on which he would base a judgment and cut this tremendous load of 25 per cent maximum down.

The experts will deceive him about that just as they have deceived him about this being a revision downward. They are past masters in that sort of work and can come near making black appear white.

Mr. CULLOP. Who knows, if we are to take as a criterion his vacillating opinion upon the income tax, the inheritance tax, and the corporation tax, how long he would remain in one conclusion when he arrived at it? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You will have to ask me something easy. I can not answer that. Let us make a practical application of this. There is a great hullabaloo in the newspapers about the tariff on rough lumber having been reduced to $1.25. Is it reduced to $1.25? No. I will tell you what it is reduced to. It is reduced to $1.25 plus 25 per cent of $1.25 of its value.

Mr. MANN. Twenty-five per cent of the value of the goods in the foreign country, which itself would be at least $1.25 on rough lumber.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is what I mean. I made a slip of the tongue.

Mr. MANN. It will be $1.25 plus 25 per cent of the value of the goods as inventoried on shipments from the foreign country, which in itself, on rough lumber, would be equivalent to at least $1.25 a thousand, making the total tariff $2.50 per thousand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Missouri will allow me, I should like to suggest that if rough lumber is worth $10 a thousand, when this bill goes into effect in March next the rate will be $1.25 per thousand and 25 per cent ad valorem, which would make it $3.75 per thousand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad that the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Alabama have straightened out my lapsus linguæ. That is what I intended to say. So that instead of getting cheap lumber, which we have been clamoring for for a great many years, some on both sides of the House, we are to get very high priced lumber, and I protest against it in the name of everyone who has to build a house between the two oceans. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not believe that there are enough news agencies, and press agencies, and newspapers, and stump speakers, and letter writers, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to convince a man who has two ideas above a Hottentot that he is getting cheap lumber in this transaction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman is criticising the outcome of the tariff on lumber. I hope he will not overlook the circumstance that if 30 or 40 Members of that side had joined this side of the Chamber we would have put lumber on the free list.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. "Shake not thy gory locks at me. [Laughter.] Thou canst not say I did it." So help me Almighty God I will never vote for a tariff rate that increases the cost of building the homes of the people of this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have dwelt a little longer on the lumber features than I ought, but it is a sample of the rest, 25 per cent ad valorem increase above the conference rates on all the rest, and I say that with that feature staring me in the face, as a proposition to reduce the tariff downward this bill is the most stupendous fake in the history of mankind. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is a colossal bunko game. The people asked for bread and you are giving them a stone.

Of all the false theories about the tariff—and there are many—the most fallacious is the claim that simply because any rate is cut down the consumer will have the benefit of lower prices. That is not always or necessarily true. It depends entirely on what article is involved. For instance, the claim is brazenly made that because in this conference report the tariff on steel rails is cut in two, being reduced from $7.84 per ton to $3.92, and because the tariff on pig iron is reduced from $4 to $2.50 per ton, the consumers will be benefited to that extent. Therefore the framers of this bill are public benefactors. There is not a syllable of truth in it, because in practice it will be demonstrated that $3.92 is practically prohibitive on steel rails, and $2.50 is prohibitive on pig iron, and if these lower rates prohibit importations, the old and higher Dingley rates could do no more. This being the case, no matter whether the Dingley rates or the Payne-Aldrich rates prevail, the Steel Trust has all the consumers of iron and steel products absolutely at its mercy. In this report are scores of reductions of that sort, which are reductions on paper only, from which the consumer will derive no benefit whatever. Nevertheless they are counted at their face value in working out tables of percentages and help to pull down the average and to pull the wool over the eyes of the people; but they will wake up to the sad and sober truth when they make their purchases during the life of this iniquitous measure. Yet the people are expected to kiss the hand that smites them and to sing hosannas to the authors of this bill.

When this thing began here last spring, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means came into the

House and figured it out, or had it figured out for him, that there would be a net surplus of $12,000,000 growing out of the bill for the next fiscal year; that is, the fiscal year of 1911. It turned out on investigation that the learned arithmetician who prepared that table left out a debit item of $45,000,000, so that it really makes a deficiency instead of a surplus.

Let us see if there is anything in this bill that carries out the idea that they are looking for a deficiency instead of a surplus. Section 39 of the conference report provides for the issue of $290,569,000 of 3 per cent Panama bonds. Already $130,000,000 of Panama bonds have been issued. Up to date the canal has cost $172,000,000. I was as much in favor of building the canal across the Isthmus as any man in this House, provided we were to build the canal, that we were to own the canal, that we were to control the canal, that we were to fortify the canal, and that it would be our property, and then we would give other nations of the earth an easement through it provided they complied with the conditions. I would never have voted for a dollar on any other conditions. I see that somebody is objecting in the newspapers and starting a crusade to prevent our fortifying the two ends of that canal. I am in favor of fortifying it thoroughly. It looks somewhat like the Panama Canal is to be used by Republicans as an excuse to issue bonds to cover up a deficiency.

One query about this $290,569,000: How does it happen that the rate of interest is to be 3 per cent and the bonds to run fifty years, instead of 2 per cent, as the other Panama bonds are to run? I will tell you why. It is that through the maladministration of the Republican party the public credit is being lost. Let us see if that is all. Ever since the Spanish war there has been a law on the statute book permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to issue in any one year, and to run for not more than one year, one hundred millions of 3 per cent "certificates," which is only another name for bonds. But in this conference report the one hundred millions is raised two hundred millions. What is it done for? Because the leaders of the Republican party know down deep in their hearts that this bill is going to create a deficiency in the Treasury. The final verdict on this bill is not made up by the sycophants and enthusiasts who sound praises into the ears of President Taft at this time, but the verdict on the merits of this bill will be made up piecemeal every time the head of a family, every time the woman of the house, buys a bill of goods in any store. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. On the question of the deficit it was estimated in the papers the other day that at the end of 1910 the deficit would be $150,000,000. Let me put this question to the gentleman, whether or not taking the basis of appropriations for the current year just ended and estimating the revenue under the proposed bill, whether or not the gentleman from Missouri can tell us approximately his opinion what the deficit will be?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not had time to do that; it would take several weeks. In 1894 there was a man named Sam Clark, who afterwards served four years in Congress, in the Fifty-fourth and Fifty-fifth. He was the editor of the Keokuk Gate City. He was a stanch Republican; he was no kin to me, but a very good man nevertheless. After the McKinley bill was passed Mr. Clark published in the Gate City an editorial about as long as the joint of your finger, and I quoted it in every speech I made that year, and the entire editorial was this: "The McKinley bill will compel every merchant in the land to make a Democratic stump speech every time he sells a bill of goods over the counter." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

So it will be with this bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Do not the newspapers now tell us that the retail merchants are informing every man who buys a suit of clothes from them that that suit of clothes will be $5 or $10 higher next year than it now is?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the truth, and I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. The consumers of America will find that out very soon, to their very great sorrow.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not a fact that the taxes to be levied under the conference report, if it is adopted, on the necessaries of life are higher on an average than the taxes carried originally in the Payne bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think they are.

Mr. SULZER. And is it not a fact also that the taxes on the necessaries of life in the Payne bill were higher on a general average than the taxes on the necessaries of life under the Dingley law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The average increase of rates in the Payne bill over the average rates in the Dingley bill was 1.56 per cent. The average increase of the Aldrich-Smoot rates over the Dingley bill was something over 6 per cent.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does not the gentleman think he ought to refer to the Fordney rates also, in view of the lumber exposé?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I am not certain but what brother Fordney ought to be given some credit for that, if anybody deserves any, which I doubt exceedingly.

Mr. SULZER. So, then, as a matter of fact, so far as the welfare of the consumers of the country is concerned, it would be better for them for us to vote down this conference report and go on under the old Dingley rates?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is absolutely correct. Mr. Speaker, you can not keep a barber from talking to you when he shaves you, and the man who shaves me told me the other morning that in examining his grocery bill the Saturday night before he found the merchants in Washington were marking up the prices on everything that a man has to eat or drink in order to live [applause on the Democratic side], and I would as lief believe a barber as one of these Republican expert mathematicians. I want to show how deceptive some things are. It is claimed that the rates have been put down on more articles than they have been raised on.

Mr. STANLEY. Before the gentleman leaves this question of the increase in the rates, I understand that the method of valuation has been changed, especially as to the ad valorem rates. The method of valuation, I understand, under this bill will be different from that under the previous bill, at least different from that recommended by the President, and I understand that it will have a very material effect, and there will be an actual raise, while it is not apparent on the face of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that is true. I have not examined into that enough to really elucidate. I say it is asserted that the rates have been decreased on more articles than they have been raised on. I neither affirm nor deny that, because I have not sufficient information to form a belief. I have not had time to figure it out. It is claimed that therefore there is a decrease in the rates. Nothing could be more fallacious.

THE NUMBER OF INCREASES AND DECREASES.

No greater misleading information can go to the public than a mere enumeration of the number of items that have been decreased.

Many of these are relatively and many more absolutely unimportant. In the chemical schedule there were many decreases, but all relatively small in comparison.

For instance, the actual decreases of taxation on 59 items resulted in the following savings:

Item 1	$9,065
Item 2	18
Item 3	447
Item 4	170
Item 5	957
Item 6	432
Item 7	231
Item 8	272
Item 9	55
Item 10	6,268
Item 11	637
Item 12	233
Item 13	7
Item 14	24
Item 15	3,205
Item 16	43,525
Item 17	35
Item 18	362
Item 19	113
Item 20	40
Item 21	2
Item 22	779
Item 23	478
Item 24	4
Item 25	435
Item 26	13,855
Item 27	2,335
Item 28	2
Item 29	3,410
Item 30	708
Item 31	161
Item 32	367
Item 33	1,008
Item 34	1,794
Item 35	5,365
Item 36	6,415
Item 37	2,622
Item 38	406
Item 39	2,315
Item 40	17
Item 41	8
Item 42	43
Item 43	689
Item 44	165
Item 45	4,226
Item 46	8
Item 47	18
Item 48	170
Item 49	64
Item 50	3,211
Item 51	3,794
Item 52	8,431
Item 53	1,807
Item 54	420
Item 55	4

Item 56	$826
Item 57	1,540
Item 58	115
Item 59	7,888
Total	142,957

While 10 increases added to taxation, as follows:

Item 1	$145,925
Item 2	33,550
Item 3	191,199
Item 4	222,060
Item 5	18,033
Item 6	13,482
Item 7	262
Item 8	32,938
Item 9	54,430
Item 10	60,432
Total	772,311

Fifty-nine decreases averaged $2,423 each.

Ten increases averaged $77,231 each.

Yet they go to the country on the proposition that because they cut down the rates on more items in the chemical schedule than they raise them on, therefore there is a net reduction. Of course, if you add 25 per cent maximum ad valorem, it runs the taxes on the ten items up to about a million dollars, while it entirely wipes out the decreases and converts them into increases.

Mr. BYRD. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD. Is it not a fact that the real tariff bill that we are voting on to-day is the schedules in the conference report plus the 25 per cent which takes effect next March?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is it. Just one word, Mr. Speaker, about the making of a tariff bill. Under the Constitution of the United States there devolves upon the House of Representatives the duty of originating money bills.

To accept such a thing as this conference report virtually defeats that provision of the Constitution of the United States. I hope to live to see the day, whether I stay here that long or not, when there will come a House of Representatives to this Capitol which will stand up for its rights to really make the tariff bills of the United States, if they have to stay here continuously for two whole years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I could go on and elaborate on these items in extenso, but it would perhaps be a waste of time and of strength. I want to give you some idea of how a tariff bill is made. Yesterday evening I clipped out of the Washington Times this article, which I am going to read. It is not very long, but it is very illuminating:

With the closing days of the tariff session in sight and many of the schedules already agreed upon, scores of professional lobbyists are buying tickets for home. The hotels are feeling the effect of the exodus, the expressmen are doing a land-office business, and Members of Congress are feeling some confidence in being able to leave their committee rooms without being held up every ten steps by some one who wants to talk tariff.

While there have been no scandals about the tariff lobbies, the lobbyists have done enough entertaining to occasion the remark that "a pleasant time was had." Some of the lobbyists have been in Washington since the day the Ways and Means Committee held its first public hearing. Some of them have devoted their entire time to one particular schedule, while others have been working for half a dozen interests. A few of the lobbyists are lawyers, but most of them are either experts in a particular line or are former employees of the New York customhouse, thoroughly familiar with the workings of the tariff.

A former surveyor of the port of New York, who has been looking after several schedules, has lived at the most expensive hotel in Washington since last November. His expense account has been unlimited, his personal living expenses have cost him nothing, and he has been getting big fees.

"When I return to New York," said this lobbyist, "I will be $30,000 richer than I was the day Congress began tinkering with the tariff. So far as I am personally concerned, I would like to see Congress called together next October. One or two more tariff revisions will fix me financially so that I will retire and live on my income."

The free-hides lobby is generally admitted to be the biggest and most effective in Washington, but it is their boast that there is not a professional in their ranks, and that their expense accounts will not show a single purchase of champagne. The smallest lobby in town is that conducted by Lucius Littauer, the glove manufacturer, of Gloversville, N. Y., and a former Member of the House, who has given his personal attention to the increased duty on women's gloves.

That is the newspaper article. That is what Horace Greeley would have called "mighty interesting reading." From the morning of the 10th day of November down to last Thursday night lobbyists swarmed in Washington City; first a brigade, then a division, then a corps, then a full army. They were as pestiferous, if not as numerous, as the frogs, flies, and lice of Egypt. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Washington Times informs us that, like the Arab, they are folding their tents and stealing away. It will not do to say that entertaining, even legitimate entertaining, in this delectable city has not had its influence on the results of the tariff rates in this conference report. It is well known to most of us that in the closing days of the Fifty-ninth Congress our Republican brethren could not get out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a favorable report on the ship-subsidy bill. In the nick of time a sick member of that committee resigned and our affable friend, Hon. Lucius N. Littauer, of New York, was appointed in his place, and then things began to happen. The newspapers said that he gave a series of banquets and feasts which would have stirred with envy the breasts of Epicurus and Lucullus. One day, so the papers said, a reporter met the late lamented James E. Watson [laughter on the Democratic side], who was at that time the Republican whip, down in one of the corridors, and asked him how they were getting along with the report on the subsidy bill, and Watson said: "Well, we will get a favorable report providing Littauer's grub holds out." [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

And evidently Littauer's grub did hold out, because they got a favorable report, rammed it through this House under whip and spur, and it was talked to death in another place. In this vast army of lobbyists there was every sort of a man except a fool. No fool is ever sent here to lobby. Nearly every one of them represented special interests, but there was nobody to represent the consumers of the land except the Senators and Representatives who assumed that task as a patriotic duty. In passing, it is one of the curiosities of tariff legislation, I will say to my beloved friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], that his "ultimate consumer" was incontinently and unceremoniously snuffed out by "a scholar in politics," nameless here for evermore because of that rule of the House which prevents comment upon persons and their actions in a certain august body which consists of 8 less than 100 Members in this Capitol. But I wish to remind all Senators and Representatives that no man is fit to be a lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the solicitations of the few who have access to us here and pays no attention to the interests of the vast multitude upon whom he will never set his eyes. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items.

SCHEDULE A.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 1.				*Per cent.*
Boracic acid	Five cents	Three cents	$29,948	a 40
Chromic acid	Three cents	Two cents	25	a 33⅓
Lactic acid	Three cents	Two cents	894	a 33⅓
Lactic acid, over 40 per cent	Three cents	Two cents		a 33⅓
Oxalic acid	Free	Two cents	145,925	Increase, infinite.
Salicylic acid	Ten cents	Five cents	149	a 50
Tannic acid	Fifty cents	Thirty-five cents	2,233	a 30
Gallic acid	Ten cents	Eight cents	1,829	a 20
Tartaric acid	Seven cents	Five cents	579	a 28
PARAGRAPH 2.				
Alcoholic compounds	Sixty cents per pound and forty-five per cent.	Sixty cents per pound and twenty-five per cent.	1,081	a 19
PARAGRAPH 4.				
Bauxite	Six-tenths cent	Four-tenths cent	110	a 33⅓
Bauxite, over sixty-four per cent	Six-tenths cent	Six-tenths cent	55	Same; no change.
Alum, etc	One-half cent	One-fourth cent	6,268	a 50
Alum, etc., over fifteen per cent	One-half cent	Three-eighths cent		a 25
PARAGRAPH 5.				
Ammonia sulphate	Three-tenths cent	Free		Decrease, infinite.

a Decrease.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE A—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 6.				*Per cent.*
Argols, crude	One cent and one and one-half cent.	Five cents	$128,313	Increase.
Argols, refined	Four cents and five cents.	Three cents and four cents.	705	[a] 20 and 25
Tartrate of soda	Four cents.	Three cents.	22	[a] 25
Cream of tartar	Six cents.	Five cents	134	[a] 16
PARAGRAPH 9.				
Blue vitriol	One-dalf cent.	One-fourth cent	3,205	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 11.				
Borax	Five cents.	Two cents	29,017	[a] 60
Borates of lime	Three cents and four cents.	Two cents	73	[a] 50 and 66
PARAGRAPH 14.				
Chloroform	Twenty cents	Ten cents	362	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 17.				
Collodion	Fifty cents	Forty cents.	453	[a] 20
Collodion, in sheets, etc.	Sixty cents	Forty-five cents	122	[a] 25
Collodion, finished, etc.	Sixty-five cents and twenty-five per cent.	Sixty-five cents and thirty per cent.	337,011	[b] 18
PARAGRAPH 19.				
Copperas	One-fourth cent	Three-twentieths cent	3	[a] 40
PARAGRAPH 21.				
Ethers—sulphuric	Forty cents.	Eight cents.	195	[a] 80
Ethers—nitrous	Twenty-five cents	Twenty cents.	New.	[a] 25
Ethers—fruit	Two dollars	One dollar.	478	[a] 50
Ethers not specially provided for	One dollar.	Fifty cents.	436	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 22.				
Extracts, quebracho, exceeding 28 degrees	One-half cent.	Three-fourths cent	573,598	[b] 25
PARAGRAPH 28.				
Iodoform	One dollar.	Seventy-five cents.	14	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 29.				
Licorice	Four and one-half cents.	Two and one-half cents	17,318	[a] 44
DINGLEY 35.				
Cotton-seed oil	Four cents per gallon.	Free		Decrease, infinite.
DINGLEY 36.				
Croton oil	Twenty cents per gallon.	Free		Decrease, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 35.				
Flax seed oil	Twenty cents per gallon.	Fifteen cents per gallon.	2,128	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 39.				
Peppermint oil	Fifty cents per pound	Twenty-five cents	3,411	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 41.				
Opium, crude	One dollar.	One dollar and fifty cents.	666,181	[b] 50
Opium, manufactured		Two dollars.		Increase.
Opium, morphia	One dollar per ounce.	One dollar and fifty cents per ounce.	786	[b] 50
Opium, alkaloids, salts of	One dollar per ounce.	One dollar and fifty cents per ounce.	40,446	[b] 50
PARAGRAPH 42.				
Barytes, etc	Seventy-five cents per ton.	One dollar and fifty cent per ton.	18,033	[b] 100
PARAGRAPH 46.				
Chromes, etc	Four and one-half cents.	Four and three-eighths cents	5,642	[a] 9
PARAGRAPH 47.				
Ochers, etc	One and one-half cents	One cent	1,119	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 48.				
Orange mineral	Three and five-eighths cents.	Three and one-fourth cents	23,697	[a] 9
PARAGRAPH 49.				
Red lead	Two and seven-eighths cents.	Two and five-eighths cents.	23,415	[a] 9
PARAGRAPH 50.				
Ultramarine blue	Three and three-fourths cents.	Three cents.	21,458	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 51.				
Varnishes	Thirty-five per cent	Twenty-five per cent.	16,036	[a] 3
Varnishes, spirit, over 30 per cent.	One dollar and thirty-two cents and thirty-five per cent.	Thirty-five cents and thirty-five per cent.	2,750	[a] 58
PARAGRAPH 52.				
Vermilion	Five cents	Four and seven-eighths cents.	2,776	[a] 2
PARAGRAPH 53.				
White lead	Two and seven-eighths cents.	Two and one-half cents	15,438	[a] 13

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE A—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 54.				*Per cent.*
Whiting in oil	One cent	One-half cent	$18	[a] 59
PARAGRAPH 58.				
Lead, acetate of	Three and one-fourth cents	Three cents	95	[a] 7
Lead, brown, etc	Two and one-fourth cents	Two cents	337	[a] 11
Lead, nitrate of	Two and one-half cents	Two and one-fourth cents	6,245	[a] 10
Lead, litharge	Two and three-fourths cents	Two and one-half cents	1,655	[a] 9
PARAGRAPH 60.				
Potash, chromate	Three cents	Two and one-fourth cents	212	[a] 33
PARAGRAPH 61.				
Potash, chlorate	Two and one half cents	Two cents	411	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 66.				
Plasters	Thirty-five per cent	Twenty-five per cent	2,367	[a] 28
PARAGRAPH 67.				
Perfumery:				
With alcohol		Sixty cents and fifty per cent	543,633	Infinite.
Without alcohol	Fifty per cent	Sixty per cent	346,464	[b] 20
PARAGRAPH 68.				
Santonin	One dollar	Fifty cents	4,117	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 69.				
Soaps, medicated	Fifteen cents	Twenty cents	241,447	[b] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 70.				
Saleratus	Three-fourths cent	Five-eighths cent	850	[a] 16
PARAGRAPH 71.				
Soda, chromate	Two cents	One and three-fourths cents	121	[a] 12½
PARAGRAPH 72.				
Soda, crystal	Three-tenths cent	One-fourth cent	319	[a] 5
Soda, chlorate	Two cents	One and one-half cents		[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 73.				
Soda, hydrate	Three-fourths cent	One-half cent	6,424	[a] 33⅓
Soda, nitrite	Two and one-half cents	Two cents	15,151	[a] 20
Soda, sulphide, thirty-five per cent less	One-half cent	Three-eighths cent	5,424	[a] 25
Soda, sulphide, more than thirty-five per cent.	One-half cent	Three-fourths cent		[b] 50
PARAGRAPH 74.				
Sal soda	Two-tenths cent	One-sixth cent	1,100	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 75.				
Soda ash	One-fourth cent	Three-eighths cent	25,295	[b] 25
Arseniate of soda	One and one-fourth cents	One cent	1,685	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 76.				
Silicate of soda	One-half cent	Three-eighths cent	4,634	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 77.				
Sulphate of soda	One dollar and twenty-five cents per ton.	One dollar	3,293	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 79.				
Sponges, manufactured	Forty per cent	Thirty per cent	14	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 80.				
Strychnia	Thirty cents per ounce	Fifteen cents per ounce	115	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 81.				
Sulphur	Eight dollars per ton	Four dollars per ton	7,888	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 83.				
Vanillin	Eighty cents per ounce	Twenty cents per ounce	20	[a] 75

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties	$11,186,860
Amount of decreases in conference	142,957
Bill as decreased	11,043,903
Amount of increases in conference	772,311
Amount of conference duties	11,816,214
Amount of increase over Dingley	629,454

Or 5.63 per cent.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE B.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 84.				*Per cent.*
Glazed fire brick	Forty-five per cent	Thirty-five per cent	$7	[a] 20
Glazed common brick	Forty-five per cent	Thirty-five per cent	2,682	[a] 22
PARAGRAPH 88.				
Plaster rock	Fifty cents per ton	Thirty cents per ton	117,020	[a] 40
Plaster rock, ground	Two dollars and twenty-five cents	One dollar and seventy-five cents	5,264	[a] 22
PARAGRAPH 89.				
Pumice, manufactured	Six dollars	Seven dollars and fifty cents	25,850	[b] 25
Pumice, unmanufactured	Fifteen per cent	Thirty per cent	16,360	[b] 100
PARAGRAPH 91.				
Mica, crude	Six cents and twenty per cent	Five cents and twenty per cent	378,765	[a] 7
Mica, manufactured	Twelve cents and twenty per cent	Ten cents and twenty per cent	24,006	[a] 5
PARAGRAPH 96.				
Gas retorts	Thirty dollars each	Twenty per cent	323	[b] 95
Carbon for electric lighting	Ninety cents per one hundred	Thirty-five cents per one hundred feet.	55,254	[a] 22
Filter tubes	Forty-five per cent	Thirty-five per cent	615	[a] 10
PARAGRAPH 99.				
Glass, unpolished	One and three-eighths to four and three-eighths cents.	One and one-fourth cents to four and one-fourth cents.	56,221	[a] 3
PARAGRAPH 100.				
Glass, polished	Fifteen to twenty cents	Twelve to fifteen cents	9,508	[a] 20
Glass, ground	Eight cents per square foot	Ten cents per square foot	7,420	[b] 20
Glass, ground	Ten cents per square foot	Twelve and one-half cents per square foot.	46,146	[b] 25
Glass, ground	Thirty-five cents per square foot	Twenty-two and one-half cents per square foot.	1,394	[a] 35
PARAGRAPH 102.				
Glass, cast, polished	Eight cents per square foot	Ten cents per square foot	120,757	[b] 25
Glass, cast, polished	Ten cents per square foot	Twelve and one-half cents per square foot.	572,132	[b] 25
Glass, cast, polished	Thirty-five cents per square foot	Twenty-two and one-half cents per square foot.	40,705	[a] 35
PARAGRAPH 103.				
Glass, silvered	Thirty-eight cents per square foot	Twenty-five cents per square foot	1,197	[a] 51
Glass, bent	Thirty-eight cents and five per cent	Twenty-five cents and five per cent	172	[a] 69
Glass, bent	Eight to ten cents and five per cent	Ten to twelve and one-half cents and five per cent.	4,577	[b] 25
Glass, bent	Thirty-five cents and five per cent	Twenty-two and one-half cents and five per cent.	3,638	[a] 35
Glass, bent			15,769	[a] 9 to 12
PARAGRAPH 111.				
Onyx, rough	One dollar and fifty cents per cubic foot.	Sixty-five cents per cubic foot	5,546	[a] 40
Marble and onyx, dressed	One dollar and ten cents per cubic foot.	One dollar per cubic foot	158	[a] 9
Marble slabs, unrubbed	Twelve cents per foot	Eight cents per foot	12,167	[a] 33⅓
Marble slabs, unrubbed	Fifteen cents per foot	Ten cents per foot	3,975	[a] 33⅓
Marble slabs, unrubbed	Eighteen cents per foot	Twelve and one-half cents per foot	15	[a] 34
Marble slabs, rubbed	Fifteen cents per foot	Ten cents per foot	8,636	[a] 33⅓
Marble slabs, rubbed	Eighteen cents per foot	Twelve cents per foot	251	[a] 33⅓
Marble slabs, rubbed	Twenty-one cents per foot	Fourteen and one-half cents per foot.	15	[a] 34
Mosaic cubes	One cent and twenty per cent	One-fourth cent and twenty per cent.	18,992	[a] 60
PARAGRAPH 114.				
Freestone, unmanufactured	Twelve cents	Ten cents	10,228	[a] 16

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule B	$15,349,939
Amount of decreases in conference	221,593
Bill decreased	15,127,346
Amount of increases in conference	163,586
Amount of conference duties, Schedule B	15,290,932
Decrease over Dingley	59,007

Or thirty-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

SCHEDULE C.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 117.				*Per cent.*
Iron ore	Forty cents	Fifteen cents	$146,828	[a] 60
PARAGRAPH 118.				
Iron in pigs	Four dollars a ton	Two dollars and fifty cents a ton	1,359,180	[a] 37½
Scrap iron	Four dollars a ton	Two dollars and fifty cents a ton	54,607	[a] 37½
PARAGRAPH 119.				
Bar iron, etc	Six-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	11,985	[a] 50

[a] Decrease.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 120.				*Per cent.*
In coils, etc	Eight-tenths cent	Six-tenths cent	$773	[a] 25
In slabs	Five-tenths cent	Four-tenths cent	100	[a] 20
Charcoal	Twelve dollars	Eight dollars	295,012	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 121.				
Structural iron	Five-tenths cent	Four-tenths cent	137,437	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 122.				
Boiler iron:				
Value 1 to 2 cents	Six-tenths cent	Five-tenths cent	2,970	[a] 16
Value 1 to 3 cents	One cent	Six-tenths cent	255	[a] 40
Value above 3 cents	Twenty-five per cent	Twenty per cent	44	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 123.				
Anchors	One and one-half cents	One cent	644	[a] 33⅓
Forgings	Thirty-five per cent	Thirty per cent	57,031	[a] 74
PARAGRAPH 124.				
Hoop iron, 10-gauge	Five-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	623	[a] 40
Hoop iron, 20-gauge	Six-tenths cent	Four-tenths cent	14	[a] 33⅓
Hoop iron, thinner	Eight-tenths cent	Six-tenths cent	779	[a] 25
Hoop iron, flared	Six-tenths to seven-tenths cent	Five-tenths to six-tenths cent	40	[a] 25 to 33
Steel bands	Three to six cents and twenty per cent.	Thirty-five per cent	4,438	[b] 27
PARAGRAPH 125.				
Hoops for cotton	Five-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	2,150	[a] 40
PARAGRAPH 126.				
Railroad bars	Seven dollars and eighty-four cents	Three dollars and ninety-two cents	15,441	[a] 50
Railroad fishplates	Four-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	1,528	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 127.				
Sheets, 10 gauge	Seven-tenths cent	Five-tenths cent	5,754	[a] 28
Sheets, 25 gauge	Eight-tenths cent	Six-tenths cent	2,273	[a] 25
Sheets, 32 gauge	One and one-tenth cents	Eight-tenths cent	No import.	
Sheets, thinner	One and two-tenths cents	Nine-tenths cent	No import.	
Sheets, corrugated	One and one-tenth cents	Eight-tenths cent	21	[a] 27
Sheets, corrugated	Thirty-five cents	Thirty-five per cent	70	[b] Infinite.
Sheets, corrugated	Seven-tenths to one cent	Five-tenths to eight-tenths cent	993	[a] 25 to 28
PARAGRAPH 128.				
Sheets, galvanized	Eight-tenths to one and one-tenth cents.	Seven-tenths to one cent	2,344	
Sheets, corrugated	One and one-tenth cents	One cent	1,199	[a] 9
PARAGRAPH 129.				
Sheets, polished	Two cents	One and one-half cents	2,079	[a] 25
Sheets, pickled	Nine-tenths to one and one-tenth cents	Seven-tenths to one cent	153	[a] 22
Sheets, cold rolled	Nine-tenths to one and one-tenth cents	Seven-tenths to one cent	1,396	[a] 18
PARAGRAPH 130.				
Sheets, coated	One and one-half cents	One and two-tenths cents	1,695,513	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 131.				
Steel ingots, 1 cent	Three-tenths cent	Seven-fortieths cent	44,563	[a] 40
Steel ingots, $1\frac{3}{10}$ cents	Four-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	3,498	[a] 25
Steel ingots, $1\frac{8}{10}$ cents	Six-tenths cent	Five-tenths cent		
Steel ingots, $2\frac{3}{10}$ cents	Seven-tenths cent	Six-tenths cent	4,869	[a] 14
Steel ingots, 3 cents	Nine-tenths cent	Eight-tenths cent	21,644	[a] 11
Steel ingots, 4 cents	One and two-tenths cents	One and one-tenth cents	12,365	[a] 9
Steel ingots, 7 cents	One and three-tenths cents	One and two-tenths cents	44,327	[a] 9
Steel ingots, 10 cents	Two cents	One and nine-tenths cents	247,092	[a] 9
Steel ingots, 13 cents	Two and four-tenths cents	Two and three-tenths cents	12,641	[a] 9
Steel ingots, 16 cents	Two and eight-tenths cents	Two and seven-tenths cents	7,487	[a] 9
Steel ingots, 18 cents	Four and seven-tenths cents	Four and seven-tenths cents	247,499	[b] 70
All above this are increased very much.				
Sheets partially manufactured	Three-tenths to four and seven-tenths cents.	Seven-fortieths to four and six-tenths cents.	32,255	[a] 9 to 40
Sheets polished	Three-tenths to four and seven-tenths cents.	Seven-fortieths to four and six-tenths cents.	1,451	[a] 9 to 40
PARAGRAPH 132.				
Steel wool		Forty per cent		Increase, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 133.				
Grit, shot, etc		One cent		Increase, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 134.				
Wire rods, four cents	Four-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	117,420	[a] 25
Wire rods, over four cents	Three-fourths cent	Six-tenths cent	2,792	[a] 20
Wire, tempered	Nine-tenths cent	Eight-tenths cent	2	[a] 11
Wire, cold rolled	Nine-tenths cent	Eight-tenths cent	2,576	[a] 11
PARAGRAPH 135.				
Round wire (second)	One and one-half cents	One and one-fourth cent	28,074	[a] 16
Round wire (first)	One and one-fourth cents	One cent	16,292	[a] 20
Round wire (third)	Two cents	One and three-fourths cents	38,508	[a] 12½
Round wire, not specially provided for	Forty per cent	Thirty-five per cent	225,180	[a] 12½

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.
SCHEDULE C—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 135—continued.				*Per cent.*
Hat wire, etc	Forty-five per cent	Thirty-five per cent	$97,938	a 12½
Wire manufactures	One and one-fourth cents more	One cent more	72,647	
Wire rope			34,800	
PARAGRAPH 137.				
Sheets and plates	One cent more	Four-tenths cent more	2,338	a 60
Saw plates	One-half cent more	One-fourth cent more	21,784	a 50
PARAGRAPH 140.				
Anvils	One and seven-eighths cents	One and five-eighths cent	4,335	a 20
PARAGRAPH 142.				
Axles	One cent	Three-fourths cent	5,508	a 25
PARAGRAPH 143.				
Blacksmith hammers	One and one-half cents	One and three-eighths cents	670	a 8
PARAGRAPH 144.				
Bolts	One and one-half cents	One and one-eighth cents	3,257	a 25
PARAGRAPH 146.				
Cast-iron pipe	Four-tenths cent	One-fourth cent	4,721	a 37½
PARAGRAPH 148.				
Castings, malleable	Nine-tenths cent	Seven-tenths cent	6,054	a 22
PARAGRAPH 149.				
Cast hollow ware	Two cents	One and one-half cents	112	a 25
PARAGRAPH 150.				
Chains, ¾ inch	One and one-eighth cents	Seven-eighths cent	427	a 22
Chains, 1½ inches	One and three-eighth cents	One and one-eighth cents	32	a 18
Chains, $\frac{5}{16}$ inch	One and seven-eighth cents	One and six-eighth cents	12	a 6
PARAGRAPH 151.				
Boiler tubes	Two cents	One and one-half cents	14,294	a 25
Welded furnaces	Two and one-half cents	Two cents	1,434	a 20
Tubes, n. s. p. f.	Thirty-five per cent	Thirty per cent	19,149	a 14
Tubes for cycles	Thirty-five per cent	Thirty per cent	7,992	a 14
PARAGRAPH 152.				
Razors, $1.50 dozen	Fifty cents and fifteen per cent	Seventy-two cents and thirty-five per cent.	133,975	b 68
Razors, $3 dozen	One dollar and fifteen per cent	One dollar and forty-four cents and thirty-five per cent.	273,755	b 61
Razors, more	One dollar and seventy-five cents and twenty per cent.	One dollar and eighty cents and thirty-five per cent.	69,611	b 29
PARAGRAPH 153.				
Swords, etc	Thirty-five per cent	Fifty per cent	16,675	b 42
PARAGRAPH 154.				
Knives, table	Sixteen cents	Fourteen cents	2,855	a 12½
Knives, deerhorn	Twelve cents	Ten cents	4,307	a 16
Knives, bone	Five cents	Four cents	1,601	a 20
Knives, other	One and one-half cents	One cent	12,966	a 33⅓
Knives, n. s. p. f.	Forty-five per cent	Forty per cent	23,141	a 11
Knives	Forty-five per cent	Forty per cent	26,660	a 11
PARAGRAPH 155.				
Files, 2½ inches	Thirty cents	Twenty-five cents	3,356	a 16
Files, 4½ inches	Fifty cents	Forty-seven and one-half cents	21,109	a 2
Files, 7 inches	Seventy-five cents	Sixty-two and one-half cents	25,868	a 17
Files, over 7 inches	One dollar	Seventy-seven and one-half cents	5,663	a 22
PARAGRAPH 159.				
Cut nails	Six-tenths cent	Four-tenths cent	255	a 33
PARAGRAPH 160.				
Horseshoe nails	Two and one-fourth cents	One and one-half cents	14	a 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 161.				
Wire nails	One-half cent	Four-tenths cent	213	a 20
Wire nails	One cent	Three-fourths cent		a 25
PARAGRAPH 162.				
Spikes	One cent	Three-fourths cent	239	a 25
Nuts	One cent	Three-fourths cent	185	a 25
Horseshoes	One cent	Three-fourths cent	6	a 25
PARAGRAPH 163.				
Cut tacks	One and one-fourth cents	Five-eighths cent	10	a 50
Cut tacks	One and one-half cents	Three-fourths cent	0	a 50
PARAGRAPH 166.				
Steel plates	Twenty-five per cent	Twenty per cent	9,193	a 20
PARAGRAPH 167.				
Rivets	Two cents	One and one-fourth cents	490	a 75

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE C—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 168.				*Per cent.*
Cross-cut saws	Six cents	Five cents	$371	[a] 16
Mill saws	Ten cents	Eight cents	No import.	[a] 20
Pit and drag	Eight cents	Six cents	39	[a] 25
Circular	Twenty-five per cent	Twenty per cent	177	[a] 20
Steel band	Ten cents and twenty per cent	Five cents and twenty per cent	489	[a] 16
PARAGRAPH 169.				
Screws	Four cents	Three cents	17	[a] 25
Screws	Six cents	Five cents	30	[a] 16
Screws	Eight and one-half cents	Eight cents	23	[a] 6
PARAGRAPH 171.				
Railway wheels	One and one-half cents	One and one-fourth cents	67,646	[a] 16
PARAGRAPH 172.				
Aluminum	Eight cents	Seven cents	90,461	[a] 12½
Aluminum plates	Thirteen cents	Eleven cents	1,205	[a] 15
PARAGRAPH 173.				
Antimony	Three-fourths cent	One and one-half cents	176,349	[b] 100
PARAGRAPH 178.				
Silver leaf	Seventy-five cents	Fifty cents	757	[a] 30
PARAGRAPH 179.				
Bullions	Five cents and thirty per cent	Five cents and thirty per cent	33,852	
Embroideries	Sixty per cent	Fifteen cents and sixty per cent	143,362	[b] 39
PARAGRAPH 180.				
Hooks and eyes	Five and one-half cents and fifteen per cent.	Four and one-half cents and fifteen per cent.	1,631	
PARAGRAPH 182.				
Lead dross	Two and one-eighth cents	Two cents	485,537	[a] 11
Lead in sheets	Two and one-half cents	Two and one-eighth cents	8,576	[a] 15
PARAGRAPH 183.				
Monazite sand	Six cents	Four cents	No import.	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 184.				
Ferrosilicon	Four dollars	Five dollars	63,150	[b] 25
PARAGRAPH 187.				
Penholder tips	Twenty-five per cent	Five cents gross and twenty-five per cent.	7,568	[b] 16
PARAGRAPH 192.				
Watch movements, 7 jewels	Thirty-five cents and twenty-five per cent.	Seventy cents	614,028	[b] 27
Watch movements, 11 jewels	Fifty cents and twenty-five per cent.	One dollar and twenty-five cents	25,038	[b] 11
Watch movements, 15 jewels	Seventy-five cents and twenty-five per cent.	One dollar and eighty-five cents	108,265	[b] 11
PARAGRAPH 193.				
Zinc ore The new classification makes it impossible to compare exactly.	Twenty per cent	Free	67,420	Increase, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 194.				
Zinc in blocks	One and one-half cents	One and three-eighths cents	16,021	[a] 8
Zinc in sheets	Two cents	One and one-half cents	1,127	[a] 25

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule C	$21,811,184
Amount of conference decreases	1,983,770
Bill as decreased	19,827,414
Amount of conference increases	542,982
Amount of conference duties, Schedule C	20,370,396
Decrease over Dingley	1,440,788
Or 6.65 per cent.	

SCHEDULE D.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 200.				*Per cent.*
Timber, hewn	One cent	One-half cent	$1,917	[a] 50
PARAGRAPH 201.				
Sawed lumber—whitewood, etc	One dollar	Fifty cents	5,888	[a] 50
N. s. p. f	Two dollars	One dollar and twenty-five cents	1,074,173	[a] 37½
Planed lumber	Two dollars to four dollars	One dollar and seventy-five cents to two dollars and seventy-five cents.	58,697	
PARAGRAPH 204.				
Paving posts, etc	Twenty per cent	Ten per cent	57,032	[a] 50

[a] Decrease.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE D—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 205.				*Per cent.*
Clapboards	One dollar and fifty cents	One dollar and twenty-five cents	$7,526	[a] 16
Fence posts	Ten per cent	Free		Decrease, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 207.				
Laths	Twenty-five cents	Twenty cents	133,727	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 209.				
Shingles	Thirty cents	Fifty cents	441,883	[b] 66⅔
PARAGRAPH 212.				
Osier, prepared	Twenty per cent	Twenty-five per cent	9,809	[b] 25
Osier, manufactured	Forty per cent	Forty-five per cent	88,187	[b] 12½

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties	$3,705,024
Amount of conference decreases	764,984
Bill as decreased	2,940,040
Amount of conference increases	188,513
Amount of conference duties	3,128,553
Decrease over Dingley	576,471

Or 15.53 per cent.

SCHEDULE E.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 216.				*Per cent.*
Refined sugar	One dollar and ninety-five cents	One dollar and ninety cents	$82,060	[a] 2½
PARAGRAPH 218.				
Saccharine	One dollar and fifty cents	Sixty-five cents	350	[a] 56

[a] Decrease.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule E	$60,338,523
Amount of conference decreases	2,657
Amount of conference bill duties, Schedule E	60,335,866
Decrease over Dingley	2,657

Or four-thousandths of 1 per cent.

SCHEDULE F.

Dingley duties, $26,125,037.

There were no conference changes.

SCHEDULE G.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 234.				*Per cent.*
Buckwheat flour	Twenty per cent	Twenty-five per cent	$1,897	[b] 25
PARAGRAPH 236.				
Corn meal	Forty-five cents per ninety-six pounds	Forty cents per one hundred pounds	13	[a] 1
PARAGRAPH 254.				
Cabbages	Three cents	Two cents	115	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 260.				
Hops	Twelve cents	Sixteen cents	954,500	[b] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 262.				
Peas, green	Forty cents	Twenty-five cents	376	[a] 37½
Peas, dried	Thirty cents	Twenty-five cents	30,960	[a] 16
Peas, split	Forty per cent	Forty-five cents	17,497	[b] 12
PARAGRAPH 264.				
Stocks, cherry	Fifty cents and fifteen per cent	One dollar	17,798	[b] 53
Stocks, apple, etc	One dollar and fifteen per cent	Two dollars	19,974	[b] 42
Rose plants	Two and one-half cents	Four cents	67,116	[b] 60
PARAGRAPH 275.				
Figs	Two cents	Two and one-half cents	541,080	[b] 25
Dates	One-half cent	One cent	210,427	[b] 100
PARAGRAPH 276.				
Grapes	Twenty cents	Twenty-five cents	344,820	[b] 25
PARAGRAPH 277.				
Lemons	One cent	One and one-half cents	2,309,375	[b] 50
PARAGRAPH 279.				
Pineapples in barrels	Seven cents	Eight cents	106,404	[b] 13
Pineapples in bulk	Seven cents	Eight cents	9,800	[b] 13

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE G—Continued.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 284.				*Per cent.*
Bacon and hams	Five cents	Four cents	$19,017	a 20
PARAGRAPH 285.				
Veal, etc	Two cents	One and one-half cents	15,036	a 25
PARAGRAPH 288.				
Lard	Two cents	One and one-half cents	60	a 25
PARAGRAPH 290.				
Tallow	Three-fourths cent	One-half cent	2,106	a 33⅓
Wool grease	One-half cent	One-fourth cent	35,068	a 50
PARAGRAPH 291.				
Chicory	One cent	One and one-half cents	40,667	b 50
Chicory, ground	Two and one-half cents	Three cents	18,660	b 20
PARAGRAPH 295.				
Salt in bags	Twelve cents	Eleven cents	82,815	a 8
Salt in bulk	Eight cents	Seven cents	102,706	a 12½
PARAGRAPH 296.				
Common starch	One and one-half cents	One cent	15,921	a 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 297.				
Dextrine	Two cents	One and one-half cents	72,303	a 25

a Decrease. b Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule G	$19,181,887
Amount of conference decreases	108,691
Bill as decreased	19,073,196
Amount of conference increases	1,381,450
Amount of conference bill duties, Schedule G	20,454,646
Increase over Dingley	1,272,759
Or 6.63 per cent.	

SCHEDULE H.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 297.				*Per cent.*
Brandy	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	$1,527,477	b 44
Alcohol	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	203,881	b 65
Gin	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	2,173,295	b 15
Spirits	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	4,249,241	b 15
PARAGRAPH 299.				
Compounds	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	65,622	
PARAGRAPH 300.				
Cordials	One dollar and seventy-five and two dollars and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	1,566,665	
Vermuth	Thirty-five and forty cents	Two dollars and sixty cents	21,131	b 550
Vermuth, in bottles	Sixty-two cents and one dollar and twenty-five cents.	Two dollars and sixty cents	276,364	b 200 to 400
Vermuth, in excess	Four and five cents per pint	Two dollars and sixty cents	109	
PARAGRAPH 302.				
Bay rum	One dollar and fifty cents	One dollar and seventy-five cents	2,357	b 16
PARAGRAPH 303.				
Champagne	Two to eight dollars per dozen	Two dollars and forty cents to nine dollars and sixty cents.	4,085,679	
PARAGRAPH 304.				
Wine in casks	Thirty-five to forty cents	Forty-five cents per gallon	229,086	b 12½
14 per cent alcohol	Thirty-five to fifty cents	Sixty cents	2,737,299	b 71
Wine in bottles or jugs	Eighty cents to one dollar and twenty-five cents.	Ninety-two and one-half cents to one dollar and eighty-five cents.	855,795	
Wine in excess	Four to five cents per pint	Six cents	1,792	b 50
PARAGRAPH 305.				
Malt liquors:				
In bottles	Forty cents	Forty-five cents	904,925	b 12½
In other	Twenty cents	Twenty-three cents	1,186,920	b 15
PARAGRAPH 306.				
Malt extract	Twenty to forty cents	Twenty-three to forty-five cents	1,926	
PARAGRAPH 307.				
Cherry juice	Sixty cents	Seventy cents	64,692	b 16
Prune juice	Sixty cents	Seventy cents	32,957	b 16

b Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley revenue, Schedule H	$16,318,220
Conference increases	4,387,149
Amount of conference revenue, Schedule H	20,705,369
Increase over Dingley	4,387,149
Or 26.88 per cent.	

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE I.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 313.				*Per cent.*
Cotton yarn	Three cents and one-fifth cent	Two and a half cents and one-sixth cent.	$18,800	[a] 11
PARAGRAPH 315.				
Cotton cloth. This paragraph is a marked increase on the Dingley law. How much can not be estimated. The value classification in all cotton-cloth paragraphs will increase the rate materially. It is estimated that the duties under these paragraphs will increase the Dingley paragraphs fully $500,000.				
PARAGRAPH 328.				
Stockings	Fifty cents and fifteen per cent	Seventy cents and fifteen per cent	2,066,831	[b] 30
Stockings, $1.50 dozen	Sixty cents and fifteen per cent	Eighty-five cents and fifteen per cent	1,222,434	[b] 33⅓
Stockings, $2 dozen	Seventy cents and fifteen per cent	Ninety cents and fifteen per cent	1,580,800	[b] 21

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule I	$14,291,026
Conference decreases	737
Bill as decreased	14,290,289
Conference increases	1,544,823
Amount of conference bill duties	15,835,112
Increase over Dingley	1,544,086

Or 10.80 per cent.

SCHEDULE J.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 337.				*Per cent.*
Hemp and tow	Twenty dollars	Twenty-two dollars and fifty cents	$191,596	[b] 12½
Hemp, hackled	Forty dollars	Forty-five dollars	470	[b] 12½
PARAGRAPH 339.				
Cables	One cent	Three-fourths cent	669	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 340.				
Threads	Thirteen cents	Ten cents	4,375	[a] 22
Threads	Thirteen and three-fourths cents	Twelve and three-fourths cents	151,328	[a] 4
PARAGRAPH 341.				
Yarns in gray	Seven cents	Six cents	6,668	[a] 14
PARAGRAPH 342.				
Gill netting	Twenty-five per cent	Twenty per cent	2,298	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 343.				
Floor matting	Three cents	Three and one-half cents	1,562,937	[b] 16
PARAGRAPH 344.				
Carpets	Five cents and thirty-five per cent	Four cents and thirty per cent	230	(a)
Do	Ten cents and thirty-five per cent	Eight cents and thirty per cent	83,329	(a)
PARAGRAPH 345.				
Hydraulic hose	Twenty cents	Fifteen cents	497	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 347.				
The changes in this are an increase, but the amount can not be calculated.				
PARAGRAPH 352.				
Burlaps	Five-eighths cent and fifteen per cent.	Nine-sixteenths cent and fifteen per cent.	5,436,107	[a] 10

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule J	$49,900,580
Conference bill decreases	311,416
Bill as decreased	49,589,144
Conference bill increases	187,132
Amount of conference bill duties	49,776,276
Decrease over Dingley	124,304

Or twenty-four one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE K.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
				Per cent.
PARAGRAPH 377.				
Yarns	Twenty-seven and one-half cents and forty per cent.	Twenty-seven and one-half cents and thirty per cent.	$29	a 1
PARAGRAPH 380.				
Women's dress goods over 4 ounces	Fifty, fifty-five, and sixty per cent	Forty-five, fifty, and fifty-five per cent.	2,473,125	

a Decrease. b Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule K	$36,554,815
Amount of conference decreases	128,601
Amount of conference bill duties, Schedule K	36,426,214
Decrease over Dingley	128,601

Or thirty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

SCHEDULE L.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
				Per cent.
PARAGRAPH 397.				
Spun silk, several rates raised. The increase will most probably be more.			$1,883,915	b 31
PARAGRAPH 398.				
Thrown silk and sewing silk, rates raised. The increase will be much more.			403,690	b 92
PARAGRAPH 399.				
Velvets and plushes. This increase will be more.			1,860,189	b 20
PARAGRAPH 399.				
Woven fabrics			9,332,287	b 29
PARAGRAPH 400.				
Handkerchiefs, not hemmed			7,980	a 30
Handkerchiefs, hemstitched			2,479	a 30

a Decrease. b Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule L	$20,313,706
Amount of conference decreases	2,969
Bill as decreased	20,310,737
Amount of conference increases	3,148,010
Amount of conference bill duties, Schedule L	23,458,747
Increase over Dingley	3,145,041

Or 15.48 per cent.

SCHEDULE M.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
				Per cent.
PARAGRAPH 409.				
Printing paper, two and one-fourth	Three-tenths cent	Three-sixteenths cent	$32,748	a 38
Printing paper, four cents	Four-tenths cent	Three-tenths cent	503	a 25
PARAGRAPH 411.				
Paper, surface coated, not specially provided for.	Two and one-half cents	Five cents	344,158	b 50
Paper, coated with gelatin	Three cents and twenty per cent	Five cents and twenty per cent	135,352	b 54
PARAGRAPH 412.				
Lithographic prints. This paragraph will go much higher. Writing paper is also raised, but the new classification destroys all previous data.		Rates raised	656,418	b 26
PARAGRAPH 415.				
Paper, not specially provided for	Twenty-five per cent	Thirty per cent	397,983	b 20

a Decrease. b Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley duties, Schedule M	$4,136,029
Conference decreases	19,757
Bill as decreased	4,117,272
Conference increases	433,220
Amount of conference bill duties	4,550,492
Increase over Dingley	414,463

Or 10.02 per cent.

Comparison of the conference report with the Dingley law on all changed items—Continued.

SCHEDULE N.

	Dingley rate.	Conference rate.	Conference duties.	Conference.
PARAGRAPH 428.				*Per cent.*
Bituminous coal	Sixty-seven cents	Forty-five cents	$467,113	[a] 32
PARAGRAPH 434.				
Fulminites	Thirty per cent	Twenty per cent	220,111	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 435.				
Gunpowder	Four cents	Two cents	31	[a] 50
Gunpowder, 20 cents per pound	Six cents	Four cents	11,030	[a] 33⅓
PARAGRAPH 436.				
Matches	Eight cents	Six cents	47,303	[a] 25
Matches in bulk	One cent	Three-fourths cent	1,175	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 437.				
Cartridges	Thirty-five per cent	Thirty per cent	30,444	[a] 14
Blasting caps	Two dollars and thirty-six cents	Two dollars and twenty-five cents	13,749	[a] 5
PARAGRAPH 438.				
Feathers, n. s. p. f	Fifteen per cent	Twenty per cent	905,049	[b] 33⅓
Feathers, dressed	Fifty per cent	Sixty per cent	1,024,148	[b] 20
PARAGRAPH 445.				
Crinoline	Ten cents	Eight cents	182	[a] 20
PARAGRAPH 446.				
Hats of beaver, valued $4.50	Two dollars	One dollar and fifty cents	2,820	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 450.				
Hides, raw	Fifteen per cent	Free	No duty.	Decrease, infinite.
PARAGRAPH 451.				
Band belting and sole leather	Twenty per cent	Five per cent	3,087	[a] 75
Upper leather, etc	Twenty per cent	Fifteen per cent	542,136	[a] 25
Skins for Morocco	Ten per cent	Five per cent	155,641	[a] 50
Patent, 10 lbs	Thirty cents and twenty per cent	Twenty-seven cents and fifteen per cent.	63,742	[a] 19
Patent, 25 lbs	Thirty cents and twenty per cent	Twenty-seven cents and eight per cent.	26,248	[a] 13
Pianoforte	Thirty-five per cent	Twenty per cent	No import	[a] 43
Shoe laces	Fifty cents and twenty per cent	Fifty cents and ten per cent	101	[a] 20
Boots and shoes	Twenty-five per cent	Fifteen per cent	24,676	[a] 40
PARAGRAPH 454.				
The cheapest gloves	One dollar and seventy-five cents	One dollar and twenty-five cents	154,940	[a] 28
PARAGRAPH 461.				
Harness	Forty-five per cent	Thirty-five per cent	56,221	[a] 22
PARAGRAPH 463.				
Manufactures bone, etc	Thirty per cent	Thirty-five per cent	984,783	[b] 16
PARAGRAPH 470.				
Paintings, not specially provided for	Twenty per cent	Fifteen per cent	381,639	[a] 25
PARAGRAPH 476.				
Plows, etc	Twenty per cent	Fifteen per cent	3,546	[a] 25

[a] Decrease. [b] Increase.

SUMMARY.

Amount of Dingley rates, Schedule N	$29,896,505
Amount of conference decreases	3,950,198
Bill as decreased	25,946,307
Amount of conference increases	538,192
Amount of conference bill duties, Schedule N	26,484,499
Decrease over Dingley	3,412,015
Or 11.41 per cent.	

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield thirty-five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up any time in discussing the general features of this bill. It seems to me that the matter has been thrashed out from A to Z in this House, and that further discussion of its general features is not necessary. I merely want to say that I most heartily approve of the bill as reported by the conference committee, because I believe it to be a bill which does not depart one iota from the true Republican theory of protection, and because I believe that it is a substantial revision downward. I am not one of those who quibble about the meaning of the word "revision." I do not believe that to revise merely means to look over. I believe that to revise means to take affirmative action, and I believe that the promise of the Republican platform was to take affirmative action, and that in the direction of a revision downward. I sincerely trust that my colleagues upon this side who are not suited in every respect by this bill will be content to follow the leaders of the Republican party and not worship at the altars of the false gods either of excessive rates or of free trade.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. With pleasure.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman asked some of us to follow the leaders of the Republican party. I suppose he takes into consideration, when he makes that request, that the ordinary Member of this House has had precious little to do with this bill, and that any compromise now arrived at is a compromise between leaders of this body and the Senate, and not between the Members of this body and the Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Payne bill gave, as much as any tariff bill could, a chance to every Member of this House to indicate his views and to have them

adopted in this tariff bill. I say that this bill is a personal victory for the leader of the Republican party on this floor, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause on the Republican side.] I say that it is a personal victory for the leader of our party in this Nation, the President of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] And as such it should be supported by every Republican in this House.

But I do not attempt, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HARDY. What is that victory over?

Mr. LONGWORTH. That victory is over, on the one hand, those who advocate excessive protective rates, and, on the other hand, those who advocate free trade and the closing up of the factories of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said before——

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield to one question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to decline for the moment, as I will have to go on with my subject.

Mr. ADAIR. Just one short question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman stated that this bill has been made by the Members of this House. I would like to ask him whether or not it is true that, with the exception of four items, the Members of this House had no opportunity to offer any amendment whatever to the 3,996 items of the bill outside of the four?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to answer that question. It seems to me that I answered it before. If there is anything in the theory of representative government, it means men must delegate some discretion to duly authorized representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss but one feature of this bill in detail, and that is the corporation tax.

It was apparent from the outset that whatever the final action of this Congress upon the tariff question might be, whatever changes might be made in the Dingley law, there would be, in one respect at least, a marked departure from the mode of raising revenue which has prevailed during the past twelve years. During this time the main sources of revenue of this Government have been but two, namely, receipts from customs and receipts from internal revenue. It was apparent, I say, that this bill would surely contain a new method of raising revenue in the form of a tax upon other sources than the two I have mentioned.

Whether such a tax is necessary purely from a revenue standpoint, or whether any tax for the purpose of supplementing our present revenue is necessary, I shall not discuss, except merely to say that for my part I believe that a substantial addition to the revenue is necessary not only for the purpose of paying off the deficit, but also to provide for a larger expenditure than has hitherto been made for the improvement of our inland waterways. But whether it is necessary or not, I believe that it will be the settled policy of this Government hereafter to tax certain sources of wealth which to-day pay no tax to the Government.

As to the exact form that this tax should take there have been wide differences of opinion. Three definite propositions have been considered since the beginning of this extra session—an inheritance tax, such as was contained in this bill as it passed the House; a tax upon the receipts of corporations, such as was contained in the bill as it passed the Senate; and a proposition which contained these two; and, in addition, a tax on individual incomes, which was presented in the Senate and was known as the Bailey-Cummins amendment. It is true that the inheritance-tax feature of this amendment is not precisely the same as that which passed the House, but it is, nevertheless, a tax on inheritances. It is true, also, that the corporation tax of this amendment is not the same as the corporation tax as it passed the Senate, but it is a tax upon the net income of all corporations, and in principle they are practically identical. While the Bailey-Cummins amendment is generally referred to as an income tax solely, it is, in fact, in addition to this, an inheritance tax and a corporation tax measure.

Two of these propositions have been discussed with great thoroughness upon the floor of this House—the inheritance tax and that portion of the Bailey-Cummins amendment which deals with individual incomes, and which is essentially the same as the income tax contained in the Wilson law. Unfortunately, the corporation tax was not discussed here at all, or, at least, very little, because it was not a part of the bill as it passed the House; and while, for this reason, it may seem to many Members of this House to be a new proposition, and one to which too little consideration has been given, I want to try to show, if I can, that it is not in fact new, but one which has been considered thoroughly, if not here, at least elsewhere, and to show also, if I can, not only the advisability, but the necessity, of its adoption as a part of this bill.

I have heard it frequently said here—I heard it said only the other day by the leader of the Democracy, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and his statement was greeted with great applause on that side of the Chamber—that this proposition was evolved merely for the purpose of beating the income tax in the Senate. I have no hesitation in agreeing to a part of this statement. It did beat the kind of income tax that was proposed in the Senate, and I am glad of it. But with the other part of the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, that the corporation tax was evolved for that purpose, I take issue, for it was evolved, practically in all its details, long before the Bailey-Cummins amendment was ever heard of—before even this Congress was called into extra session.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Is it the intention of your party to make this corporation tax part of the permanent fiscal policy of the Government?

Mr. LONGWORTH. So far as I am concerned, I will say, in reply to the gentleman, that I sincerely hope so.

Mr. CLAYTON. And you think your party intend to make it a part of its permanent fiscal policy?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do. There is one man, and one man only, who is primarily responsible for this corporation tax, and to whom, if it shall become part of our permanent law, the credit is due, and that is the President of the United States. I know of my own knowledge that the thing was in his mind before his inauguration, that he asked for the advice of many well-known economists upon this subject. Immediately after his inauguration he required to be drawn up by the Attorney-General a corporation-tax measure substantially identical with the one that is before us now. His object was not to meet any particular condition in the Senate which might arise, not to meet any particular measure, but to ingraft upon our taxation system a measure which he believed to be right, not only for revenue-raising purposes but for procuring a reasonable supervision by the Government of the corporations of this country.

Mr. JAMES. If the gentleman will permit me, you are referring now to what the President intended to do with reference to the corporation tax before his inauguration? Why is it he did not recommend the corporation tax instead of an inheritance tax, if the gentleman is correct in his statement and conclusions as to the position of the President?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am coming to that a little later, if the gentleman from Kentucky will pardon me.

Before this Congress met, and while the majority Members of the Committee on Ways and Means were engaged in drafting the tariff bill, I submitted to the committee, at the President's request, a draft of this corporation tax, similar in almost every respect to the measure which finally passed the Senate and which is now before us. It was there most carefully considered. That it was not adopted by the committee was not because of its lack of merit, but because we did not believe that the revenue that it was estimated it would produce was necessary, and because we had already decided to adopt the inheritance tax, which had been specifically recommended by the President in his inaugural address as a proper means of supplementing the revenue. Thus it was not a question with us of substituting the corporation tax for the inheritance tax. It was a question of supplementing the inheritance tax with the corporation tax, and in the opinion of the committee the additional revenue that would have been produced was neither necessary nor desirable.

Far from being a legislative trick, designed to meet a particular condition in the Senate, or designed to beat any particular measure, this corporation tax is a well-considered plan, designed to go upon the statute books on account of the merit it has in it.

While I do not propose to discuss at any length the general question of an income tax, it is impossible to pass it by altogether, because a corporation tax is an income tax, and embodies, in my judgment, the best features of such a tax. Generally speaking, the Bailey-Cummins amendment is an almost exact reproduction of the income tax adopted in the Wilson bill. Hardly any change has been made in it, except that the exemption has been increased from two to five thousand dollars. I gathered in the debate here the other day that some gentlemen on the other side would prefer that the exemption should be increased even above this point. The gentleman from Alabama, in reply to a question I addressed him, said that he would exempt incomes of $7,500. Evidently the gentleman from Alabama, if he had the drafting of an income-tax law,

would see to it that those who voted for it should not be included in its provisions. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLAYTON. I would exempt all the poor men and all the men with small incomes, so that I might get their support, in order in that way to make the multimillionaires, who now pay no taxes, contribute something to the support of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, the gentleman advocates a class system of taxation.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is not class. Every income tax that we have had has recognized these exemptions.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But no income tax in any country except this exempts more than $800.

Mr. CLAYTON. Your corporation tax itself has exemptions in it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Of corporations, but not of individuals.

Mr. CLAYTON. And thereby it recognizes the principle of exemptions.

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary, this will exempt only a comparatively small percentage of all the corporations.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would exempt the small corporations.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And the gentleman's income-tax proposition exempting incomes of eight, nine, or ten thousand dollars, it would exempt 90 per cent of the population.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does not the gentleman admit that every corporation whose net income does not exceed $5,000 is exempt?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Most assuredly.

Mr. CLAYTON. Is not that the same principle that would exempt the individual in an income tax? What is the difference in principle? I should like to have the gentleman elucidate it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The difference between investigating the personal affairs of an individual and the affairs of a corporation, which I think should be made public. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must go on. I will yield later, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. CLAYTON. You do not deny the justice of it, but you put it solely upon the ground that it is inquisitorial in the case of the individual, but not inquisitorial in the case of the corporation?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have no objection to an investigation of the affairs of corporations.

Mr. CLAYTON. It is inquisitorial in its nature in both cases.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I draw a sharp line between an inquisition into the affairs of the individual and an inquisition into the affairs of a corporation.

I am referring to the Bailey-Cummins amendment in this connection, because I believe that I can best show why I approve of this corporation tax by pointing out my objections to certain features of the Bailey-Cummins amendment. My principal objections to it are four:

First, that the exemption is too high. I do not believe in exempting so large a class as this amendment would exempt from the operation of any tax which, it is assumed, is a just tax. In the second place, it makes no distinction between earned and unearned incomes. Certainly I should never favor a tax which did not make this distinction. I can see no justice in making one man pay upon an income which he earns with his brains or the sweat of his brow the same rate that another man pays upon an income which is derived from invested capital, and whose only exertion is to collect it. The capital of the first is his brains and his hands, and can endure only during his years of vigorous life. The capital of the other is, for the most part, in the brains and hands of others, and though he may spend his entire income, it is not exhausted or even deteriorated.

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Very well.

Mr. SHERLEY. What would the gentleman say as to the man's income derived from bonds of corporations?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think undoubtedly if the income tax shall come before this country, if the country shall demand that an income-tax law be passed, that the English system of collecting such a tax ought to be adopted, namely, the collection at the source and not at the hands of the individual.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman is warranted in saying that the corporation tax is superior to an income tax, how is the gentleman warranted in not taxing bondholders in place of stockholders?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It was seriously considered in drafting this measure, as I understand it, whether constitutionally the bonds could be gotten at, but it was deemed that it would make the measure unconstitutional, and for that reason it was not put in.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would rather not yield at all for the present. I do not want to be discourteous, but I have much more to get through before I close.

My third objection to the Bailey-Cummins amendment is that it is unduly inquisitorial; and later I shall call attention to the distinction that I make between inquisition into the affairs of an individual and inquisition into the affairs of a corporation.

My fourth objection is that it is unconstitutional, in that it contains all the features that were held unconstitutional in the Wilson income tax; and its passage by this Congress would be, in my judgment, little short of an insult to the Supreme Court of the United States. The only way to remedy this last objection, in considering the question of an income tax in future years, was to have taken the action which has, in fact, been taken by this Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution, so that people may decide through the legislatures of the various States whether or not the undoubted power shall be given to the Government to assess a tax on individual incomes. To my mind the right to assess such a tax in time of war is not only advisable but a necessary incident to popular government. Whether such a tax is advisable in time of peace would depend, in my judgment, upon the form of the tax. That is a bridge which we can cross when we come to it.

With regard to the inquisitorial feature of this tax and with regard to the exemption, I want to refer briefly to the English system of collecting a tax upon incomes; and I do so because it was suggested by gentlemen on the other side in the debate the other day, who, in advocating the Wilson tax, quoted the English income tax as an argument therefor. I remember that several gentlemen said that the English system was an ideal system. It seems to me that in using the English income tax as an argument for the adoption of the system proposed here, gentlemen have shot very wide of the mark. In fact, I fear that they have not made a profound study of the English system, for it is no more like the tax here proposed than black is like white.

In the first place, the English law differs from this one in placing the exemption at $800 instead of $5,000, and therefore reaches an infinitely larger class of the community. In the second place, the whole theory of the tax is diametrically opposed to this, for while the system that these gentlemen advocate would impose a tax upon the income in the hands of the individual, the English system taxes it before it comes into the hands of the individual, and thus almost entirely eliminates the inquisition by the Government into the private affairs of the individual, which, to my mind, is the most serious objection to an income tax.

That the English system has been successful as a means of raising revenue can not be questioned, nor can its popularity among the English people—or at least their acquiescence in its provisions—be questioned, for it has existed practically in the form that it is now for nearly seventy years, and the revenue which it has raised has continuously increased from that time on until it now reaches the enormous sum of more than $160,000,000 a year.

In 1906 a committee of the House of Commons was constituted to examine into the general subject of the income tax with a view particularly of inquiring as to whether it was practicable to differentiate between permanent and precarious incomes, and as to whether it was practicable to graduate the tax by assessing it against the individual. This committee was composed of some of the leading members of Parliament, 17 in all, among them Mr. McKenna, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Keir Hardie, the leader of the Labor party, and Mr. William Redmond, the leader of the Irish party. The report was unanimous. In regard to the question of assessing the tax direct, the committee said:

> If that system were adopted, it would be easy to levy a graduated rate of tax according to the total net income of the individual. Such a course would involve, however, the abandonment of the principle which is known as "collection at the source." The importance of retaining in our revenue system a principle which is mainly responsible for the present development of the tax and the ease with which it is collected and the extreme undesirability of doing anything which would reduce its efficiency can scarcely be overestimated. At the present time, indeed, something like two-thirds of the tax is collected before the income reaches the person to whom it belongs and without any information being obtained or required as to the persons to whom it will go. It is interesting to recall the fact that a hundred years ago we abandoned direct personal assessment, and collection at the source was substituted, with the result that the yield of the tax was almost doubled immediately. In 1803 an income tax of 5 per cent, collected at the source, yielded within a very small amount as much as a tax of 10 per cent did in 1801, when it was assessed and collected direct from each taxpayer.
>
> Your committee are convinced that direct personal assessment for the whole tax is not practicable in this country, in the sense of being an expedient or desirable means of collecting revenue.

The committee further reported that it was practicable and advisable to differentiate between earned and unearned incomes, and in accordance with this report these two classes of incomes are now assessed upon a different scale.

The finance act of 1907 divides taxpayers into two classes—those who receive less than $10,000 a year whose income, or a part of which, is earned, and those who receive the same amount whose income is not earned. To the first class this act grants a remission of 3 pence in the pound upon the amount of the earned income. So that as the average tax in recent years in England has been 12 pence on the pound, this amounts to a remission of 25 per cent of the tax. If the distinction were recognized in the Bailey-Cummins amendment between earned and unearned incomes, as it is in England, the tax upon earned incomes would only be 1½ per cent. This provision of the finance act is the result of an agitation which has gone on for many years in England and has finally resulted in the adoption of a distinction which, to my mind, is at the very basis of a just income tax.

We are asked, in the only proposition that has been before us, to disregard this distinction entirely, to disregard the experience of a great country in which the income tax has been one of the principal sources of revenue continuously for the past sixty-seven years, and above all we are asked, by taxing the income in the hands of the holder, to adopt a principle which was discarded by England as impracticable, inexpedient, and undesirable as a means of collecting revenue more than a hundred years ago. If we are to have an income tax in the future, let us at least profit by the experience of other countries. Let us at least have a tax which is comparatively up to date.

There is, as I have said, a radical difference between the English system and the system proposed here, in that there the tax is levied upon the source of income, and here upon the income itself in the hands of the individual. For instance, here an owner of houses or lands would pay a tax upon the rents he receives. In England he pays no tax himself, but the tax is paid by his tenant. Here the man who receives a salary from the Government would pay a tax upon the salary himself. There the tax is deducted by the Government from the amount he is to receive. Here the creditor would pay the tax upon the amount of interest he receives from the debtor.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will be brief about it.

Mr. BORLAND. How do they arrive at the tax to be paid by the Englishman who draws his revenue from foreign investments?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not answer that question at the moment. There is one schedule under which that comes, where the collection is made before it is transmitted to the individual.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know as the gentleman understands me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think I understand the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. Suppose an Englishman has money invested in the United States in railroad bonds, the interest on which is remitted directly to him.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That would be probably a case where the individual pays the tax himself. So it is in the case of a lawyer or a physician, where it is impossible to arrive at the source of the income. If it is possible to arrive at the source, it is invariably done. There the debtor pays the tax and deducts it from the interest. More than half of the revenue raised from the English income tax is derived from the tax on the earnings of businesses, and at this point we find that their theory of levying the tax is precisely similar to the theory of this corporation tax in that it taxes the income received by the stockholders, not in their hands, but at its source, namely, upon the income of the corporation. Thus the only resemblance between the English system and the system here proposed lies in the corporation tax; so that gentlemen who urge the English system as a reason for the passage of an income tax here argue themselves out of court, except so far only as the corporation tax is concerned. Instead of an argument for the general principles of the Bailey-Cummins amendment, it is a most powerful argument against it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman is brief.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to ask the gentleman's opinion in reference to the income tax that he is discussing, where the income or a part of it subject to this tax is derived from real estate.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have said that in England the income is taxed in the hands of the tenant and not in the hands of the owner.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman believe if the income to be taxed consists of rental from real estate that such a tax is a constitutional tax?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, I am speaking of the English income tax.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am referring to the corporation income tax that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is constitutional in England, because anything that Parliament enacts is constitutional.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would it be constitutional in the United States, where the law operates?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, I have already said that I believe the corporation tax to be constitutional in every respect. I have said that my principal objection to an income tax is that it is inquisitorial, and I am met by the argument from opponents of the corporation tax that it, too, is inquisitorial. Of course that is true. It is true of any tax on incomes. But I draw a sharp distinction between inquisition into the affairs of an individual and inquisition into the affairs of a corporation.

It is said that this tax is unpopular, and Members of this House point to large numbers of communications that they have received from their constituents protesting against its adoption. I have yet to see, however, a communication from any source except those interested in corporations. Certainly this has been true in my case. I have received a large number of letters and telegrams from such sources in my city, urging me to vote against this measure, all based upon the ground that it is unjust and discriminatory. I know the officers of these various corporations and know them to be upright and honorable men of the highest standing in the community, and yet I can not agree with them that this corporation tax is either unjust or discriminatory in the proper sense.

That this measure discriminates between corporations and individuals is, to my mind, not a fault but a virtue. I have heard over and over again this argument: Suppose A is a corporation engaged in doing business upon one corner of a street. B is a partnership doing a business precisely the same, both as to character and volume, on the other corner of the street. Is it fair that establishment A should pay a tax to the Government upon its net earnings, and that establishment B should go free? My answer is, "Yes." By virtue of having incorporated his business, A has certain advantages which B, managing his affairs as a partnership, has not. Among other things, his liabilities are limited, and he has the right of perpetual succession. He has paid something for the privilege of becoming a corporation and of enjoying these advantages, and hence has shown that he deems them to be of value. It seems to me that he is barred from asserting that the Government has not at least an equitable right to ask him to pay a tax upon the profits of his business, or from saying that such a tax is discriminatory. The members of the partnership have not asked from the Government any privileges that they are not entitled to as individuals, and it seems to me that they have the right to consider that their profits are their own private affair; but if individuals incorporate and ask of the Government certain privileges to which they would not be entitled as individuals, it seems to me that they can not justly object to revealing to the Government their profits and paying a tax upon them, if this tax shall be necessary to the support of the Government. I can give but little weight to the argument that this tax is unjust because it discriminates between corporations and individuals.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will make it very brief.

Mr. GARRETT. Is there not this inherent injustice in this proposed bill, and that is the exemption? I know of thousands—well, hundreds—of men who own stock in corporations that make less than $5,000 net that are much more able to pay a tax than thousands and thousands of men who own stock in corporations which make more than $5,000 net. What about the injustice of that exemption?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not understand the gentleman's question. I will ask him to state his question over again.

Mr. GARRETT. I know hundreds of men who own stock in corporations that make less than $5,000 a year——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. That are much more able to pay a tax than thousands of people who own stock in corporations that make more than $5,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, the gentleman is getting back to the question of an individual income tax.

Mr. GARRETT. But it all falls on the individual.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Probably there is no real justice in any exemption, either in the case of an individual income or a corporation tax. It is a practical question——

Mr. GARRETT. But there is humanity in the personal exemption, although it may not be——

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is all a question of degree. One gentleman may think an income of $500 ought to be exempted and another man may think, as the gentleman from Missouri, that $7,000 should be exempted. There is no settled rule that can be laid down.

Mr. RICHARDSON. May I ask the gentleman——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask that I be not interrupted for a moment.

As to the constitutionality of this tax I shall have but little to say, because I take it to be beyond argument. If anyone holds any doubt upon this question, I would recommend the reading of the speech recently made in the Senate by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], in which he goes thoroughly into the question of the constitutionality of this legislation. His speech is a masterpiece of clearness and force, and leaves practically nothing to be said upon the subject.

Let us see what other reasons there are besides the fact that this tax is legal and that it is equitable that it should be passed at this time; because the mere fact that any tax is legal and equitable is not of itself a compelling reason why it should be adopted. Both the Committee on Ways and Means of this House and the Finance Committee of the Senate are agreed that further revenues are necessary, and that in the neighborhood of $25,000,000 a year additional must be raised by some other forms of taxation than those contained in our present law.

A practical way to do this was to adopt such a measure as the inheritance tax, but that was open to some objections; in the first place because it was, in the nature of things, impossible to estimate what it would produce in any given year, and because it was already in force as a state law in more than half the States in the Union. With the sharp necessity for an immediate remedy for the deficit staring us in the face, it always seemed to me, while I heartily supported and am in thorough sympathy with the principle of an inheritance tax, that we are groping in the dark as to the amount it would raise in the next two or three years which could be applied to paying off the deficit. At the time when this corporation tax was first considered in the Ways and Means Committee, which was, as I have said, early in March, it was estimated roughly that a tax of 2 per cent upon the earnings of corporations would produce certainly not to exceed $25,000,000. As investigation progressed, however, this amount began to rise, until competent authority now estimates that it would raise nearer seventy or eighty millions. Thus it became necessary to reduce the rate to 1 per cent to avoid what would almost surely turn out to be a surplus of revenue.

There can be no question but that a tax of 1 per cent upon the net earnings of corporations will produce a revenue of, at the very least, $25,000,000 annually, that it would be simple and easy of collection, and that its effect would be immediate. Of all the propositions proposed for raising this additional revenue, it seems to me that the corporation tax, if viewed only from its revenue-producing capacity, is the most logical.

But there is another feature of this measure which, to my mind, is of even more importance, and that is the feature of publicity. I have long thought that this was at least the first step in the solution of one of the most important questions that is before the American people—the question of the reasonable regulation of corporations. How can we legislate intelligently upon this subject? How can we determine what corporations are managing their affairs honestly and with due regard for the interests of the public? How can we determine what corporations are managing their affairs dishonestly and with contemptuous disregard for the public welfare, unless we have some means of ascertaining what their business really is? How can we separate the sheep from the goats unless we have some means, outside of mere rumor, of judging which are the sheep and which are the goats? This measure is conceived in no spirit of hostility to corporations. It does not compel the disclosure of any trade secrets which might bring upon some small corporation a ruinous competition from some greater and stronger one. It merely compels the corporations to state in general terms what their gross earnings have been, what has been charged off to repairs, renewals, maintenance, and overhead charges, and what remains which can reasonably be considered their net profit from the business every year. To my mind, it will be of immense advantage to the stockholders of corporations throughout the country. I venture to say that the vast majority of all the stockholders have no real idea of what their legitimate profits have actually been. In many cases a few insiders have gotten together and juggled the accounts to suit themselves, and the ordinary, every-day stockholder has been left out in the cold.

I have heard again and again urged against this measure the old argument that it will cut into the savings of the widows and orphans. This is the argument we always hear when any legislation is contemplated which affects a corporation. I believe this measure is for the direct benefit of the widows and orphans and all stockholders, to whose interest it is that the affairs of the corporations of which they are part owners shall be wisely and intelligently administered.

The junior Senator from New York, in his speech, called attention to another feature of this measure which I think is of the greatest importance, and that is the difficulty of making a well-considered protective tariff with the almost inconceivably meager information that we really have concerning the affairs of corporations which the tariff really affects. As he says:

> What do we know about those corporations? Upon the one hand, we have garbled and partial statements; upon the other, equally garbled and partial statements, and no means of distinguishing the truth.

And he says further:

> I should like to see in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the next time a tariff bill comes before Congress statements, under oath and tested year by year, about the business of all these vast multitudes of corporations that come appealing to us here for help, so that we shall not again be compelled to come to the conclusion that all the business of the United States is on the brink of failure.

I think perhaps the Senator exaggerates in saying that apparently all the corporations which came before us were on the brink of failure; but it is true that not one of the representatives of any of the corporations which appeared in the public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee gave the remotest hint that they were unduly prosperous. If, as the Senator suggests, we could have turned in every case to the files of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, it would not have been necessary for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] to preface the testimony of every representative of a corporation who appeared before us with the question: "Are you making any money?" We would have all known, including the gentleman from Georgia, whether or not they were by merely examining the records.

I thoroughly believe in publicity in the affairs of corporations. I believe it will be a benefit, not only to the public at large, not only for the benefit of the small stockholders, but for the benefit of the corporations themselves. There is no question but that the disclosures that were made some years ago of reckless dishonesty in the management of a few of the great corporations destroyed the confidence of the investing public, both here and abroad, in all corporations—a confidence which has not yet returned and which will not wholly return until the public has some means of knowing what the affairs of these corporations really are. I believe that a reasonable publicity will cause millions of the public's money to come out of hiding and seek investment in corporate stock, and that floods of money will come to this country from foreign investors. I believe that incalculable benefit will come to the present stockholders because they will have a means of knowing whether a fair amount of the profit of the corporation in which they are interested finds its way into their hands or whether it is diverted, by the payment of unreasonable salaries to the officers of the corporation or in other ways, from its proper channels. I believe that the safest tribunal before which any corporation can be judged is before the bar of public opinion, and that the reasonable publicity which this measure requires will show that corporations, no matter how big, will be fairly judged, and will show further that the vast majority of all the corporations of this country are, in fact, managed honestly, intelligently, and with due regard for the interests of the public.

I believe that this measure is in line with the great progressive measures which have been enacted by the Republican party in the past eight years for the supervision and regulation by the Government of corporate wealth, the question which, to my mind, together with the question of the conservation of our national resources, overshadows all others in importance. I believe that in evolving and advocating the passage of this law that the President of the United States has redeemed in the fullest measure his pledge that he would, during his administration proceed along the paths blocked out by his predecessor; that he would use every effort to bring to his policies their fullest fruition. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, who is controlling the time upon the Republican side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who is temporarily absent. He has some

two hours and fifteen minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri has some one hour and eighteen minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to Mr. UNDERWOOD of Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As much time as he desires.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the important pledge the Republican party made to the country last fall, as defined by their candidate for President, was a promise to revise the tariff downward. There are some members of that party who claim that the pledge to revise the tariff did not mean a revision downward, but their candidate for President of the United States defined his position in such a way that there could be no possible mistake as to what he meant and as to what he pledged himself to the people of the United States to accomplish.

Now, the question before us is not how you have written this bill or why you have written this bill, but as to whether you have kept the pledges of your standard bearer. I take it that when the President of the United States pledged himself to the people in favor of a downward revision he was honest and candid in that pledge, that he did not favor a revision merely on the face of the paper, but that when he said he was in favor of a downward revision he meant such a revision as would lift from the backs of the masses of the people of this country the burdens of taxation that they had borne under the Dingley bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I take it that he did not mean a revision that would revise the tariff in the interest of the manufacturers of this country, but that he meant a revision that would revise the tariff in the interest of the masses of the people of the United States.

Now, in estimating how far this revision has gone, some expert employed by the conference committee, or acting in behalf of the conference committee, has estimated that there is a very slight reduction in this bill below the Dingley rates, less than 1 per cent; but I understand that that gentleman's figures have been repudiated by the Treasury Department. We who are supposed to represent the minority on the conference committee have had no opportunity to go into their inner councils and to know what they were doing. For three weeks they sat behind closed doors, deliberated together as to what they would do, and had every opportunity to estimate whether their bill was a revision downward or a revision upward. The minority were given only twenty-four hours' notice to work out the result of the bill. Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the representative of this House on the conference committee, when he presented the original Payne bill to the House last winter gave a detailed statement of the increases and the decreases in the Payne bill as compared with the present law, of the actual rate on each item, and of the final increase of the bill over the Dingley bill; but in presenting this report to the House, containing the final conclusions of the representatives of both Houses, he gives no information showing whether the new law will be higher or lower than the old one.

Mr. CLAYTON. Referring to the conference on account of the disagreement between the two Houses over this bill, is it not a fact that the Democratic conferees of the House were invited to stay away from that conference?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, the Republican Members of the conference committee adjourned the conference committee and went into a caucus.

A MEMBER. Were you not in a polite way told that the Democrats were not needed in the conference, and they did not want you?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

A MEMBER. And do you know what happened in that conference committee? Did not these Republicans when they held the conference committee hold hearings before that committee? A number of people appeared before them, did they not, from time to time? And were you, as a member of that conference committee, permitted to know what happened in that committee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, as I have said, we had no information of what went on in the committee at all, and we were not informed.

A MEMBER. It was only yesterday or the day before that you knew anything that they had done?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. But I have no complaint to make that those gentlemen excluded the Democrats from the committee. The country is not going to try the Republican party on the question as to how they treated the Democratic membership of this House. The real issue before the people is how they are treating the people of this country in passing this bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] That is where the verdict will be found, and I desire, as I said before, to call your attention to the fact that although the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when he brought the original Payne bill into this House informed the House as to the actual percentage of increases and decreases in every rate brought before the House, to-day we are presented a bill that no man in the country except 11 men on the conference committee had an opportunity of knowing anything about more than forty-eight hours ago. He has not presented the figures showing wherein this bill was increased and where it is decreased. They have had every opportunity to make a detailed statement, and have not done so; and they know the reason why. They know when the final estimate is made as to the rates of this bill that it will show an increase over the present law on an average of at least 2 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Eighty per cent of the items contained in the bill presented by the conference committee are the rates of the present law—the Dingley bill—unchanged in any particular. Twenty per cent of the rates have been changed. There are about 6 per cent decreases and about 14 per cent of increases in the bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In advance of our receipt of the conference report the Democratic members of the committee had reviewed the bill as it passed the Senate and the House and worked out every separate item in the bill as to the rate of duty it bore. We had worked it out on the Senate rate and on the House rate. Therefore when the conference report was presented to us we merely had to substitute the conference rate in place of the other rate to find the result. It has been worked out on the same basis as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee worked it out on his first report of the Payne bill to the House. He took the imports for the year 1907 as the basis in forming his estimates. We took the imports of 1907. We calculated the increases and decreases in the same way that he did, and we find the rates of duty levied in this bill are an increase over the Dingley bill rates of 1.71 per cent; but in making our estimate we left out of our calculations all those items that were taken from the free list in the Dingley bill and put upon the dutiable list in this bill, because we did not have any returns from the Treasury Department to show the amount of importations on these items. When they are ultimately included they will show an additional increase above our findings.

By leave of the House I shall insert in the RECORD a statement prepared under the direction of the minority members of the conference committee, showing the increases and decreases in this bill as compared with the present law. The first column contains the Dingley revenue for 1907 by schedules and the second is estimated by applying the rates of the conference bill to the imports of that year. The duties of the conference bill will be largely increased by the changed classifications of the cotton and silk schedules and the many new items of taxation introduced.

Estimated revenues of the conference tariff bill upon the Payne-Aldrich bill.

[Increase (+). Decrease (−).]

Schedule—	Dingley duties.	Conference duties.	Percentage of the latter on the former.
			Per cent.
A. Chemicals, etc	$11,186,860	$11,816,214	+ 5.63
B. Earthenware, etc	15,349,939	15,290,932	− .32
C. Metals, etc	21,811,184	20,370,396	− 6.65
D. Wood, etc	3,705,022	3,128,553	−15.53
E. Sugar, etc	60,338,523	60,335,866	− .004
F. Tobacco, etc	26,125,037	26,125,037	No change.
G. Agricultural products	19,181,888	20,454,646	+ 6.63
H. Spirits, etc	16,318,220	20,705,369	+26.88
I. Cotton, etc	14,291,026	15,835,112	+10.80
J. Flax, etc	49,900,580	49,776,276	− .24
K. Wool, etc	36,554,816	36,426,214	− .35
L. Silk, etc	20,313,706	23,458,747	+15.48
M. Pulp, paper, etc	4,136,629	4,550,492	−10.02
N. Sundries	29,896,500	26,484,490	+11.41
Total	329,109,342	331,758,344	

Increase over Dingley, $5,649,002, or increase of 1.71 per cent above the present law.

We did not include the raise in rates caused by the change of classification in the cotton schedule, but no one can deny that that change will increase the rates above our estimates. We had no Treasury Department reports on which to estimate the rates as to the items affected by the new classification, and we have not included these items in our estimate of the increases in the cotton schedule. I am sure that when the reclassifica-

tion of the items in the cotton schedule and the items taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list are included that the average rate of increase in taxation will be at least 2 per cent above the present law.

There is no responsibility resting on the Democratic party for this increase. We have stood here day in and day out, for months, ready to reduce these rates to a reasonable revenue basis. The Republican party all this time has had a majority on that side of the Chamber. They had pledged the country through their President to a revision downward in the interests of the people; and we find to-day, when the verdict is about to be written into law, that they are keeping those pledges by revising the tariff upward at least 2 per cent above the Dingley rate.

I said in the beginning that I did not believe that when the President of the United States pledged himself to a revision downward that he meant to be captious in making his pledge. I believe that he made an honest pledge and meant revision downward in the interest of the masses of the people. I want to call your attention to this fact, that notwithstanding there has been no revision downward in the main, that where they have revised it down in some items it has not been in the interests of the people, but in the interests of the great corporations of this country, or the manufacturing interests, in the main. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

They have revised downward the tariff on iron ore. Who will receive the benefit of that revision downward? It will go into the pockets of Mr. Schwab and Mr. Carnegie at the Bethlehem Iron Works, of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company in its plant at Sparrows Point, Md., and of other great corporations.

Now, do you think that revision downward on iron ore is going to be handed down to the people of this country? It takes two tons of Cuban ore to make one ton of pig iron. The reduction of the rate on those two tons of ore amounts to 50 cents, or 50 cents on a ton of pig iron. If they were willing to hand it down, and wanted to hand that 50 cents down to the ultimate consumer, how much would the man who buys a 20-pound plow receive? It would not amount to 1 cent on a 20-pound plow, if he got all that was coming to him. The same thing is true in reference to fence wire and the ordinary commodities purchased in daily life. It is true the great corporation that might buy a $3,000 boiler might receive some benefit of that reduction on iron ore; but it is so infinitesimal, when it comes down to the article purchased by the consuming masses of the people, that they will never hear of it and never know of it, and these great corporate interests are going to receive the benefit of that reduction of the tariff and not the people. And yet in estimating how much they have reduced the tariff iron ore is included.

More than that, consider the reduction on hides; you are going to exempt the boot and shoe and leather manufacturers of this country from paying $2,000,000 into the Treasury of the United States. It is one of your boasted points of revision downward. I may be mistaken, but I do not believe that there is a man in the United States who will buy his shoes one cent cheaper after this bill is passed than he does to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that $2,000,000 will go as a revision downward for the benefit of the manufacturing corporations of this country.

And so on you might go through the list.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman object to this bill because of its high duties?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. HILL. What was the rate on pig iron in the Wilson bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The rate on pig iron in the Wilson bill was $4.

Mr. HILL. What is it in this bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Two dollars and a half.

Mr. HILL. What is the rate on scrap?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The rate on scrap in the Wilson bill——

Mr. HILL. No; under this bill. It is $1, and under the Wilson bill it was $4.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have been comparing, commencing with acetic acid, the first item in the bill, and I found item after item where the rate of duty in this bill is cut in two, as compared with the Wilson bill. That occurs over and over again. In the cotton schedule some of the rates of duty were higher under the Wilson bill than they are under this, and I make the assertion now, simply based on a guess, that a comparison of these rates where the reductions have been made will show that the bulk of the reductions have brought the duties below those of the Wilson bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SABATH. In favor of the trusts, too.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am delighted that the gentleman from Connecticut has made that statement. There is no man in the United States who knows better than the gentleman from Connecticut that since the Wilson bill was put on the statute books there has been a revolution in the production of iron and steel products in this country; that what was a low rate twenty years ago is a high rate to-day, due to improved machinery and improved methods, and that what was a reduction under the Wilson bill is high now.

Mr. HILL. Is that true of the chemical schedule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not so well informed on the chemical schedule as I am on the iron and steel schedule.

Mr. HILL. I would suggest to the gentleman that there is a profitable field for him in which to work his intellect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that that is answered by the fact that you raised the chemical schedule upward instead of lowering it downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, the gentleman refers to the reduction on pig iron and the reduction on scrap. Does the gentleman know anybody in this country who makes clothes out of pig iron, or makes anything out of pig iron, except the manufacturer? Have they reduced the finished product in this bill proportionately to the rates which they have reduced on raw material? The greatest importation in the iron and steel schedule that came into this country was pig iron; it was the main competitive item, and they cut it more than anything else; and yet the conferees have raised the duty on structural steel, that is a finished product to be sold by the manufacturers and not purchased; they not only were not content with the raise made in the Senate bill, but they struck out both rates, so that it would fall into the basket clause and be raised above both—raising when they come to the finished product that the people consume and cutting down the rate when they come to the raw material, or that material which approaches raw material, that the manufacturers of this country will use; and that is how they have revised this bill downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. By the reduction from 25 to 15 per cent, does it not take the iron-ore schedule below the Dingley rate; but when you add 25 per cent ad valorem, which is provided in section 2, it really has not been cut down at all?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am coming to that. I am discussing the minimum rates in the bill. When you add the 25 per cent ad valorem to the minimum rates and arrive at the maximum rates they become extremely oppressive. Of course we all know that this is not the bill; that we are going to raise it 25 per cent ad valorem after a while, but I am basing my argument on the bill as presented to the House to-day.

Now, the distinguished gentleman from New York never presented his case to the House more lamely, with less force and with less facts behind him, than he has presented this conference report. In fact, he has been driven so far from any base to stand on that he has been compelled to go into Democratic fields for an opportunity to make his argument. He has issued a statement to the country as to the reductions and increases made in this bill. He does not give the rates of reduction and the rates of increase, but he gives to the country the number of products that are affected by the reductions and increases made, and it is very misleading.

I had some one ask me to-day if the Payne-Aldrich bill had not reduced the taxes $4,000,000,000. Now, here is what the gentleman said in making his report. He says:

> The following table shows the consumption value of articles on which the rates of duty have been increased and decreased in all cases where the amount of reduction could be ascertained.

The consumption value! Why, my friends, you might take a product where there was six hundred millions consumed in the country and only $60,000 imported. Reduce the rates of duty 1 per cent and the government taxes would be reduced $600, but the total amount of the product on which the reduction was made would be $600,000,000. The gentleman must think the American citizen is an easy mark to make such an argument. And, more than that, the gentleman is not even accurate in his figures. He states that there are $4,978,000 worth of articles affected by the decreases in his bill; he does not state how much of these commodities are produced at home and how much come in at the custom-house. The total consumption of the United States, as shown by the census of 1905, was $14,000,000,000. One billion three hundred million dollars of that was commodities that are on the free list. Of the articles enumerated in the dutiable list there are $12,780,000,000 consumed yearly in this country, but the total value of our imports for the year 1906 amounted to $1,226,562,446, and the importation of articles on which the gentleman claims to have reduced rates will not amount to one-tenth of that amount.

Of course it is refreshing to hear the chairman of the Republican Ways and Means Committee assert that of the $352,000,000 worth of coal consumed in the United States in the year 1908, the entire people of the United States have been benefited by the reduction of the duty on coal from 67 to 45 cents a ton. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] If that is so, if the people of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean have received this great benefit on the reduction of coal, then, of course, the gentleman from New York must admit that the people of the United States from one ocean to the other are being taxed 45 cents a ton on over 300,000,000 tons of coal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman another question? I do not want to interrupt him if he does not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I know the gentleman wants to be perfectly fair in regard to the matter. The largest single schedule of consumption in the United States, of course, is the metal schedule. It amounts to over three billions. That is equal to any other two schedules the gentleman will see if he will look down his list. Is not the gentleman cognizant of the fact that the greatest reductions that have been made in this tariff bill have been made in the metal schedules?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, of course, but——

Mr. HILL. Then, they have made on the largest single item of production and consumption in the United States the largest reductions.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, for the benefit of the manufacturing interests and not for the benefit of the common people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. The manufacturers do not make things to keep; they make them to sell.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I challenge the gentleman to show where the schedule is reduced in the interests of the common people in the United States.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman admits that the largest single schedule has been reduced to the largest extent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; that is true; and one of the greatest reductions in the iron and steel schedule is the reduction in the price of steel rails from $7.84 to $3.92, and when the great railroad interests of this country buy their rails cheaper than they did before this bill will be passed I suppose the gentleman from Connecticut will insist that that is in the interest of the common people.

Mr. HILL. Not at all. The gentleman will pardon me just a moment, and I will not interrupt him if he objects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I do not object.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is perfectly familiar with the metal schedule and he knows that barbed wire, which every farmer in the United States uses, has been reduced far more than steel rails.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not.

Mr. LATTA. But it is 200 per cent too high now.

Mr. HILL. I am not disputing that. I am stating what I believe to be a fact.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is it not a fact that in the metal schedule, which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has emphasized so much, the reductions in nearly every case are reductions on schedules that are already prohibitive, and therefore the lower schedule, being prohibitive, gives no relief, although it is less than the old schedule?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not say that I agree with my friend from Texas in that assertion, because, as I said a while ago, in some of the cases where the greatest importations came in they have made the greatest reductions. They have not reduced this schedule, basing their reduction on the question of importation, to balance the difference in cost at home and abroad, but the great reductions that have been made in the main in this schedule have come for the benefit of the men who were manufacturers of other products, who wanted cheaper iron and steel for their manufacturing plants and wanted to avoid paying their share of taxes. I admit that there has been a greater reduction in this bill on iron and steel than any other schedule; that it is one of the great products of consumption in this country; but I want to say to you this, that the iron and steel schedule does not bear on the backs of the people like these other schedules that they have not reduced. When you raise your revenue from iron and steel, wealth pays far more of the taxes than poverty. The man who builds a railroad or a skyscraping building pays much more for the iron and steel that goes into it than the man who is a farmer and buys a plow; but when you come to the cotton schedule, which has been raised, and to the woolen schedule, which has not been changed, they rest absolutely on the backs of the masses of the people of the United States. They could reduce the iron schedule, when the pressure from certain manufacturers forced them to do it. They could put hides on the free list, when the boot and shoe manufacturers demanded it, but when the people of the United States asked for cheaper clothes and cheaper blankets and cheaper food, not one cent of reduction is given to them in this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I said, in presenting his figures on these questions the gentleman from New York has estimated that under "sundries" the reductions affect $1,719,000,000 worth of products consumed in this country. Now, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the census of 1905 the total consumption of articles under Schedule N, sundries, amount to only $1,584,000,000. In the sundry schedule there are 55 paragraphs. There is a reduction in but 10 of those paragraphs, and yet the gentleman in his statement says the number of products of consumption that have been affected by the reductions in this schedule is over $200,000,000 more than the entire consumption of products in this schedule as shown by the census report. So when the people, if they are expected to believe this report that there has been a reduction on $4,900,000,000 worth of articles of consumption in this country, come to consider it, I advise that they look into the census reports and ascertain where the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] gets his figures.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. This $4,000,000,000 that is mentioned in the report of the majority is on the articles consumed in this country, whether produced in this country or imported from abroad.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Well, is not that an admission on their part that the tariff charges are put on the articles produced in this country for which the protection is granted?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So I just stated, I will say to my friend, that the gentleman from New York had been driven to the Democratic position to defend his bill and show that he had done something for the country. It is not necessary for us to go into detail as to the increases and decreases of all of these items, but as has already been pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], on the commodities that the people of the United States are most interested in, those that go into their homes and their everyday life, the clothes that they wear on their backs and the food that they consume, the same high rates of duty are maintained in this bill which were in the Dingley bill and in some cases they have been made higher. We have heard a great deal in the last week or ten days about the great victory that the President of the United States achieved, a great victory that he had won for the people and redeemed his pledges. We found the President of the United States fighting for a reduction of duty on five items. He was fighting for free ore. In the interest of the people? No; in the interests of the manufacturer. He was fighting for free hides. In the interest of the people? No; in the interest of the manufacturer.

He was fighting for a lower rate on gloves. Fighting for a reduction below the Dingley rates that he had been pledged to revise in the interest of the people? No; he was merely fighting that the old Dingley rate might remain, and that we would not put up the price of gloves to women and children of this country above the old Dingley rate—a great fight to redeem the pledges of the Republican party in favor of revising the tariff downward! He was fighting for a reduction in the hosiery schedule. For a reduction below the Dingley rate? No; fighting to make the conferees bring back these schedules to the rates in the Dingley bill that he was pledged to revise. And did he succeed? No. When he got through they reported a bill to this House with an increase in the hosiery schedule of 20 per cent. So what has he won in all this great fight that has been made in the interest of the people as they claim; all this great fight that has been made to redeem his pledges? He has succeeded in keeping gloves at the Dingley rate, in not letting them go more than 20 per cent above the Dingley rate on hosiery, and in giving free ore and free hides to the manufacturing interests of this country. A great victory, a great victory for the people of the United States! But during that time the President of the United States knew what was in this bill. He knew that in order to make the rate on boots and shoes proportionate with the reduction on hides that he had to force a rule through this House to make it in order. When he knew that he had to have that rule to

make that in order he knew that that same rule would make in order other things in the bill. The Dingley bill and the bill as reported to this House have a duty of 67 cents a pound on cheap blankets, the blankets that the common people buy to keep away the cold of winter. It is equal to an ad valorem rate of 165.42 per cent. One hundred and sixty-five and forty-two one-hundredths per cent of tax on the blankets that must protect them from the winter's cold; and there is but 23 per cent of wages that go into the manufacture of that blanket, and on the balance the manufacturer is protected. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Have we heard anything from the President or the Republican party about reducing the rate on blankets? I find that cheap worsted serge bears a rate of duty of 105 per cent in the woolen schedule, and worsted dress goods 101 per cent, and another grade of cheap worsted goods 127 per cent. These are worn by the plain people. When the President was making this strenuous fight to redeem his pledge, to redeem the honor of the Republican party, why did he not stand for a revision of the woolen schedule?

Mr. HILL. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman seems to bear rather hardly upon the hosiery schedule. I wish to submit as a perfectly fair proposition that under the Wilson bill common hosiery had a duty of 30 per cent, and under this bill it is 30 per cent ad valorem, precisely the same as under the Wilson bill, and the duty on fine hosiery was 50 per cent ad valorem, and here has the specific duty of 50 cents and a duty of 15 per cent. Now, then, cotton to-day is worth 12½ cents, is it not? It was worth in 1895, when the Wilson bill was in operation, 7 cents. Your Wilson bill duty of 50 per cent, if continued to the present time, would be higher than what you condemn now in the hosiery schedule.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Do you believe that the Wilson bill had anything to do with the price of cotton?

Mr. HILL. I am speaking of the duty, which was 50 per cent ad valorem under the Wilson bill; and if you apply it to the present price of cotton, your duty under your Democratic law would *be higher* than this specific duty or by ad valorem.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. We got wiped out of power because the Wilson bill was not Democratic.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no man in this House that knows better the woolen schedule as in that bill to-day than the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. And I have condemned it from start to finish.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I knew the gentleman did, and knew it was an outrage.

Mr. HILL. But, understand me, it was the way in which it was applied and not the rate, because they are absolutely dependent upon the rate on wool.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman admits it is wrong, and that it is an outrage upon the people of this country, and the gentleman is very tactful in attempting to carry me off from the woolen schedule and point out some of the inequalities of the Wilson bill.

Mr. HILL. I have not desired to take the gentleman from the woolen schedule. He made a misstatement a moment ago when he said there was no reduction. There is a reduction made on ladies' dress goods, the kind of goods that ladies in the country wear.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In the woolen schedule?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, I will tell you——

Mr. HILL. Evidently the gentleman has not read the bill he is talking about.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have read the bill and have read it carefully. I find but one reduction as reported by these conferees in this bill so far as I have examined it, and that is on wool tops.

Mr. HILL. No. They have made a reduction on cotton-wool dress goods and a 5 per cent reduction on yarn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is in the cotton schedule that the reduction is made. It is not in the woolen schedule.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it is.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I overlooked it. I congratulate the gentleman, and I congratulate the country, that in all these various items in the woolen schedule they did give somebody a reduction of 5 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CULLOP. Not a 5 per cent reduction when you add the 25 per cent in section 2. It increases it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will you answer why it is that the clothing manufacturers all over the United States are sending out cards notifying the trade that there is an advance in woolen or all clothing of 33⅓ per cent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because they know that although the woolen schedule has not been raised directly in this bill, it has been reenacted as it is in the minimum bill, and that on the 31st day of March, 1910, there will be an increase of 25 per cent ad valorem, and they know it is going to stay there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I will not spend any further time in discussing these rates.

Mr. SHARP. Is not the protection under this bill hidden in the specific duty?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Absolutely. I want to say a few words in reference to this minimum and maximum rate. I do not intend to go into it fully, because the gentleman from Missouri has already discussed the question. But, as you all understand, the bill as reported to the House, the bill we have been considering, is the minimum bill, or will be the minimum bill, on the 31st day of March, 1910. On that date the 25 per cent ad valorem increase will go on every article that comes into the United States that is on the dutiable list.

It will be a blanket clause that covers everything, and it will stay there until the President of the United States reduces it to the rates of this bill. Now, how can the President of the United States reduce these rates of duty? He has not the absolute right under this bill, when he sees proper, to reduce the rate and bring it down. Not at all. He can reduce the rate to the minimum rate only when certain conditions prevail in the country to which the rate applies. If there is any country in the world that is discriminating against the United States in its trade relations or that pays an export bounty to its own manufacturers or producers, then the President has not the power to reduce these rates. Therefore we are not putting these advances in the hands of the President of the United States to take care of, but we are putting this increased tax on the American people at the will of a foreign government. Some one to-day said that there will be no difficulty about reducing lumber to the minimum rate. It is a recognized fact, and nobody denies it, that although we have pretended to reduce the duty on rough lumber from $2 a thousand to $1.25 a thousand feet, that on the 31st day of next March, when the maximum clause of this bill goes into effect, that there will be an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent added to all articles in the bill, and on rough lumber it will amount to a duty of $3.75. How are we going to get that reduced? They say we can depend upon the good wishes and good will of Great Britain to see that Canada does not discriminate against us, and that the maximum rate will not be enforced as to lumber coming from Canada. Great Britain has no authority or the right to control the Canadian government in its domestic matters. This bill does not apply to a particular article. If Canada discriminates against us on any article, the maximum rate on lumber will remain in force. She may be willing to give us terms on lumber; but if she discriminates against us or pays an export bounty on anything at all, this increased 25 per cent rate is going to remain in force. Great Britain can not control it. It is only the Canadian government which can control the situation; and let me tell you now that the Canadian government is paying bounty upon the manufactures of iron and steel in Canada to-day, and they do not dare to take those bounties off.

If they took those bounties off or failed to continue their discriminating tariff on iron and steel, the American manufacturers would take their market. So they can not do it. They can not wipe out their bounty. And if they do not repeal their laws discriminating against iron and steel, then the maximum duty of 25 per cent ad valorem on lumber is going to stay up. The same is true as to France and Germany. Does anyone for a moment think that Germany is going to reduce her bounty on sugar that her sugar manufacturers are entirely dependent upon? It is the absolute basis of her agricultural system, and yet if she does not remove her bounty on sugar, this entire 25 per cent will stand against every product that comes into this country from Germany. That is what the American people are getting in this bill. They claim that there is a great reduction on coal—from 67 cents to 45 cents a ton. But if Canada does not stop paying her manufacturers a bounty and reduce her discriminatory rate you will not have a reduction of the difference between 67 cents and 45 cents on coal, but on coal that is laid down at $3 a ton at the seaboard—and that is a fair estimate—25 per cent ad valorem will amount to 75 cents. Add to that 45 cents, and you have got $1.20 that the people of the United States have got to pay on coal that is im-

ported into this country instead of 67 cents that they have to pay to-day.

Take shoes. They claim a great reduction on shoes. They have reduced the rate of duty from 25 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem, but they turn right around and when the maximum rate goes into effect they are going to add 25 per cent ad valorem to the duty on shoes, making it in the future 35 per cent ad valorem instead of 25 per cent.

So that there can be no doubt that there is great danger to the people of this country in the maximum tariff rate they have adopted in this bill. The danger not only lies in the fact that we have conferred on the Executive a power of this magnitude, but, more than that, it lies in the fact that the Executive has not control of the matter if some foreign government chooses to discriminate against us on some one item. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JAMES. And in case the President did have the power, which I concur with you he has not, under certain conditions, we might have another President, who might be skyward in his ideas of the tariff which even exceeds the present Executive and keep it on.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; and we are not altogether sure that this one is downward in his tendencies.

Mr. JAMES. No; we are not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not attempt to go into other details of the customs taxes provided for in section 1 of this bill. Everyone admits that they will not produce sufficient revenue to overcome the present deficit in the Treasury revenues. Before closing I desire to call to your attention a provision in the bill that the Republicans have introduced under the pretense that it is intended to raise revenue. That is the clause that lays a tax of 1 per cent on the net incomes of corporations. I know there is a sentiment among some people that is antagonistic to corporations; that in some quarters the antagonism to corporate interests is intense; but the American people are just and can not be misled by an appeal to prejudice, so I am surprised that a great political party should, under the cloak of that sentiment, attempt to put a tax on the people of the United States that is not intended primarily to raise revenue, but has for its ultimate goal the purpose of invading the rights of the States in their control of domestic corporations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Equality in taxation is justice. We will all agree to that simple principle. We will all agree that the man who has a vast amount of property receives more protection from the Government than the man who has none, and that in proportion to his wealth he receives protection from the Government, and therefore in proportion to his wealth he should pay taxes to the Government. That is the rule in the States. That is the just rule here. The Democratic party has stood for that proposition in advocating an income tax, and why? Under our system of collecting taxes at the custom-house and the internal-revenue taxes, we tax men on their living expenses. The surplus wealth of the country goes untaxed. In other words, you can divide the accumulations of any man into two classes, the consumed earnings and the unconsumed earnings. The consumed earnings he pays for his clothes, his food, his house, and his children's schooling. The unconsumed earnings go into the savings bank or are invested for the future. Now, under our system of taxation at the custom-house and as to internal-revenue taxes every man pays taxes on his consumed wealth. He pays it to the Government in internal-revenue taxes or at the custom-house, or he pays it to the manufacturing interests that are benefited by the tariff; but as to his surplus earnings, his unconsumed wealth, he pays no taxes whatever. The Democratic party, recognizing that every man should pay in proportion to what he has, proposed to exempt him on his consumed earnings, the money that the ordinary man spends in his living expenses, because he is already paying his taxes to the full amount of his living expenses, and proposed to adopt an income tax to make him pay taxes on his unconsumed wealth that the Government is protecting for him. Now that was fair, that was just. It was so just that when the Democrats in the United States Senate proposed such an amendment to this bill the Republican ranks could not stand the fire, and they broke to our standard. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They came to our proposition, that to put an income tax on the unconsumed wealth of this country was equality in taxation, and therefore just.

To defeat that proposition, to prevent that righteous verdict from being found, the President of the United States and the Republican leaders in Congress proposed this tax on the incomes of corporations—incomes that go to the poor as well as the rich; income that is consumed in living expenses as well as that which is unconsumed and hoarded.

Mr. WICKLIFFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WICKLIFFE. Suppose a corporation, which for the purpose of the question I will denominate corporation A, a holding corporation, has a net income of $5,000 derived from business, and in addition to that it owns four-fifths of the stock in a dozen other corporations, no one of which other corporations has a net income exceeding $5,000; then this holding company would receive $53,000 net income if the income of each of these 12 corporations was $5,000; and yet under the provisions of this corporation-tax law as now written it would not pay one cent of taxation on that net income. Is not that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and his illustration is a good one to show the inequalities of this proposition.

Now, here is the proposition when you analyze it. The great corporations in this country that are violating the law of the land should be regulated by the Government, but there is no prejudice in the minds of the people against the little domestic corporations in the States that are doing a legitimate business. Their charters are granted by the States. If the people of the States think these corporations are performing an unrighteous act, they have the power to revoke their charters or to regulate them; but when you reach out, as in my opinion this law is intended to do, and first make these little corporations pay a small tax, then say they must take out a federal charter when they pay that tax, and then put an additional tax on all state corporations that have not taken out a federal charter, your state control has gone to the winds; you have destroyed your control at home and you have built up the vastest power in the Federal Government that the mind of man can conceive of. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen on the Republican side of the Chamber can not deny the ultimate object of this corporation tax. They did not want it for the money that it raised, because, although they have got a deficit in the bill, they reduced the tax from 2 cents to 1 cent. The Attorney-General of the United States only a few days ago in a public speech said that this tax was the forerunner of federal control of corporations. Now, you are facing the question, Do you want the people of your State under their legislative authority to control their domestic corporations and regulate them, or do you want the power fixed in the Federal Government here in Washington, so that when a corporation goes into the State and violates every principle of honesty and decency the people of your State will have no control over it and must depend for justice on the will of the Federal Government? I think that is the whole question. I think there has been no more dangerous proposition ever presented to those people and those Representatives who believe in the sovereign power of the state government.

As to the question of the justice of the taxation, you can readily see that the great millionaire who has got hundreds of millions of dollars invested in bonds, hundreds of millions in real estate in some great city which is protected by the Government, pays no tax under this corporation-tax law he would pay under an income tax. And yet the small merchant or a dozen little fellows off in a State who have ten or twenty thousand each invested in some little corporation, the income from which they are spending in living expenses, every dollar that they are getting out of those corporations, paying taxes on it when they buy their clothes, when they buy their cigars, when they spend their money—and yet must have an additional tax placed on them because, forsooth, they have joined together under the state law for a legitimate purpose. For what purpose? Not for the purpose of raising more revenue for the Government, but to give the National Government control of domestic corporations, and that it might be used as a weapon to defeat an honest income tax that would equalize the burdens of taxation on all the people. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

An exhaustive presentation, showing labor's share or the labor cost in 177 specified industries (about 200,000 establishments and 5,470,000 wage-earners) in comparison with the Dingley tariff rates on the articles manufactured. The wages and value of products are taken from Volume 1, Special Census Reports for Manufactures, and cover the year 1905. The share of labor is a simple computation which proves itself, and the detailed tariff rates are taken from Imports and Exports, by Evans, for the year 1907.

The average tariff rate for all imports in 1907 was very nearly three times the labor cost for all industries connoted by the census of manufactures for 1905.

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods.

[Compiled and calculated from Volume 1, Special Census Reports for Manufactures.]

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
			Percent.	*Per cent.*
Agricultural implements	$25,000,659	$112,007,344	22	20
Ammunition	4,082,000	19,930,000	20	57
Caps				83
Powder				25
Fireworks				97
Automobiles	7,158,009	30,033,000	23	45
Axle grease	61,800	879,483	7	20
Babbitt metal	337,000	13,099,000	2	45
Bags, jute, etc	1,828,000	37,399,000	5	33
Bags, paper	930,171	10,086,000	9	35
Baking powder	1,041,000	19,042,000	5	20
Willow ware	1,730,000	5,187,283	33	40
Beet sugar	2,486,000	24,393,000	10	75
Belting and hose, leather	1,164,000	14,220,000	8	20
Belting and hose, linen	252,000	2,836,000	9	45
Belting and hose, rubber	1,804,000	14,954,000	12	30
Blacking	495,000	5,941,000	8	25
Bluing	77,000	678,000	11	27
Bone and lamp black	105,000	647,000	16	25
Boot and shoe cut stock	2,364,000	27,675,000	8	35
Boot and shoe uppers	102,000	549,000	18	35
Boots and shoes	69,059,000	320,107,000	21	25
Boots and shoes, rubber	8,863,000	70,035,000	12	30
Brick and tile	28,646,000	71,152,000	40	25 to 45
Brass ware	5,176,000	17,499,000	29	45
Brooms and brushes	4,380,000	21,103,000	20	40
Buttons	3,680,000	11,133,000	33	35 to 126
Carpets	13,724,000	61,586,000	22	
Axminster				66
Brussels				75
Druggets				70
For rooms				60
Felt				50
Velvet				72
Tapestry				60
Ingrain				66
Wool, Dutch				58
Part wool				50
Carriages and wagons	30,878,000	125,332,000	24	35 to 45
Chemicals	13,361,000	92,688,000	14	26
Acids				45
Tannin				126
Borax				126
Calomel				35
Sulphuric ether				241
Other ether				63
Gelatin				35
Magnesia				48
Morphine				52
Soda				33
Strychnia				51
Vanillin				323
Zinc sulphate				76
China decorating	99,000	326,000	30	
Decorated				60
Clocks	3,514,000	8,868,000	39	40 to 60
Clothing, men's	57,225,000	355,796,000	16	
40-cent goods				134
70-cent goods				118
Above				94
4-ounce goods				105
Over				104
Ready-made				76
Rubber				50
Cotton				12 to 58
Ready-made				37 to 60
Clothing, women's	51,180,000	247,661,000	26	
Wool—				
70-cent goods				105
50-cent goods				50
Over 4-ounce				155
40-cent goods				115
Flannels				143
Over 4-ounce				106 to 125
Knit				95 to 141
Plushes				95 to 141
Cloaks				80
Dolmans				80
Jackets				80
Ulsters				80
Shawls				35 to 92
Ready-made				76
Cotton—				
Sleeve linings				39 to 58
Curtains				50
Tablecloths				40
Handkerchiefs				58
Plushes				58
Garters				50
Bindings				50
Ribbons				50
Corset laces				50
Pillow shawls				45
Tidies				45
Napkins				45
Flouncings				45
Lace				50 to 60
Stockings				33 to 68
Linen—				
Handkerchiefs				37 to 60
Laces				45

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Clothing, women's—Cont'd.				
Linen—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Window curtains				62
Pile fabrics				60
Woven fabrics				26 to 56
All flax (other)				45
All hemp (other)				45
All jute (other)				45
Coffins	$4,119,000	$20,206,000	20	
Wood				35
Nickel trimmings				45
Silk trimmings				60
Plush trimmings				58
Plain iron trimmings				45
Collars and cuffs, paper	35,000	301,000	11	35
Combs	757,000	2,769,000	27	
Bone				30
Horn				30
Metal				45
Confectionery	11,699,000	87,087,000	13	40 to 60
Cooperage	2,485,000	49,424,000	19	
Barrels				30
Staves				10
Iron hoops				15 to 38
Cordage and twine	5,338,000	48,017,000	11	
Tarred				25
Hemp				25
Binding				Free.
Other twine				35
Corsets	3,600,000	14,862,000	24	
Cotton				50
Clasps				45
Covers				55
Lacings				45
Steels				45
Wire				40 to 45
Cotton goods	96,205,000	450,467,000	21	
Cloths				38 to 72
Yarns and thread				33
Average yarn and thread				33
Crochet thread				30 to 49
Bleached				27 to 72
Unbleached				19 to 74
Linings				58
Waterproof				39
Chenille				50
Tablecloths				50
Damask				40
Duck				35
Average handkerchiefs				58
Average plushes				58
Bandings				45
Beltings				45
Bindings				45
Bone casings				45
Cords				45
Garters				45
Ribbons				45
Suspenders				45
Braces				45
Tapes				45
Tubing				45
Webbing				45
Boot and shoe lacing				50
Labels				47
Lamp wicking				49
Candle wicking				49
Lace window curtains				45
Pillow shams				45
Bed sets				45
Insertings				45
Flouncings				45
Napkins				45
Nets				45
Veils				45
Ruffilings				45
Ruchings				45
Tuckings				45
Flutings				45
Quillings				45
Embroideries				45
Trimmings, all kinds				45
Braids				45
Edgings				45
Insertings				45
Galloons				45
Gorings				45
Appliquéed articles				45
Tamboured articles				45
Hemstitched articles				45
Skirtings				45
Tuckings				45
Rubber				45
7 to 18 point lace				50 to 66
Wearing apparel				60
Wearing apparel, lace				45
Ready-made clothing				50
Rubber outside garments				57
Cotton collars, cuffs				88
Corsets				50
Knit shirts				57
Knit drawers				30 to 63
Knit vests				30 to 63
Knit union suits				30 to 63

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Cotton goods—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Knit combination suits				30 to 63
All knit underwear				30 to 63
Stockings				36 to 68
Cotton waste	$494,000	$8,343,000	6	Free.
Cutlery and edge tools	7,076,000	18,614,929	38	
Penknives				40 to 94
Blades				88 to 95
Handles				88 to 95
Razors				53 to 57
Razor blades				53 to 57
Scissors				26 to 35
Swords				26 to 35
Table knives—				
Mother-of-pearl handle				75
Deerhorn handle				66
Hard-rubber handle				52
Silver handles				68
All other handles				68
Carving, kitchen, butter, and cheese knives, and forks, same as above.				
Cutlery and edge tools:				
Butcher knives—				
Mother-of-pearl handle				83
Iron handle				83
Deerhorn handle				58
Hard-rubber handle				36
Bone handle				36
Celluloid handle				36
Other materials				64
Hunting, painters', plumbers', and shoe knives same as above.				
Dyestuffs and extracts	1,264,000	10,893,000	11	
Coal tar, n. s. p. f.				30
Coal tar				20
Extracts—				
Quebracho				18
All other				44
Envelopes	1,629,000	10,222,000	16	20 to 35
Felt goods	1,356,000	8,948,000	15	95
Files	1,514,000	4,391,000	34	33 to 87
Almost ⅓ pay				87
Almost ½ pay				83
⅓ pay				33
The balance pay				81
Firearms	3,722,000	8,275,000	44	25 to 389
Fireworks	535,000	1,986,000	26	97
Flax and hemp	59,000	346,000	17	
Threads				12 to 105
Yarn				12 to 105
Cotton bags				9
Bags				26
Burlaps				32 to 40
Woven fabrics				22 to 57
Cordage				10 to 25
Twine				10 to 35
Carpets				20 to 77
Collars and cuffs				49
Netting				40 to 87
Handkerchiefs				40
Do				50
Do				55
Do				60
Laces				60
Edgings				50
Curtains				60
Wearing apparel				60
Oilcloths				25 to 47
Pile fabrics				60
Shirts				50
Tapes				40
Furniture	49,883,000	170,446,000	29	35
Furs	5,125,000	37,123,000	13	10 to 48
Glass	37,288,000	79,607,000	46	
Bottles				30 to 87
Demijohns				40 to 48
Lenses				45
Opera				45
Spectacles				45 to 108
Window				15 to 100
Crown polished				22 to 69
Plate				32 to 114
Gloves, leather	3,840,000	17,740,000	21	
Schmaschen				31 to 58
Lamb				34 to 84
Sheep				26 to 43
Kid				31 to 493
Men's—				
Schmaschen				32 to 64
Lamb				34 to 66
Sheep				11 to 81
Kid				24 to 60
All gloves				57
Glucose	1,774,000	24,566,000	7	55
Glue	1,528,000	10,034,000	15	20 to 34
Fish				29 to 42
Grease and tallow	2,114,000	18,814,000	10	
Grease				20
Tallow				10
Grindstones	274,000	788,000	34	10

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
			Percent.	*Per cent.*
Hairwork	$334,000	$1,782,000	18	25
Hammocks	91,000	446,000	20	45
Hardware	14,580,000	45,770,000	31	
Steel saw plates				55
Wire rods				19
Wire, round				41
Manufactures				40
Hat wire				45 to 51
Wire rope				50
Axles				20
Anchors				40
Anvils				29
Bolts				29
Buckles				65
Cards				57
Castings				15
Chain				49
Cutlery				28 to 75
Files				89
Firearms				78
Forgings				45
Furnaces				38
Hammers				17
Machinery				45
Nails				6 to 48
Needles				5 to 41
Saws				29
Screws				16 to 63
Tubes				35
Wheels				57
Hats and caps:				
Wool	619,000	2,457,000	25	25 to 86
Other	17,069,000	59,941,000	28	
Fur				40
Straw, etc				35 to 50
Horseshoes	126,000	798,000	15	24
Hosiery	31,536,000	136,558,000	23	
Cotton				36 to 68
Wool				76
Silk				50
Ink:				
Printing	474,000	5,774,000	8	25
Writing	169,000	1,881,000	9	25
Iron and steel, blast	141,426,000	905,787,000	15	
Ore				16
Slag				11
Pigs				6 to 25
Wrought				30
Steel				27
Bars				16 to 30
Railway				22 to 28
Ingots				19 to 38
Hoop				10 to 62
Boiler				32 to 51
Sheet				5 to 67
Saw plates				7 to 53
Tin plates				42
Wire rods				9 to 18
Wire				9 to 58
Iron and steel bolts	3,642,000	14,687,000	24	
Bolts				28
Iron and steel nuts, washers and rivets:				
Buckles				77
Nuts				9
Rivets				14
Iron and steel forgings	3,428,000	12,110,000	28	35 to 45
Iron and steel nails	1,684,000	8,922,000	18	
Cut				20
Horse				25
Wire				6 to 8
Spikes				43
Tacks				3 to 14
Iron and steel wrought pipe	2,472,000	17,400,000	13	25 to 35
Jute and jute goods	1,917,000	9,065,000	21	45
Kaolin and ground earths	898,000	4,438,000	20	
Kaolin				36
Fuller's				18 to 35
Bauxite				25
All other				6 to 18
Labels and tags	609,000	2,462,000	24	
Cigar				20 to 35
Cotton				47
Paper				35
Lard	219,000	6,128,000	3	20
Lead	405,000	9,277,000	4	
Bars				49
Pipes				48
Shot				48
Wire				48
Glazier's				48
Sheet				48
All other				45
Leather	27,049,000	252,620,000	11	
Band				20
Calfskins				20
Pianoforte				35
Cut leather				35
Upper				20
Patent				28 to 36
All other				20
Gloves				29 to 81
Harness				45

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Leather—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Shoe laces				39
Other manufactures				35
Lime and cement	$15,301,540	$54,788,000	29	
Lime				20
Cement				20 to 25
Liquors, distilled	2,657,000	131,269,000	2	
Alcohol				803
Brandy				59 to 238
Gin				172 to 204
Compounds				99 to 118
Cordials				79 to 113
Liquors, malt	34,542,000	298,358,000	11	
Bottles				42
Kegs				68
Malt				38
Extract				38 to 52
Liquors, vinous	1,001,000	11,097,000	9	
Champagne				42 to 62
Still				24 to 78
Vermuth				66
Ginger wine				38 to 45
Lithographing	8,198,000	25,245,000	32	15 to 40
Looking glass and picture frames	3,314,000	13,269,000	24	45 to 60
Lumber and timber products	183,021,000	580,022,000	31	
Unmanufactured				20
Ties				20
Round				5
Hewn				5
Sawed boards				5 to 12
Lumber, planing mills, sash and doors, planed	50,713,000	247,441,000	20	17 to 23
Malt	1,456,000	30,288,000	4	
Extract				38
Fluid				33 to 52
Solid				40
Mantels	56,000	233,000	28	
Slate				20
Marble				50
Iron				45
Marble and stone	25,092,000	63,059,000	39	
Sawed				54 to 80
Rough				42
Tiles				10 to 52
Cubes				38 to 93
Other				50
Burrstones				15
Freestone				50
Granite				50
Sandstone				50
Limestone				50
Matches	1,100,000	5,646,000	19	24 to 31
Mats and matting	249,000	1,242,000	20	
Cocoa				21
Fancy				36
Floor mats				36 to 73
Hemp				71
Flax				71
Wool				50
Cotton				50
Mineral waters	5,487,000	30,261,000	18	33 to 123
Mirrors	1,374,000	7,605,000	18	
144 inches				45
Exceeding				54
Monuments:				
Tombstones	8,213,000	25,688,000	31	
Hewn stone				50
Dressed				50
Iron				45
Marble				50
Mucilage and paste	237,000	3,556,000	6	20
Musical instruments	19,689,000	69,573,000	28	45
Needles, pins, hooks and eyes	1,595,000	4,750,000	33	
Pins				25 to 35
Needles				25 to 41
Hooks and eyes				42
Nets and seines	243,000	1,724,000	14	
Spangled				60
Cotton				50
Flax, etc				50 to 60
Gill				40 to 118
Oil:				
Castor	22,000	642,000	3	35
Essential	69,000	1,464,000	5	25
Linseed	785,000	27,577,000	2.8	49
All other	729,000	22,127,000	3.2	2 to 98
Oilcloth and linoleum	1,719,000	10,388,000	16	25 to 96
Optical goods	1,923,000	6,116,000	31	
Spectacles				50 to 96
Opera glasses				45
Lenses				45
Watch dials				40
Paints	5,063,000	67,277,000	7.3	
Unmanufactured				20
Manufactured				54
Blacks				25
Blanc fixe				44
Satin white				44
Blues				27 to 40
Browns				30
Chromes				29
Crayons				30
Litharge				57

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Paints—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Orange mineral				58
Red lead				56
White lead				46
Ochers				9 to 83
Siennas				8 to 24
Umbers				18 to 31
Paris green				15
London purple				15
Venetian red				20
Vermilion red				20
Whiting				35
Paris white				35
Zinc oxide				15 to 16
Sulphide of zinc				39
All other				30
Paper and wood pulp	$32,019,000	$188,715,000	17	
Paper				20
Books				22
Copying				35
Playing cards				138
Stereotype				46
Filtering				40
Photographic				19 to 30
Printing				15 to 18
Sheathing				10
Parchment				21
Surface-coated				35 to 44
Writing				26 to 38
All other				25
Boxes				45
Papier-maché				35
Paper goods, n. s. p. f	3,712,000	22,159,000	16	25
Patent medicines and compounds	4,351,000	74,520,000	5.8	
With alcohol				62
Without alcohol				25
All other				25
Paving materials	952,000	5,032,000	18	
Brick				25
Vitrified				45
Hewn stone				50
Asphaltum				20
Marble paving				54
Marble slabs				10
Onyx tiles				40 to 107
Pencils, lead	1,059,000	4,425,000	23	10 to 40
Pens, gold	225,000	692,000	32	25
Steel	204,000	473,000	43	47
Stylographic and fountain (new rate)	307,000	2,082,000	14	30
Perfumery and cosmetics (new rate higher)	768,000	11,132,000	6.8	77 to 331
Petroleum refining	9,989,000	175,005,006	5.7	
Crude				98
Crude and refined				6 to 40
Phonographs and graphophones (new)	1,683,000	10,237,000	16	45
Photographic apparatus, lenses	872,000	3,479,000	25	45
Photographic materials	923,000	9,543,000	9	
Paper				19 to 30
Plates				25
Pickles, preserves, and sauces	3,068,000	29,696,000	10	
Pickles				40
Sauces				40
Preserves				20 to 87
Pipes, tobacco	830,000	2,834,000	29	53 to 60
Plumbers' supplies	5,996,000	21,542,000	27	
Knives				52 to 97
Lead				45
Iron pipes				31
All iron				45
Pocketbooks	796,000	3,767,000	21	35
Pottery	25,177,000	64,200,000	39	25 to 60
Printing and publishing:				
Book and job	48,720,000	182,611,000	26	
Music	340,000	4,147,001	11	
Newspaper	59,824,000	309,327,000	16	
Books				25
Copying				25
Cards				138
Envelopes				20 to 35
Lithographic labels				15 to 40
Photographic paper				19 to 30
Printing paper				15 to 30
Book paper				15 to 30
Surface coated				21 to 44
Writing				26 to 38
Drawing				26 to 38
Tablets				26 to 38
Typewriter				26 to 38
All other paper				25
Fancy boxes				45
General tariff				35
Machinery				45
Types, new				25
Type metal				21
Pumps, not steam	718,000	2,852,000	21	
Wood				25
Iron				35 to 45
Rice	640,000	16,296,000	3.9	
Cleaned				62
Uncleaned				47
Paddy				18
Flour				15

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
			Percent.	*Per cent.*
Roofing materials	$4,007,000	$19,870,000	20	
Slate				20
Felt				10
Pitch				20
Shingles				13
Rubber and elastics	9,412,000	62,995,000	14	
Gutta-percha				35
Elasticon				20
Substitutes				20
Vulcanized				35
Manufactures				30
Rules	54,000	248,000	21	
Wood				15 to 35
Ivory				35
Saddlery and harness	7,634,000	42,054,000	18	
Saddles				45
Harness				45
Bridles				45
Salt	2,066,000	9,437,000	21	
Bags				36
Bulk				90
Saws	2,707,000	9,819,000	27	
Crosscut				18
Circular				25
Mill				36
Pit				25
Drag				25
Band				37
Hand				30
Back				30
Screws, wood	556,000	2,133,000	26	16 to 54
Shirts	11,233,000	50,971,000	22	
Cotton shirts				45
Knit shirts				30 to 62
Shirtings				12 to 60
Linen shirts				45
Wool shirts, knit				96 to 133
Flannel shirts				88 to 123
Shoddy	834,000	8,406,000	10	98
Silk and silk goods	26,767,000	133,288,000	20	
Part manufactured				80
Sewing silk				30
Spun silk				30 to 40
Velvets				60
Velvet ribbons				60
Plush ribbons				60
Chenilles				60
All other ribbons				50
Plushes				50 to 75
Pile fabrics				50 to 60
Webbings				45
Gorings				45
Suspenders				45
Braces				45
Beltings				45
Braids				45
Bindings				45
Galloons				45
Fringes				45
Cords				45
Tassels				45
Bone casings				50
Cords and tassels				50
Garters				50
Tubings				50
Webbings				50
Hat bands				50
Buttons				50
⅛-ounce fabrics				67
All other				50
1⅛-ounce fabrics				6
Boiled off				54
Dyed				59
All other				50
8-ounce fabrics				78
20 to 30 per cent silk				56
30 to 45 per cent silk				67
More				78
Dyed in piece				55
20 to 30 per cent silk				52
30 to 45 per cent silk				51
Printed				87
Dyed in thread				54
30 to 45 per cent silk				55
More				54
Woven in piece—				
30 per cent silk				67
45 per cent silk				53
More				53
All not less				50
Jacquards				50
Handkerchiefs				50
Not hemmed—				
1⅛-ounce				59
Dyed				61
8-ounce				77
Dyed				99
Hemstitched—				
Boiled off				63
Dyed				53
Dyed in thread				83
Laces				50
Neck rufflings				50
Ruchings				50

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
			Percent.	*Per cent.*
Silk and silk goods—Cont'd.				
Nettings				50
Veilings				50
Tamboured				60
Appliquéed				60
Chiffons				60
Insertings				60
Flouncings				60
Embroideries				60
Ornamented				60
Knit silks				60
Wearing apparel				60
All other				50
Silversmithing and silverware	$5,265,000	$20,700,000	24	
Gold thread				25
Silver thread				25
Silver laces				60
Silver embroidery				60
Silver braids				60
Galloons				60
Trimmings				60
Leaf				141
Manufactures				35
Silver manufactures				45
Slaughtering and meat packing, wholesale	37,000,000	$81,757,000	4.6	
Bacon				23
Hams				23
Beef				18
Mutton				23
Pork				13
Veal				16
All other				10 to 25
Fluid extract				21
All other				18
Poultry				23
Game				20
Frog legs				36
Lard				20
Tallow				10
Smelting and refining:				
Copper	10,827,000	240,780,000	4.4	
Ore		4,492,073		Free.
Matte		2,369,450		Free.
Regulus		32,455		Free.
Old		1,232,461		Free.
Plates, etc		38,007,328		Free.
Total free copper		46,233,747		
Manufactures—				
Rolled plates				4
Braziers				4
Sheathing				12
Wire				48
Manufactures				45
Lead	5,374,000	185,826,000	2.8	
Ore				78
Bullion				70
Pigs				47
Old				49
Pipes				48
Sheets				48
Shot				48
Glaziers				48
Wire				48
Other				45
Zinc	3,856,000	24,791,000	15	
Calamine ore		784,303		Free.
Other				20
Pigs				18
Smelting and refining zinc:				
Old				31
Sheets				28
Manufactures				45
Soap and candles	5,056,000	72,161,000	7	
Castile				18
Fancy				34
Other				20
Wax candles				25
Other				20
Sporting goods	1,641,000	7,032,000	23	
Muskets, muzzle-loading				25
Rifles, muzzle-loading				35
Revolving pistols				50
Breech-loading shotguns				45 to 57
Double-barrel shotguns				44
Other				50
Gunpowder				7 to 21
Starch	856,000	8,082,000	9	
Potato				69
Other				45
Stationery	1,499,000	8,867,000	16	
Pencils				40
Slate				35
All other pencils				50
Penholder tips				25
Pens, metallic				47
Pens, gold				25
Writing paper				26 to 38
Other paper				25
Fancy boxes				45
Papier-maché				35
Inkstands				45
Envelopes				20 to 35
Copying				25 to 46

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Stationery—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Parchment				21 to 30
Albums				35
Embossed paper				38
Blank books				25
Children's books				22
Playing cards				138
Sheathing paper				10
Wall paper				35
Ink				25
Stereotyping and electrotyping	$1,993,000	$5,005,000	39	
Plates				25
Paper				19 to 46
Straw goods	42,000	186,000	22	
Braids				15 to 20
Bonnets				35
Hats				35
Trimmed				50
Flax straw				38
Mattings				36 to 73
Other manufactures				30
Structural iron work	19,760,000	90,944,000	21	
Beams				36
Girders				36
Joists				36
Angles				36
Channels				36
Posts				36
Columns				36
Parts of				36
Building forms				36
Structural shapes				36
Sugar and molasses refining	7,575,000	277,285,000	2.7	
Sugar				64
Molasses				22
Total sugar imported [a]		85,355,929		61
(Duty $52,440,228.)				
Sugar and molasses				61
Tin and terne plate	2,383,000	35,283,000	6.7	
Manufactures				45
Plates				42 to 46
Taggers' tin				42 to 46
Tin imported by Standard Oil and other trusts, rebate 99 per cent on exports.				
Tinware, coppersmithing, and sheet-iron working	20,608,000	97,974,000	21	
Tin				45
Copper				45
Sheet iron				60
Tools	6,048,000	20,407,000	29	
Track				17
Other				45
Substitutes				17 to 34
Anvils				30
Files				33 to 83
Saws				17 to 37
Toys	1,614,000	5,577,000	28	55
Trunks and valises	4,139,000	18,643,000	22	
Leather				35 to 45
Turpentine and rosin	8,382,000	23,937,000	35	
Rosin				20
Turpentine				Free.
Umbrellas and canes	1,826,000	13,296,000	13	
Umbrellas				50
Parasols				50
Sticks				50
Canes				40
Varnishes	1,200,000	23,561,000	5.9	
Spirit				104
Other				35
Vinegar and cider	725,000	7,265,000	9.9	
Vinegar				27
Cider				5
Wall paper	1,868,000	12,636,000	14	25
Watch cases	2,170,000	8,626,000	27	50 to 60
Watch and clock materials	182,000	428,000	42	
Movements				25
Jewels				10
Marble				50
Metal				45
Wood				35
Parts of				40 to 60
Watches	6,024,000	11,866,000	50	
7 jewels				66
11 jewels				42
15 jewels				47
17 jewels				43
More				34
Cases				50 to 60
Movements				25
Dials				40
Whalebone cuttings	7,000	135,000	5.1	30
Whips	603,000	3,147,000	19	
Leather				35 to 45
Whip gut				25
Window shades	1,086,000	8,930,000	12	25 to 35
Wire	2,858,000	37,914,000	7.5	
Steel				17 to 43
Coated				12 to 58
Blued				17 to 43
Covered				40

[a] There is no free sugar.

General table showing industries, wages, production, labor's share, and tariff rates on certain goods—Continued.

Industry—Details.	Wages.	Value of product.	Labor's share.	Tariff rate.
Wire—Continued.			*Percent.*	*Per cent.*
Hat				45
Corset				45
Piano				45
Watch				45
Manufactures of				47 to 54
Wire rope				53 to 63
Fence wire				40 to 63
Wirework, wire rope, and cable	$6,099,000	$33,038,000	18	
Rope				53 to 63
Wirework				13 to 43
Cable				13 to 43
Wood carpet	268,000	801,000	33	35
Wood, turned and carved	6,031,000	20,169,000	29	
Hubs				20
Furniture				35
Wooden ware	2,357,000	8,531,000	27	35
Wool pulling	364,000	881,000	41	26 to 45
Wool scouring	397,000	1,052,000	37	35 to 149
Woolen goods	28,827,000	142,196,000	20	
Worsted goods	26,269,000	165,745,000	15	
Woolens and worsteds	55,096,000	307,941,000	14	
11-cent wool				39
12-cent wool				41
Angora goat				35
Alpaca				35
Carpet wool				26 to 35
Camel's hair				37
Rags and flocks				32
Mungo				81
Noils				50
Shoddy				98
Top waste				62
Ring waste				118
Garnetted				118
Yarn waste				46
Yarn				87 to 145
Blankets				71 to 165
Carpets				50 to 75
40-cent cloth				134
70-cent cloth				118
Above				94
Women's dress goods				70 to 155
Children's dress goods				70 to 155
Flannels				86 to 143
Knit goods				95 to 141
Plushes				95 to 141
Cloaks				80
Jackets				80
Dolmans				80
Ulsters				80
Hats				35 to 80
Shawls				92
Ready-made clothing				76
Other clothing				45 to 50
Webbings				80
Gorings				80
Suspenders				80
Braces				80
Braids				80
Beltings				80
All other				79 to 140
Zinc	614,000	2,976,000	20	
Blocks				18
Pigs				18
Old				31
Sheets				28
Manufactures				45
All industries	2,611,540,000	14,802,147,000	17	42.5
Tobacco — chewing and smoking and snuff	6,775,000	116,767,000	5.8	
Snuff				78
Chewing and smoking				151
Tobacco—cigars and cigarettes	55,864,000	214,350,000	21	
Cigars and cheroots				152
Cigarettes				146

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, all I wish is to correct a statement which I made when the bill was in the House in March. I stated that the President of the United States had said that if Congress would agree to admit sugar from the Philippine Islands coming into the United States free of duty to the amount of 300,000 tons in any one year, he would oppose further legislation on the sugar schedule; that he would go to the extreme and say that during his term in office he would use the veto power to oppose further legislation in sugar.

Through a mistake I misstated what the President intended to say; I misunderstood him. What he meant was, so far as sugar coming from the Philippine Islands into the United States was concerned, and from no other country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican and a protectionist, and it is with the greatest reluctance that I rise in my place for the purpose of expressing the reasons which actuate me in voting against the conference report on the tariff bill now pending and in favor of sending that report back to conference,

so that the true interests of the print-paper manufacturers and the print-paper consumers may be properly cared for and the dignity of this House and the importance of this legislative body preserved and not minified in the proportion of 7 to 1 in favor of the Senate. [Applause.]

It is my desire to discuss in the few minutes which are allotted to me what I conceive to be the natural results of the conference report if enacted into law upon the pulp and paper industries of the United States and the consumers of those products.

WOOD PULP.

The present tariff upon ground wood or mechanical pulp is $1.67 per ton. Leaving out of consideration for the moment the application of the proposed maximum tariff, the ground wood pulp item in the conference report is unobjectionable and similar to the provisions of both the bill as it passed the House and the Senate amendment. The tariff is nominally left at $1.67 a ton on ground wood, with the proviso, however, that it shall be admitted free of duty from any country, dependency, province, and so forth, which does not forbid or restrict in any way the exportation of pulp wood or levy any export charge upon pulp wood, wood pulp, or print paper. So far as that proviso is concerned, I certainly can not object to it, because, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said, I drafted it for the conference committee and believe it is satisfactory to all parties concerned. The result of that proviso will be that ground wood pulp will be upon the free list coming from the different Provinces of Canada, if those Provinces remove the restrictions which they now have upon the exportation of pulp wood. I say Canada, and I shall refer in the course of my remarks specifically to Canada, although the item in the bill and the proviso itself are in general language, covering all foreign countries, but in practical effect the application in each case is only to Canada and her different Provinces.

We import from the Province of Ontario large quantities of ground wood pulp. We obtain some from the Province of Quebec. Most of the pulp wood in Ontario is owned by the provincial government, and that government, under its present regulations, requires that all pulp wood which it sells shall be manufactured within the Dominion of Canada, so that, practically, the Province of Ontario to-day forbids the exportation of pulp wood to the United States, though this does not apply to the small quantities of pulp wood cut from the lands owned by individuals. The Province of Quebec owns on her public lands most of the forests suitable for pulp wood within her borders, and under the present regulations of that Province, where the right to cut pulp wood in her forests has been sold, the Province makes a stumpage charge of 65 cents a cord for the pulp wood cut, with an allowance or rebate of 25 cents per cord if the pulp wood is manufactured within the Dominion. These rates now existing will, under their own terms, soon expire, and the Quebec government is considering a change in the stumpage rates, with the likelihood, unless deterred by our legislation, of increasing the stumpage charge and also either increasing the differential between the charge for exportation and home consumption, or forbidding entirely the exportation of the pulp wood cut on the public lands of the Province. So that we are confronted with this situation: Ontario now forbids the exportation of wood pulp and Quebec makes an extra stumpage charge where the pulp wood is exported and threatens to increase that charge or forbid exportation.

The Canadian and provincial governments have reached the conclusion that possibly, if not probably, they will be justified in absolutely forbidding the exportation of a raw material to the United States, which is certainly necessary for the continuance of the paper-making industry in the United States, unless we grant concessions which, in their opinion, will be an equivalent for giving us the right to bring pulp wood from there here for use in manufacture in our mills.

So far, however, there is no controversy between the Senate and House provision, and by the conference report we will obtain wood pulp free from those Canadian Provinces which remove or do not impose restrictions on exportation of pulp wood, wood pulp, or print paper.

The wood-pulp paragraph of the conference report would be entirely satisfactory if its effect were not destroyed by the print-paper tariff and the maximum and minimum tariff clause, as reported from the conference. As the tariff bill passed the House, the maximum tariff did not apply to wood pulp, but as agreed upon in this conference report the maximum tariff will add a tariff of 25 per cent of the value of wood pulp, which value is in no case less than $20 a ton and in most cases more, so that if the maximum tariff goes into effect as against Canada, the tariff on ground wood pulp, instead of being $1.67 a ton, as it now is, will be $1.67 plus at least $5 a ton, making a tariff of at least $6.67 a ton on ground wood pulp, and under all of the provisions of the pending conference report, the maximum tariff is as sure to go into effect between Canada and this country as that God made little apples. [Applause.]

However, I will discuss that more fully in connection with the print-paper schedule.

PRINT-PAPER TARIFF.

Let me recall to you the situation. The present tariff rate on print paper is a flat rate of $6 per ton, plus any export charge which the foreign government may impose, so that print paper now coming from Canada pays $6 per ton, with a slight plus export charge on some paper coming from Quebec made from pulp wood cut on her public lands.

The tariff bill as it passed the House made the print-paper tariff $2 per ton from those Canadian Provinces which remove the restriction on the exportation of pulp wood. In other words, by the House bill we offer to make this exchange with Canada, that we will reduce our tariff to $2 a ton on print paper if she will permit the free and unlimited exportation of pulp wood from her Provinces which we need in our paper industries. If there be anything of advantage in that proposed trade, it is on our side and in our favor. It is impossible to make cheap print paper without ground wood.

The print-paper mills of the United States can not continue without an ample supply of pulp wood. The print-paper industry of the United States can not continue without obtaining spruce pulp wood from Canada. There is not sufficient pulp wood in our forests to make the ground wood pulp for cheap print paper, and it can not be found anywhere without bringing it from Canada. We have not the supply of spruce pulp wood. They have it. We have to have the finished product, which is print paper. All that Canada needs to do is to "stand pat" and say, "You have to have our spruce pulp wood in some form. You will take it in the form of paper manufactured by ourselves."

In the House bill we offered them then this trade of making the tariff on print paper $2 if they would give us pulp wood free of restriction, but if any of the Canadian Provinces should refuse to let us import from there pulp wood free of restriction the tariff on print paper as to that Province was to remain under the House bill $6 a ton. In other words, we proposed a concession to Canada of $4 a ton, not in the form of a threat or a penalty, but a concession from the existing tariff rates to each Province which would remove its restrictions upon the exportation of the raw material, which we must have for our manufacturing industries.

There is not a pulp or paper mill in the United States but knows that if Canada should to-day or to-morrow forbid the exportation of pulp wood from Canada that spruce pulp wood in the United States would increase at once 50 per cent in value and that print paper, such as newspapers are printed upon, would go at once to more than 3 cents a pound. It is true that there are two great States in this Union which would not suffer by that event. There are 35,000,000,000 feet of standing spruce in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. Twenty-one billion of the thirty-five billion are in the State of Maine, represented by the distinguished Senator upon the conference committee. Five billion of the thirty-five billion are in the State of New Hampshire. These two States have between them 26,000,000,000 of the 35,000,000,000 feet of standing spruce. Five billion feet of the remainder are in the State of New York, of which, however, more than one-half is in the state forest preserves, and under the constitution of that State can not now be sold or cut.

Mr. Speaker, I express the deliberate judgment, based upon much investigation, of one who at least is honest in his opinion, after as careful a study as I have ever been able to give to any subject, that under the provisions of the House bill no new restrictions upon the exportation of pulp wood would have been imposed by the Canadian Provinces and the existing restrictions would have been removed and that our print-paper industries would have obtained a plentiful supply of pulp wood from Canada at reasonable cost for all time.

When the bill left the House, then, it provided for the existing tariff of $6 a ton on print paper, with a proposed reduction of $4 a ton, making the tariff rate $2 per ton if the Canadian restrictions were removed. As the bill passed the Senate, it provided for increasing the present rate of $6 to $8 per ton, if the Canadian restrictions were not removed, and for a tariff of $4 a ton if they were removed.

The conference report now before us provides for a tariff on print paper of $5.75 per ton if the Canadian restrictions are not removed, and $3.75 per ton if they are removed. The House provision offered a concession of $4 per ton for the removal of the restrictions and a reduction in the rate to $2 per ton, which

about represents the difference in cost of manufacture in the two countries. The Senate amendment maintained the $4 differential, but the conference report reduced the differential to $2 per ton and raises the lowest tariff to $3.75 a ton. If the relative prices of paper should again prevail which prevailed before the panic of 1907, under normal manufacturing and consuming conditions, the Canadians could better afford to export their paper to other countries, like England and Australia, than to the United States over a tariff of $3.75 per ton; and the reduction of the present tariff rate of $6 a ton to $3.75, as proposed by the conference report, still leaves the tariff high enough to be no special inducement to the Canadian paper manufacturers.

Mr. SWASEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not unless the gentleman will secure further time for me.

Mr. SWASEY. Go on.

Mr. MANN. Under the provision of the conference report there is no inducement, unless the maximum tariff provision goes into effect, for the Canadians to take off their prohibitions or restrictions on exportation of pulp wood.

If they have statesmen in Canada—and my observation and experience has been that they have wise men, men as keen in reference to protective tariff as our best leaders on this side of the House—they will know that they hold the whip hand; that they have the pulp wood; and not having been offered concessions by this country which are fair to Canada, they will maintain for Canada her right to manufacture within her own borders her pulp wood, and then if we want it, we will pay the price which they fix upon it. So that if the maximum tariff provision is not to apply, we will obtain no concession from Canada as to pulp wood. We can not run our mills without spruce pulp wood. When two years ago the western mills went to the Province of Quebec and bought 50,000 cords of pulp wood, already piled up for sale to the eastern manufacturers, that purchase sent pulp wood skyward and added from $3 to $5 a cord to the selling price within a short time. What will be the effect if the Canadians prohibit the exportation of pulp wood? The Wisconsin mills have paid for the spruce pulp wood which they now have $11.25 a cord, because they have been compelled to go for it to Minnesota, which itself is short of a full supply. If those Wisconsin mills could obtain pulp wood from Ontario, they could continue to manufacture print paper, with their great water powers, against the world on even terms.

But what will happen if the Canadians prohibit the exportation of pulp wood? The price of pulp wood in Maine will increase. The price of pulp wood in New Hampshire will increase, and instead of this revision of the tariff having any effect toward reducing the price of print paper, the threat which is said to have been made two years ago that print paper would be increased to 3 cents a pound, or $60 a ton, will soon have become past history and print paper will be more than 3 cents a pound. And then I suspect that some gentlemen upon this side of the House, who propose to vote for imposing this tariff conference report upon the print-paper industry of the country, will regret their attitude, but they can not say they were not warned. [Applause.]

The Canadians will make more money by refusing the lower rate proposed in the conference report. Under the conference report, if Canada imposes no restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood, then the American paper mills will have an even chance in buying pulp wood, and the only difference in the cost at the mill would be the difference in the cost of transportation and delivery. In other words, in such case the American paper mills would be offered all the advantages which the Canadian paper mills would have as to obtaining a supply of pulp wood; but when it comes to selling the paper in the United States, the Canadian mills would have a disadvantage or differential against them of $3.75 per ton, the amount of the tariff. But suppose, on the other hand, the Canadian government and the provincial governments forbid the exportation of pulp wood from Canada. As the amount of spruce pulp wood in the United States has in recent years been wholly insufficient to supply the demands of the print-paper mills, the price of pulp wood in the United States would be at once greatly enhanced. We now import from Canada about one-third of our spruce pulp wood, amounting in 1907 to nearly a million cords of importations. If this importation be stopped, the demand for domestic pulp wood will greatly increase its selling price on this side of the Canadian border. In such case the increase in cost is inevitable.

It takes about a cord and a half of pulp wood to make one ton of print paper, and the increase in the cost of pulp wood under the circumstances will be much greater than the $2 a ton additional duty levied on Canadian paper. The increase in the price of pulp wood will be in the United States, but not in Canada. It will be caused by the regulations forbidding it coming across the border line, and it will be distinctly to the interest, under the terms of the conference report, of the Canadian paper mills to pay the additional $2 a ton duty on print paper if they can increase the cost of pulp wood to the American manufacturer, say, to the extent of $3 to $10 per ton on print paper. It is not unlikely that the increase in the selling price of pulp wood, under the circumstances enumerated, might almost, if not quite, double as compared with the present prices.

This increase in the price of pulp wood would not only be injurious and perhaps ruinous to the print-paper manufacturers, but it would be completely disastrous to the wood-pulp mills which make ground wood for sale.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, leaving out of consideration again for the moment the question of the maximum tariff and considering this conference report wholly upon the paragraphs relating to pulp and paper, it seems to me certain that the results of the adoption of this conference report will be to prohibit or further restrict the exportation of pulp wood from Canada and thereby cause an increased cost of wood pulp and print paper in the United States which will be far greater than the $2 a ton additional duty levied on print paper and $1.67 a ton duty levied on ground wood pulp.

The provisions of the House of $2 and $6 a ton on print paper, which were recommended by the select committee after a ten months' careful investigation, would have been effective in obtaining for the American people and paper manufacturers the opportunity to import freely from Canada pulp wood without restriction. We have assurances that the concessions which we proposed on this subject were satisfactory to the interested persons in Canada, and that our proposition of a reduction of the tariff in consideration of the right to import pulp wood from Canada would have been favorably considered by the provincial and Dominion governments. That opportunity will be thrown away if this conference report be agreed to.

MAXIMUM TARIFF.

Mr. Speaker, so far I have been referring to the ordinary provisions of the bill relating to the subjects discussed, but I now come to the question of the application of the maximum tariff to Canada and its effect upon these industries. Certainly, if a "club" be necessary, the maximum tariff is a club for Canada, as related to the paper industry. The second section of the bill, as reported by the conferees, contains a maximum and minimum tariff provision quite different from the one which passed this House originally. By the House bill it was provided that if a foreign country shall impose a higher rate of duty on our products than it does on goods from other countries, then we shall impose a higher rate of duty on her products coming here; and it was expressly provided in the House bill that there should be no increase in the tariff on ground wood pulp in any event.

The provision now reported from the conference goes way beyond the provisions of the original House bill. Among other things, it provides that the maximum tariff shall be imposed upon a foreign country if that country shall impose any export duties. That provision was not in the House bill. It was not in the bill as it passed the Senate. The words "or imposes no export duty" were inserted in conference, and I believe were inserted at the suggestion of a few paper manufacturers in order to impose the maximum tariff upon paper coming from the Province of Quebec. I do not recall any other country which to-day is imposing an export duty upon articles which come to the United States not now on the free list. So far as I know, the only place where this provision hits is on pulp and paper coming from the Province of Quebec, for it has been ruled by the courts that the 25 cents additional stumpage charge added by Quebec on pulp wood cut on the crown lands and exported to this country was in effect an export duty as to paper manufactured in Canada from pulp wood cut on the crown lands. The maximum tariff would be applied against Quebec unless that charge be removed, though it is quite likely that such charge would be removed if that were the only thing in the way.

Another provision in this maximum section is that the maximum tariff shall be imposed against a foreign country unless "such foreign country shall accord to the agricultural and manufactured and other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent," on its face a very fair proposition until you investigate the facts.

Canada has an antidumping law. We have not. We say by this proposition to Canada that unless she repeals her antidumping law, which she is not likely to do, we will impose an additional tariff on paper as a maximum tariff to the amount of 25 per cent ad valorem, or at least $8.50 on every ton of paper, and also impose a tariff of 25 per cent of the value additional on wood pulp.

The maximum-tariff provision as it passed the House expressly excepted from its operation the reciprocal arrangements

between Canada and England and between Canada and the British West India Islands and other colonies of Great Britain. Canada has reciprocal arrangements with England, and I believe she has reciprocal arrangements with some of the other British colonies, but by the provision in this conference report we say to Canada, not as a concession or as an inducement, but as a "big stick," "Unless you are so little, so ready to be browbeaten, that you will yield the advantage you have in holding the main supply of pulp wood on this continent, we will impose a maximum tariff on every pound of wood pulp and print paper, adding thereby to the other tariffs on print paper at least $8.50 per ton."

Do you think that any men with Anglo-Saxon blood in their veins are so craven as to yield before this threat? No. This is a serious proposition.

Every gentleman in this House has newspapers in his district. Probably I have a smaller number than almost any other Member of the House. When these papers find out that in our attempt to browbeat Canada we have entered upon a trade war with that country, with the advantages mainly on the Canadian side, and the result is that when the paper owners pay their bills the price of paper has increased from $2.15 a hundred pounds—about the present average rate—to $3 and perhaps $3.50 per hundred pounds, there will be some gentlemen here who will then realize the effect of the offense for which they are about to vote. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] It is all well enough to talk about "protecting" an American industry. Our proposition will in fact protect the paper manufacturers by providing them with the pulp wood with which to operate their mills, and at the same time we will provide cheap print paper, so essential to the comfort and education of the people of all classes throughout the country.

It is easy to say "put up the price of newspapers." It is easy to say that the newspapers have no rights, but certainly the readers of the papers have some rights. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is easy for some to slur and sneer at the newspaper men, who are constantly criticising us, often unjustly and unfairly, but after all they are doing a great service to the people of this country and a service which few, either of the thinking or unthinking, would be willing to part with. Attempt to abolish the newspapers! Try it once. Attempt to greatly increase the price of print paper unnecessarily! You will try it once, but you will not have an opportunity a second time. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

I saw men in this House a little more than a year ago shaking in their shoes, anxious for a chance to vote to repeal the tariff on print paper, crazy for an opportunity to vote to repeal the tariff on print paper. I went on the select committee on the subject as its chairman, and took the responsibility of making a preliminary report against that proposition at a time when a report the other way on the subject would have afforded a cheap political effect as a campaign document, and I took all the criticisms which went with my action. Some of my friends here, who at that time were urging me as chairman of that committee to bring in an early report before the last election in favor of removing the duty on print paper without obtaining any concessions from Canada, may well study what they are about to do now before voting to adopt this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the $3.75 rate in the conference report is illogical. The House made a rate of $2 per ton; the Senate fixed the rate at $4 per ton. The conferees have compromised on $3.75 per ton. It might just as well be $4. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], for whom I have the highest respect, who was the leader of the House conferees, stated this morning that they compromised on $3.75, as I understood him, because the Senate would not concede anything more. I take it, then, that in influence in the conference in deciding between $2 and $4—a difference of eight times 25 cents—the influence of the Senate conferees was equal to seven times 25 cents and the influence of the House conferees was equal to 25 cents only once. I am tired of seeing this House yield to the insistent demands of a few Senators who say they will or will not vote for a proposition according as they have their own individual and selfish ways. Let them vote as they please. It is our duty to stand by what we believe to be right for the country, and we should have equal power and influence in a conference report or elsewhere in legislation with the Senate of the United States. We have the responsibility for our actions, and I am in favor of accepting that responsibility and not cowering before the selfish demands of a few Senators. [Loud applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY].

[Mr. MALBY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to get everything I have wanted into this bill nor to keep out of it everything I did not want in it; but, taking the bill as a whole, it is broadly constructed and fairly representative of the diversified needs and industries of this vast country, with its many conflicting interests. I shall vote to agree to the conference report.

As is usual in the enactment of laws in a representative government, there have of necessity been compromises between conflicting claims. Some are complaining that their industries are not sufficiently protected to save them from a ruinous foreign competition. Importers are complaining that duties are levied on their imports so high as to enable industries to start the manufacture of similar products in our own country and thus injure their business as the importers and agents of foreign products.

Those having commodities to sell have wanted a protected market in which to sell, and those wanting to buy have wanted a free-trade market in which to buy. The time will never come when a tariff law, or any other, can fix it so that those who produce may sell for a high price and those who consume may purchase at a low price.

An analysis of this bill shows but few increases and many decreases in duties:

The following table shows the consumption value of articles on which rates of duty have been increased and decreased in all cases where amount of production can be ascertained:

Schedule—	Duty decreased.	Duty increased.
A. Chemicals, oils, paints	$433,099,846	$11,105,820
B. Earths and earthenware	128,423,732	
C. Metals, and manufactures of	1,248,200,169	11,432,255
D. Lumber	566,870,950	31,280,372
E. Sugar	300,965,953	
F. Tobacco. No change.		
G. Agricultural products	483,430,637	4,380,043
H. Wines and liquors		462,001,856
I. Cotton		41,622,024
J. Flax, hemp, jute	22,127,145	804,445
K. Wool. No statistics; no change.		
L. Silk	7,947,506	106,742,646
M. Paper and pulp	67,628,055	81,486,466
N. Sundries	1,719,428,069	101,656,598
Total	4,978,122,124	852,512,525

Of the foregoing increases the following are luxuries, being articles strictly of voluntary use:

Schedule A, chemicals, including perfumeries, pomades, and like articles	$11,105,820
Schedule H, wines and liquors	462,001,856
Schedule L, silks	106,742,646
Total	579,850,322

This leaves a balance of increases which are not on articles of luxury of $272,662,203.

In preparing this table the experts used all of the available information from the Census Office and other sources, but all of these are not sufficient to present the total consumption of either class of articles. If the total amount of consumption were available, the contrast between the amount of goods on which duties were lowered and those increased would be still more striking.

The following statement is based on a comparison of the rates in the conference report with the Dingley law:

INCREASES.

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS.

The principal increases over the present rates are as follows:

Oxalic acid from the free list to 2 cents per pound.

Liquid anhydrous ammonia from 25 per cent ad valorem to 5 cents per pound.

Manufactures of collodion increased 5 per cent.

Coca leaves increased 5 cents per pound.

Alkaloids of opium and cocaine increased 50 cents per ounce.

Fancy soaps increased from 15 cents per pound to 50 per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE B.—EARTHENWARE AND GLASSWARE.

A slight increase was made on the smaller sizes of plate glass.

SCHEDULE C.—METALS.

Structural steel, when fabricated and fitted for use, was placed in the basket clause with a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem, an increase above the present law.

There was an increase on razors, and also upon nippers and pliers, there being a specific rate with an added ad valorem in each case.

Lithographic plates were increased from 25 per cent to 50 per cent ad valorem.

Chrome metal, ferrosilicon, tungsten, and other new metals used in the manufacture of steels were put on the dutiable list at a duty not exceeding 15 per cent ad valorem. Tungsten ore was made dutiable at 10 per cent.

The duty on watches was readjusted, remaining at about the same rates as the Dingley law.

A duty of 1 cent per pound was put upon the zinc in the ore where it contains more than 20 per cent of zinc. On zinc with less than 20 per cent there is a lower rate of duty. Zinc now has a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem.

There was an added duty of one-half of 1 cent per pound upon plain bottle caps, and on decorated bottle caps the duty was increased from 45 to 55 per cent.

SCHEDULE D.—LUMBER.

The duty on shingles was increased from 30 cents per thousand to 50 cents per thousand.

A duty of 15 per cent was placed on brier wood and laurel wood for pipe makers' use, now free.

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Broom corn was taken from the free list and made dutiable at $3 per ton.

Sweetened biscuit, valued at over 15 cents per pound, was made dutiable at 50 per cent ad valorem.

Hops were increased from 12 cents per pound to 16 cents per pound.

Figs were increased from 2 cents per pound to 2½ cents per pound.

Almonds were increased from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound.

Pineapples were increased from $7 to $8 per thousand.

Chicory root, unground, was increased from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound. Chicory root, roasted or otherwise prepared, was increased from 2½ cents to 3 cents per pound.

SCHEDULE H.—LIQUORS.

Wines and liquors were increased by an additional duty equal to a 15 per cent advance upon the present duty.

SCHEDULE I.—COTTON.

This schedule was reconstructed and readjusted to bring the duties up to those collected during the first four years of the operation of the Dingley law and to the rates then collected under said law. Since that time the rates have been lowered, in some cases, from 60 to 6 per cent by court decisions. These new rates are equivalent to an addition, on the whole, of 3 per cent ad valorem increase over that collected under the present law for the year 1908.

Cotton hosiery, fashioned, valued at not more than $1 per dozen, from 50 to 70 cents per dozen pairs. More than $1 and less than $1.50 per dozen pairs, from 60 cents to 85 cents per dozen pairs. More than $1.50 and not more than $2, from 70 cents to 90 cents per dozen pairs.

The remaining rates on stockings are the same as under the present law.

SCHEDULE J.—HEMP, FLAX, AND JUTE.

Hemp increased from $20 per ton to $22.50 per ton.

Hemp, hackled, from $40 per ton to $45 per ton.

Certain high-priced laces made on the Lever or Gothrough machine increased from 60 per cent to 70 per cent.

The cheaper laces remain at the same rate as in the present law.

SCHEDULE M.—PAPER AND PULP.

Surface-coated papers, wholly or partially covered with metal, from 3 cents per pound and 20 per cent to 5 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; other surface-coated paper, from 2½ cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem to 5 cents per pound.

Lithographic prints, including post cards, cigar labels, decalcomanias, and other like articles, have been readjusted as to classification and rates. On many of these there has been an increase, while on some of them the rates remain practically the same. It is not possible at this time to state exactly the changes made.

SCHEDULE N.—SUNDRIES.

Fireworks other than firecrackers increased from 20 per cent ad valorem to 12 cents per pound.

Wearing apparel made of fur increased from 35 per cent to 50 per cent.

The jewelry paragraph has been recast with new and specific definitions, and this being an article of luxury, the duties on the higher-priced articles have been increased and on the lower priced reduced. Under the present law the duty is 60 per cent ad valorem. Under the proposed bill the duties run from 45 per cent to 85 per cent.

Pencil leads have been changed from ad valorem to specific rates, with slight increase in duty.

Moving-picture films and kindred articles are provided specifically for the first time in this law. The negatives are given a rate of 25 per cent ad valorem, and the positives a rate of 1½ cents per linear foot. Under the present law they were 20 per cent and upward.

DECREASES.

The principal reductions from the present law are as follows:

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICALS.

Boracic acid, from 5 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Chromic acid and lactic acid, from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Salicylic acid, from 10 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Tannic acid or tannin, from 50 cents to 35 cents per pound.

Gallic acid, from 10 cents to 8 cents per pound.

Tartaric acid, from 7 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Alum, from one-half of 1 cent to three-eighths of a cent per pound.

Sulphate of ammonia, now dutiable at three-tenths cent per pound, is transferred to the free list.

Argols and wine lees, from 5 cents per pound to 5 per cent ad valorem.

Cream of tartar, from 6 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Borax, from 5 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Borate of lime and other borate material, from 4 cents to 2 cents per pound.

Chloroform, from 20 cents to 10 cents per pound.

Collodion and all compounds of pyroxylin, from 50 cents to 40 cents per pound. If in sheets, etc., from 60 cents to 45 cents per pound.

Copperas, now dutiable at one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, reduced to fifteen-hundredths of 1 cent per pound.

Sulphuric ethers, reduced from 40 to 8 cents per pound.

Spirits of nitrous ether, from 25 to 20 cents per pound.

Fruit ethers, oils, or essences, from $2 to $1 per pound. All other ethers, from $1 to 50 cents per pound.

Gelatin, glue, isinglass, valued at not above 10 cents per pound, is reduced from 2½ cents per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Iodoform, from $1 to 75 cents per pound.

Licorice, all forms of, from 4½ cents per pound to 2½ cents per pound.

Cotton-seed oil and croton oil are transferred from the dutiable list to the free list.

Flaxseed, linseed, and poppy-seed oil are reduced from 20 cents to 15 cents per gallon.

Peppermint oil reduced from 50 cents to 25 cents per gallon.

Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths, if ground in oil or water, reduced from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent per pound.

Orange mineral, from 3⅝ cents to 3¼ cents per pound.

Red lead, from 2¾ to 2⅝ cents per pound.

Varnishes reduced from 35 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem. Methylated and spirit varnishes reduced from $1.32 per gallon and 35 per cent ad valorem to 35 cents per gallon and 35 per cent ad valorem.

Vermilion red, containing lead, from 5 cents per pound to 4⅞ cents per pound.

White lead, white paint, and pigment containing lead, from 2⅞ cents per pound to 2½ cents per pound.

Whiting and Paris white, ground in oil or putty, from 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Lead: Acetate of, white, from 3½ cents per pound to 3 cents per pound. Brown, gray, or yellow, from 2½ cents to 2 cents per pound. Nitrate of, from 2½ cents to 2¼ cents per pound; litharge, from 2¾ cents to 2½ cents per pound.

Bichromate and chromate of potash, from 3 cents to 2¼ cents per pound.

Chlorate of potash, from 2½ cents to 2 cents per pound.

Plasters, healing, etc., from 35 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Santonin, from $1 to 50 cents per pound.

Crystal carbonate of soda, from three-tenths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; chlorate of soda, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Hydrate of or caustic soda, from three-fourths of 1 cent to one-half of 1 cent per pound; nitrate of soda, from 2½ cents to 2 cents per pound.

Sal soda or soda crystals, not concentrated, from two-tenths of 1 cent to one-sixth of 1 cent per pound.

Soda ash, from three-eighths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; arseniate of soda, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Silicate of soda, or other alkaline silicate, from one-half of 1 cent to three-eighths of 1 cent per pound.

Sulphate of soda, or salt cake, or niter cake, from $1.25 per ton to $1 per ton.

Sponges and manufactures of, from 40 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Strychnia or strychnine, from 30 cents to 15 cents per ounce.

Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of, from $8 per ton to $6 per ton.

Vanillin, from 80 cents per ounce to 20 cents per ounce.

SCHEDULE B.—EARTHENWARE AND GLASSWARE.

Fire brick, glazed, enameled, etc., reduced from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem; brick, other than fire brick, if glazed, enameled, etc., reduced from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, from 50 cents to 30 cents per ton; if ground or calcined, from $2.25 to $1.25 per ton.

Filter tubes, from 45 per cent to 35 per cent ad valorem.

Unpolished, cylinder, crown, and common window glass, smaller glass and cheaper values, reduced one-eighth of a cent per pound.

Onyx in block, from $1.50 per cubic foot to 65 cents per cubic foot.

Marble, sawed or dressed, over 2 inches in thickness, from $1.10 to $1 per cubic foot. Slabs or paving tiles of the same containing not less than 4 superficial inches, and not more than 1 inch in thickness, from 12 to 10 cents per superficial foot; if more than 1 inch and not more than 1½ inches in thickness, from 15 to 10 cents per superficial foot; if more than 1½ inches and not more than 2 inches in thickness, from 18 cents to 12½ cents per superficial foot; if rubbed in whole or in part, from 3 cents per superficial foot, in addition, to 2 cents.

Mosaic cubes, not over 2 inches in size, from one-half to one-fourth cent; if attached to paper or other material, from 10 cents to 5 cents per superficial foot.

Granite, freestone, etc., not dressed or polished, from 12 cents to 10 cents per cubic foot.

Mica, cut or trimmed, from 12 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem; unmanufactured, from 6 cents per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem; and mica cut or trimmed, from 12 cents per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem; all the foregoing to 30 per cent ad valorem; mica plates or built-up mica, 35 per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE C.—METALS.

Iron ore, from 40 cents per ton to 15 cents per ton.

Pig iron, iron kentledge, and spiegeleisen, from $4 per ton to $2.50 per ton.

Scrap iron and steel, from $4 per ton to $1 per ton.

Bar iron, from six-tenths of 1 cent to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Round iron, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, from eight-tenths of 1 cent to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than bars, from five-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Charcoal iron, from $12 to $6 per ton.

Beams, girders, joists, angles, etc., not fabricated, from five-tenths of 1 cent to three-tenths and four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Anchors, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Iron and steel forgings, from 35 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge, from five-tenths of 1 cent to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20, from six-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 20, from eight-tenths of 1 cent to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound. Steel bands or strips, untempered, for making band saws, from 3 cents per pound to 35 per cent ad valorem; if tempered, from 6 cents per pound to 20 per cent ad valorem and 35 per cent ad valorem.

Cotton ties, from five-tenths of 1 cent per pound to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Railway bars and steel rails, from seven-twentieths of 1 cent per pound to seven-fortieths; railway fish plates, from four-tenths of 1 cent per pound to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Iron or steel sheets, valued at 3 cents per pound or less, thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, from seven-tenths to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25, from eight-tenths to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 32, from 1$\frac{1}{10}$ cents to eight-tenths cent per pound; thinner than No. 32, from 1$\frac{2}{10}$ cents to nine-tenths cent per pound; corrugated or crimped, from 1$\frac{1}{10}$ cents to eight-tenths cent per pound.

Sheets, polished, planished, or glanced, from 2 cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound; if pickled or cleaned, two-tenths of 1 cent per pound in addition.

Rolled sheets, of iron, steel, copper, nickel, etc., from 45 per cent ad valorem to 40 per cent ad valorem.

Tin plates, from 1½ cents to 1.2 cents per pound.

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, etc., valued at three-fourths of a cent per pound or less, from three-tenths of 1 cent per pound to seven-fortieths; valued above three-fourths of a cent per pound and not above 1.3 cents, from four-tenths to three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.3 cents and not above 1.8 cents, from six-tenths to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.8 cents and not above 2.2

cents, from seven-tenths to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2.2 cents and not above 3 cents, from nine-tenths to eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents, from 1.2 cents to 1.1 cents per pound; valued above four cents and not above 7 cents, from 1.3 cents to 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, from 2 cents to 1.9 cents per pound; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, from 2.4 cents to 2.3 cents per pound; valued above 13 cents and not above 16 cents per pound, from 2.8 cents to 2.7 cents per pound; valued above 16 cents and not above 24 cents per pound, from 4.7 cents to 4.6 cents per pound.

Round iron or steel wire, not smaller than No. 13 wire gauge, from 1¼ cents per pound to 1 cent per pound; smaller than No. 13, and not smaller than No. 16, from 1⅜ cents to 1¼ cents per pound; smaller than No. 16, from 2 cents to 1⅜ cents per pound.

Steel bars or rods, cold rolled, cold drawn, or cold hammered, or polished, from one-fourth cent per pound in addition to the above rates, to one-eighth of 1 cent per pound; on strips, plates, or sheets of iron or steel, other than polished, where cold rolled, etc., from 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates on plates to five-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Anvils, from seven-eighths to five-eighths of 1 cent per pound.

Axles, etc., from 1 cent to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Blacksmith's hammers and sledges, track tools, wedges, and crowbars, whether of iron or steel, from one-half to three-eighths of 1 cent per pound.

Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, from 1½ cents to 1¼ cents per pound.

Cast-iron pipe, from four-tenths of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

Cast hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Chains not less than three-fourths of an inch in diameter, from 1¼ cents to seven-eighths of a cent per pound; less than three-fourths of an inch and not less than three-eighths of an inch in diameter, from 1⅝ cents to 1¼ cents per pound; less than three-eighths and not less than five-sixteenths, from 1⅞ to 1⅝ cents per pound; less than five-sixteenths remain at 3 cents per pound. But no chains will pay less than 45 per cent ad valorem.

Lap-welded, butt-welded, seamed, or jointed iron or steel boiler tubes, etc., if not less than three-eighths of an inch in diameter, from 2 cents to 1 cent per pound; if less than three-eighths and not less than one-fourth, from 2 cents to 1¼ cents per pound; if less than one-fourth, 2 cents per pound; welded cylindrical furnaces, from 2½ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound; all other iron or steel tubes, from 35 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Table, butchering, carving, etc., knives, with pearl, shell, or ivory handles, from 16 cents each to 14 cents each; handles of deerhorn, from 12 cents each to 10 cents each; with handles of hard rubber, bone, celluloid, etc., from 5 cents each to 4 cents each; with other handles, from 1¼ cents each to 1 cent each, with the same ad valorem addition of 15 per cent: *Provided*, That none of the above shall pay at a less rate than 40 per cent ad valorem, instead of 45 in the present law.

Files, etc., 2½ inches in length and under, from 30 cents per dozen to 25 cents per dozen; over 2½ inches in length and not over 4½ inches, from 50 cents to 47½ cents per dozen; over 4½ inches in length and under 7 inches, from 75 cents to 62½ cents per dozen; 7 inches in length and over, from $1 per dozen to 77½ cents per dozen.

Cut nails, spikes, from six-tenths of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Horseshoe nails and hobnails, from 2¼ cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Wire nails, not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, from one-half of 1 cent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound; lighter than No. 16, from 1 cent to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Spikes, nuts, washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, from 1 cent to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Cut tacks, not exceeding 16 ounces to the 1,000, from 1¼ cents to five-eighths of 1 cent per 1,000; exceeding 16 ounces, from 1½ cents to three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Steel plates engraved, etc., from 25 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Rivets, from 2 cents to 1¼ cents per pound.

Crosscut saws, from 6 cents to 5 cents per foot; mill saws, from 10 cents per linear foot to 8 cents per linear foot; pit and drag saws, from 8 cents per linear foot to 6 cents per linear foot; circular saws, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem; steel band saws, from 10 cents per pound to 5 cents per pound, and 20 per cent ad valorem remaining; all other saws, reduced from 30 per cent to 25 per cent ad valorem.

Screws, more than 2 inches in length, from 4 cents to 3 cents per pound; over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches, from 6 cents to 5 cents per pound; over one-half inch and not over 1 inch, from 8½ cents to 8 cents per pound; one-half inch and less, from 12 cents to 10 cents per pound.

Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, from 1½ cents to 1¼ cents per pound; ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, from 1¼ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Aluminum, in crude form, from 8 cents to 7 cents per pound; in plates, etc., from 13 cents to 11 cents per pound.

Bronze powder, from 12 cents to 10 cents per pound.

Hooks and eyes, from 5½ cents to 4½ cents per pound, retaining the additional 15 per cent ad valorem.

Monazite sand and thorite, from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound.

Cash registers, jute manufacturing machinery, linotypes and all typesetting machines, machine tools, printing presses, sewing machines, typewriters, and all steam engines, from 45 per cent to 30 per cent ad valorem. Embroidery and certain lace-making machines and machines used for the manufacture of linen cloth, and tar and oil spreading machines used in the construction of roads, are admitted free of duty until January 1, 1912.

SCHEDULE D.—LUMBER.

Timber, from 1 cent per cubic foot to one-half cent per cubic foot.

Sawed boards, planks, etc., of whitewood, sycamore, and basswood, from $1 per thousand to 50 cents per thousand.

All other sawed lumber, from $2 per thousand to $1.25 per thousand.

DRESSED LUMBER.

If planed or finished on one side, from $2.50 per thousand to $1.75 per thousand; if planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved or planed or finished on two sides, from $3 per thousand to $2 per thousand; if planed or finished on three sides, from $3.50 to $2.37½ per thousand; if planed or finished on four sides, from $4 to $2.75 per thousand.

Paving posts, railroad ties, telephone poles, etc., from 20 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem.

Clapboards, from $1.50 a thousand to $1.25 per thousand.

Kindling wood transferred to the free list.

Laths, from 25 cents per 1,000 pieces to 20 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Fence posts, from 10 per cent ad valorem to the free list.

SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR.

Sugar, refined, from 1.95 cents to 1.90 cents per pound.

SCHEDULE G.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Cabbages, from 3 to 2 cents each.

Bacon and hams, from 5 cents per pound to 4 cents.

Fresh meat, from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Lard, from 2 cents to 1½ cents.

Tallow, from three-fourths of 1 cent per pound to one-half of 1 cent per pound.

Wool grease, from one-half of 1 cent to one-fourth of 1 cent.

Dextrin, burnt starch, etc., from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound.

Peas, green, from 40 cents per bushel to 30 cents per bushel.

All starch, except potato starch, from 1½ cents to 1 cent per pound.

Sugar beets, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem.

Salt in bags, sacks, etc., from 12 cents per hundred pounds to 11 cents per hundred pounds; in bulk, from 8 cents per hundred pounds to 7 cents per hundred pounds.

SCHEDULE J.—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE.

Single yarns, not finer than eight lea, reduced from 7 cents to 6 cents per pound.

Flax gill nettings, from 25 to 20 per cent ad valorem.

Carpets, mats, etc., from 5 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem to 4 cents per square yard and 30 per cent ad valorem, when valued not above 15 cents per square yard; if valued above 15 cents, from 10 cents per square yard and 35 per cent ad valorem to 8 cents per square yard and 30 per cent ad valorem.

Hydraulic hose, from 20 cents per pound to 15 cents per pound.

Oilcloth, including linoleum under 9 feet in width, from 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem to one bracket of 6 cents per square yard and the other bracket of 8 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem, and over 9 feet in width reduced from 20 cents per square yard and 20 per cent ad valorem to one bracket of 10 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem and the other bracket of 12 cents per square yard and 15 per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL.

On tops there was a reduction to readjust the proper relations between tops and yarns and other manufactured articles. There was also a small reduction on yarns and on cloths with a cotton warp.

SCHEDULE M.—PAPER AND PULP.

Mechanically ground wood pulp, from one-twelfth of 1 cent per pound to exemption from duty on pulp from any country not imposing export duty, etc., on certain forest products.

Printing paper, valued at not above 2¼ cents per pound, from $6 per ton to $3.75 per ton; valued above 2¼ cents a pound and not above 2½ cents a pound, from $8 per ton to $3.75 per ton.

Paper envelopes, from 35 per cent to 20 per cent.

SCHEDULE N.—SUNDRIES.

Bituminous coal, from 67 cents per ton to 45 cents per ton.

Gunpowder, valued at 20 cents and less per pound, from 4 cents per pound to 2 cents; valued over 20 cents per pound, from 6 cents per pound to 4 cents.

Matches in boxes containing not over 100 matches per box, from 8 cents to 6 cents per gross; imported otherwise than in small boxes, from 1 cent to three-fourths of 1 cent per 1,000.

Cartridges, from 35 to 30 per cent ad valorem; blasting caps, from $2.36 to $2.25 per 1,000.

Hides of cattle, from 15 per cent ad valorem to free list. Band and sole leather, from 20 per cent ad valorem to 5 per cent ad valorem. Dressed leather made from hides of cattle, from 20 per cent to 10 per cent ad valorem. Calfskins, chamois skins, goatskins, and other leather not provided for, from 20 per cent to 15 per cent ad valorem. Patent leather, weighing not over 10 pounds per dozen skins, from 30 cents per pound and 20 per cent ad valorem to 27 cents per pound and 15 per cent ad valorem; weighing over 20 pounds and not over 25 pounds, from 30 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem to 27 cents per pound and 8 per cent ad valorem; pianoforte leather, from 35 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent ad valorem; boots and shoes made from leather from hides of cattle in whole or chief value, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem; made from other leather, from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem; shoe laces, from 50 cents per gross and 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem.

Agricultural implements, plows, etc., from 20 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem, and further provision to free list from any country admitting American agricultural machinery free.

Works of art, including paintings and statuary, more than 20 years old, from 20 per cent to the free list.

The articles mentioned in the other paragraphs of the bill are rated, substantially, at the same duty as under the present law.

Mr. Speaker, up to this time I have in the main contented myself with urging my own views and the views of my constituents on this bill before the committees. For eight months I have given almost constant attention to the work that has been done in framing the bill. I attended the sessions of the Ways and Means Committee daily prior to the convening of Congress in regular session last December. I have listened to our own producers and manufacturers as well as to importers and representatives of foreign manufacturers. Each from the standpoint of the interests represented forcibly pressed their claims. I listened daily to discussion on this floor for a month. I was a constant attendant at the sessions of the Senate for seven weeks, and there listened to a discussion of the principles and schedules embodied in this legislation. During these eight months I have presented the claims of the people of my district for protective rates of duty on coal, oil, lead, zinc ore, zinc spelter, glass, cement, and other products of mine and factory, in addition to the agricultural schedule. I have laid before the committee the claims of farmers and stock raisers for maintaining a duty on hides.

I have pressed the claims of all these industries for protective duties because I believe in the policy of protecting the products of American industries and American labor against open competition with like commodities from the other countries of the world.

I have presented during these months the petitions of nearly 15,000 coal miners for a duty on coal and oil. I have urged the claims of thousands of glass workers for maintaining duties on glass. I have presented the claims of zinc miners and zinc smelters for duties on zinc ore and zinc spelter. I have sought in every honorable way to secure a full measure of protection for every industry in which the people I have the honor to represent here are interested.

Under the policy of protection there is a large zinc-smelting industry, employing large numbers of men, in my district and in the United States. The zinc-smelting industry has been created, as have thousands of other industries in our country, by imposing tariff duties on the product of foreign smelters high enough to protect the industries in this country from a ruinous competition. There is now a duty of $30 per ton on zinc spelter. It has not been below $20 per ton for fifty years and has been as high as $35 per ton. This bill makes the rate $27.50 per ton.

I doubt if there would be a glass industry in my district or in our whole country if it were not for tariff duties levied high enough to protect the glass industry in this country from foreign competition. And what is true of these industries is true of every variety of industry that is to-day to be found throughout the Union, making our whole country a very hive of industry, with a higher standard of citizenship, based upon higher wages and a higher plane of living, than is to be found anywhere else in the world, making us the greatest consumers of farm and factory products of any people.

Mr. Speaker, during these months of interesting and sometimes heated discussion my faith in the broad principles of the American policy of protection has not been shaken. If we would maintain American standards of living, we must maintain the protective policy of Hamilton, Clay, Blaine, and McKinley, as advocated by the Republican party for more than half a century.

The policy is simply this: If products are imported into the United States from foreign countries that compete with like products produced in our own country, the importer of these products is required to pay a tariff or tax into the Treasury of the United States for the privilege of entering our market with his foreign products.

It is manifestly fair that the importer of any article from a foreign country should pay a tariff for the privilege of entering our market with it. In the first place, the foreigner maintains his industry, employs his labor, pays his taxes, and supports government outside of the United States. The foreign manufacturer does not pay in any country more than one-half the wages that is paid to labor in the United States, and in some instances the wages are as low as one-tenth of the wages paid in the United States.

It is plain, therefore, that if we open our ports to a freer trade, we declare, to that extent, for the "open shop" in the United States, which will result in closing our industries or lowering our scale of wages and standard of living to the level of the countries with whose products we compete.

Mr. Speaker, this makes fifteen times we have made a general revision in our tariff since the adoption of the Constitution in 1789.

In addition to these fifteen general revisions we have tinkered with and altered our tariff laws 144 times.

In all these years every time we have lowered duties below the protection point our industries have suffered and the political party responsible has been rewarded with defeat.

I doubt if there has been a time when there was a greater necessity for the maintenance of the strict policy of protection than to-day. Heretofore we have protected our labor and industries against the cheaper labor and capital of Europe. To-day we must not only protect our markets against the products of Europe, but also against those of Asia.

Europe pays her labor from one-fourth to one-half of what we pay ours. Asia pays her labor from one-tenth to one-seventh of what we pay ours. Japan and China are waking up. They are starting new factories, with new machinery, and are beginning to make goods for the world's markets. Patent laws do not interfere with them. They have bought or leased our most modern machinery and duplicated it in their mills and factories. They have sent their young men to our schools, our mills, and factories, where they have learned all we could teach them, and have gone back to their own country to become manufacturers instead, as we had hoped, of becoming missionaries for the products of our country. Already they are sending their wares to our markets. They have established mills and factories, aided by loans and subsidies from the Government, for the manufacture of cottons, woolens, silk, cement, iron, steel, glass, brick, matches, paper, shoes, and other leather products. They are diminishing their imports from other countries and increasing their exports to other countries. In 1890 Japan's exports were nineteen millions; in 1904, one hundred and twenty millions. Our sales to Japan in 1898 were thirty-one millions, and in 1907 they increased to only forty millions. Their sales to us in 1898 amounted to twenty-five and one-half millions, and in 1907 they had increased to sixty-six millions.

They are largely supplying the markets of Korea, Manchuria, China, the Philippines, of Hawaii, of the Orient, with products from their mills and factories which we formerly sold these people from our mills and factories. The Orient, in and beyond the Pacific, has 800,000,000 of people—600,000,000 of laborers entering and ready to enter the mills, the shops, and factories to produce for the world's markets. Laborers in these industries, men and women, work ten hours for from 12 to 15 cents per day. Common machinists get 20 cents a day; the best machinists, 30 cents a day; and the most skilled artisans, men who make the finest surgical and astronomical instruments, 50 cents a day. The supply of this labor is unlimited

After a sleep of centuries, the yellow man of the Orient is awake and beginning a day of marvelous activity. The wise will watch him and protect themselves against him. We must guard our civilization against his encroachments, whether he comes with the mailed fist of the warrior, or the skilled hand of the artisan, with battle ships for war, or merchant ships for commerce. In either case he comes for conquest.

We must exclude him and protect our labor against competition with the products of his labor. Our standards and our civilization are in our keeping. We are able, if we will, to protect ourselves, and we will, Mr. Speaker.

In all these months of discussion I have heard no new arguments urged in favor of freer trade that has not been used for three-quarters of a century by opponents of the policy of protection and the advocates of free trade everywhere. Those who have spoken in behalf of the importer and of the right of foreign products to enter our markets at more favorable rates, whether they have been new recruits or old warriors against the policy of protection, have used the old weapons that have been used against protection through all the years since its establishment and maintenance in the United States.

The declaration that imposing a tariff on a foreign product imported into the United States that comes into competition with a like product produced in the United States increases the cost of the American articles to the American consumers is not true and is denied by the results that have followed the levying of duties and the creation and maintenance of industries in this country.

I have examined the Statistical Abstract of the United States from the year 1840 down to the present year, and find that the wholesale prices of the principal manufactured staple commodities entering into general use have been greatly reduced in price rather than increased, as a result of establishing industries under a protective tariff in our own country.

Let me cite a few items to illustrate: English white stone plates, 7 inches across, sold in 1870 for 8½ cents each, wholesale. In 1908 American plates of the same size and quality sold for 4½ cents each.

Tin plate, made in Wales, sold here in 1890, at wholesale, per box of 108 pounds, at $6.75; in 1908, American tin plate, same grade and quality, for $3.75.

Manchester gingham, in 1860, sold here for 16 cents per yard; in 1908, American gingham sold for 5 cents per yard. Flannels, in 1880, sold for 50 cents per yard; in 1908, for 46 per yard. Bleached sheeting, in 1880, sold at 26¼ cents per yard; in 1908, at 24½ cents per yard. Half-gallon glass pitchers, made in Belgium, sold here in 1860 for $8 per dozen, and in 1908, our own, made in protected glass factories, sold at 96 cents per dozen, and glass is one of the most highly protected industries in the United States. The price of all glass products, including window glass, has been reduced more than one-half.

Calico, in 1870, sold at 18 cents per yard; in 1908, at 5¼ cents per yard. Print cloths, in 1870, sold at 7¾ cents per yard; in 1908, at 3½ cents per yard. Women's solid-grain leather shoes, in 1870, sold, wholesale, at $1.37½ per pair, and in 1908 at 96¾ cents per pair. Sheffield knives and forks sold in 1870 at $18 per gross; American knives and forks of the same grade sold in 1908 at $5.41 per gross. Shirtings, in 1870, sold for 17 cents per yard, and in 1908 at 8¾ cents per yard.

These reductions have been made to the American consumer in the prices of these manufactured articles of general consumption by levying protective duties and establishing indus-

tries in our own country that have supplied us with these commodities, and on all these items the duties have been high and are high to-day, and yet the price of all these articles, and many others that could be named, has been cheapened under and by a protective tariff.

There has been a great deal said about the increased cost of ladies' hose. I stepped into a store this morning on the way to the Capitol and purchased two pairs—one of German manufacture and one of our own manufacture. They are of the same grade and quality. Members sitting near me here have difficulty in telling which is the German and which is the American hose. I paid 50 cents for the German hose and 35 cents for the American hose. The dealer from whom I purchased these informed me that when he began doing business in Washington thirty years ago he sold few but foreign hose, and that they ranged from 85 cents to $1.25 per pair for the same grades that I have here.

There are some who insist upon having imported articles, just as some people go far from home to trade. Those who insist on having imported articles generally pay a higher price for them than they would have to pay for the same grade of article of our own production.

For some years the general tendency of the price of farm products has been upward, and the farmer's grain, meat, poultry, dairy and vegetable products make up the larger part of the average family's cost of living.

The price of beef, pork, poultry, poultry products, and dairy products are higher than ever before in times of peace and sound money. The increased cost of living is not due to increase in the price of manufactured articles, but largely to the increase in the price of farm products.

Much has been said about the consumer.

Why, Mr. Speaker, our people are, with rare exceptions, all producers as well as consumers. Some produce farm products, some mill, some factory, and some mine products; and others transport and distribute the products of all these, who are alike producers and consumers. If the farmer must take a low price for his product, he can not pay a high price for factory and mine products, and he will not stimulate transportation and distribution and activity in industry.

If the man in the factory gets low wages and low prices for his work and for his products, he can not pay high prices for the products of the farm, the mill, and the mine; and if the miner does not have employment and good wages, he can not pay high prices for the products of the mill and factory and the farm; and when there is inactivity in all these branches of industry, transportation and distribution are dull and do not afford profitable employment and wages to those engaged in transportation and distribution; and these, in turn, are unable to buy the products of the farm, the factory, the mill, and the mine.

When we speak, therefore, of producers, we speak of all our people. When we speak of consumers, we speak of all our people. They are both producers and consumers, and each must enjoy prosperity in his industry in order that the country may prosper as a whole.

All our people must enjoy prosperity together or suffer adversity together.

There is a cheap man, a cheap home, cheap living, and a cheap country behind cheap products of labor.

I have been in countries where a suit of clothes such as were commonly worn there could be purchased for 90 cents, but men and women alike were almost naked, and children wore no clothes. It was a cheap country. Everything was cheap, but no one had anything with which to buy. Where I have seen everything the cheapest is where I have seen the people the least able to buy. Food was cheap, such as it was, but the native laboring man never sat down to what in our country we would call a "square meal."

If we supply our wants from the output of foreign mills and factories, we to that extent close our own industry and throw our own labor out of employment.

My deep concern therefore in the preparation of this bill has been to have it so framed that when the business of the country is adjusted to its provisions not one American workingman will be thrown out of employment by it. I am anxious that not even one American workingman be out of work and that every dollar of our money shall be profitably employed. Thus there will be prosperity in every field of industry and in every mart of trade.

Even the importer, for whom there has been so much solicitude in the press and elsewhere, will prosper, for those who prefer the foreign to the American article will be able to buy the imported article if they want it, whether the duty is high or low.

It is wise from time to time to revise and adjust the tariff to our growth and changed conditions, but it is not wise to depart from the strict policy of protection that guards the wages and employment of the American laborer and guarantees the activity of American industries and the well-being and prosperity of the American people.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

When shall we three meet again,
In the lightning and the rain?
When the hurly burly is done,
When the battle is lost and won.

Who are we three? Is the battle lost or won? We have been informed many times that the Democrats were not elected to make this tariff bill and should have no part or parcel in it. That has been verified by events. Thou canst not shake thy gory locks at us and say, "We did it." We three then consist, or, at least, have consisted, though we may never meet, nor consist again, of the following persons:

First, the President; genial, jolly, versatile, judge, diplomat, political pastmaster and magician in that accomplished art which molds and masters men, holding in his hands the destiny of the Republican party.

Second, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; the renowned and magical wizard of protection, confident, skillful, and daring, who controls his legislative associates absolutely at his will.

Third, our own great big gun, the mighty CANNON; self-satisfied, alert, and radiant "Uncle Joe," the scapegoat before the people for the sins of his party in the House, which are many and "red like scarlet." When he rules in triumph, acclaimed as doing good, he is no better than when denounced and accursed as doing evil. What he does, he does as the instrument and servant of his party in the House, and is absolutely blind to the complexion of the work and instruction given. It is all the same to him. He is the slave of the Republican majority, executing their orders, and he knows how. All he asks or seeks to know is what the Republican majority in the House wants. He believes that a majority made of Democrats and insurgent Republicans would be unparliamentary and unconstitutional. He can not see nor hear them. Only a Republican majority can issue orders to him, and no other sort is permitted to give expression, except in disjointed factions, generally under lock and key, widely separated in time and place, so as not to be counted by division, tellers, nor roll call.

All who vote for him in the House are responsible for him and his acts. Those who elect him constitute Cannonism. If anybody would defeat Cannonism in this country, the way to do it, whether he be insurgent, mugwump, Populist, Prohibitionist, Democrat, or anything else, and the only way to do it, is to vote against the Republican party at the polls. The progress of this bill has disclosed two other Republican "isms" quite as inimical to good government, to wit, Aldrichism and Taftism. The first is bold, bald, and outspoken, candidly demanding license to rob for the sake of robbery, and laughing at the mention of "the interest of the consumer." The latter patronizing, loud in profession and multiform in protestation, pretending to do the people good, while studiously avoiding any injury to the protected interests, will sooner or later be detected and held accountable by the people. A good, hearty, strong pull, all together, will wipe out the entire trio in the well merited and long merited defeat of the party, which will spawn and develop other obnoxious "isms" to betray, distress, and rob the people until it is wiped out of existence. The different orders of insurgents deserve passing notice. Some of them deserve well, because eight or ten at each end of the Capitol have voted right a time or two. There is considerable speculation, however, as to their probable fate, not so much at their respective homes as here. An irate Speaker may unhorse committeemen and an incensed administration may deny admission to the "pie counter" to those unauthorized insurgents who are outside the machine and ring, but what is going to be done with those administration insurgents who kick out of the traces and overturn the apple cart just when we think everything is fixed and all serene? Are insurgents near the throne, insurging in line with the views of the majority, to escape more lightly than the malefactors who lifted up unholy hands against the machine?

I want to enter a special plea in defense of my gentle, able friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who always works and talks for others, but modestly and unselfishly abstains from doing anything for himself. His guilt is mitigated by two extenuating facts—he is the ablest insurgent and capable of more damage to the machine than any of the variegated assortment of insurgents since the celebrated performance of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], who has been

the most successful and brilliant insurgent of the present generation. Yet the gentleman from Illinois has really done the machine very little harm. Consequently I resent the treatment of the gentleman from Illinois. When we were sending the bill to conference there was some levity indulged at the modest protest made by the gentleman from Illinois against the increases in rates on print paper made by the Senate bill, and his intimation not to accept a conference report approving the increase. The conferees have done worse than laugh at him. The House rate approved by him was $2. It was increased to $4. The conferees have beautifully split the difference by reducing it to $3.75, taking off one-eighth of the increase and retaining seven-eighths thereof. The Washington Post made the following statement:

Incidentally Senator HALE walked away with a brand from the burning by obtaining a duty of $3.75 on print paper. He was very happy, almost radiant, when he departed from the conference room.

He also seems to have "walked away" with the gentleman from Illinois and a good chunk of the importance of the House conferees.

The gentleman from Illinois, as chairman of the special committee, had worked a year on pulp and paper and knows more about the subject than any other man in the United States, more even than all the conferees and the President put together. His work, great knowledge, and high character should have been respected, and would have been if the principles and sensibilities of all the others had been equal to his. The news paper men will doubtless take notice that this was not a casus belli in the President's belated and limited declaration of war.

I do not agree with our leader from Missouri in his expressed opinion, that the Republicans could have won last year without professing a conversion to tariff reform, and stealing that gonfalon from the Democrats to rally patriots from their defection to help them save the election. The sequel has satisfied me that it was the coup d'état which, with their usual luck, they performed just in time to save themselves when they appeared to be hopelessly lost. The Democrats, detecting them in the act, flagrante delicto, with the stolen goods on their persons, bearing the pilfered standard so awkwardly, that in their platform the Democrats charged the theft outright, and warned the people that the Republicans had no intention to carry out their promise, and that owing to Republican affiliation with the trusts, it would be impossible for the Republicans to reform the tariff even if they so desired. In fact the Republicans were so unfamiliar with the doctrine that they could not even advocate it coherently in the campaign. They could not discuss it so as to be comprehended alike by people at both ends of the country. With that goody-goody, smiling, happy-go-lucky, catch-'em-all faculty of the President for glittering and pleasing generalities, he emphatically and repeatedly expressed the high-sounding idea that the revision wanted and promised was such as "the people needed and wanted."

The magnates of the East, regarding their own clans and favored associates as "the people," construed the revision to mean more iron-bound and tightly protected and highly elevated rates for their products above all competition, and the removal of all, even revenue-producing, duties from the material they must buy from the people, so as to give them all advantage, both in buying their material and selling their finished product, thus leaving a pillaged people entirely helpless against their unbridled exploitation and ravages. On the other hand, the mighty West, at last opening its eyes to the truth, and observing that the same benignant Dingley bill, which professed to improve the seasons, regulate the weather, and improve both crops and the prices thereof, had also increased the power of the trusts to rob by prices so altitudinous as to be out of all proportion to the advantages conferred, leaving, if possible, less margin between income and expenses than realized during hard times, complaining loudly of the gross inequalities of a system which deprived millions of the reward of toil to enrich a few, was demanding revision downward. The western folks naturally thought the President meant what "their people" needed and wanted, so that like the double-faced shield about which the two knights, looking from opposite sides, disputed, the promise conveyed a different significance to the different parts of the country. The western people do not yet share the doubts this week accredited by the public press to the President, as to whether low tariff would operate in favor of low prices to the people. That is elementary and sufficiently answered by the fact that the protectionists are so insistent upon high rates. If they did not carry the power to raise prices, they would not be forced upon us. Later on I will refer to some compensatory concessions made in consideration and return for securing the President's demands, which would hardly have proven so effective in suppressing opposition if tariff duties had no effect on prices. Meantime while the two knights were fighting, aided by their followers, as to what promise was written, the standpatters said the tariff needed no revision, and they would make none, and they did not make much. This extra session will live in the history of legislation and the Republican party as most masterly in the successful exploit of preventing all reforms while promising the people every reform. Its history will stimulate patriots to administer the proper punishment to the majority for its flagitious conduct in murdering a glorious opportunity for tariff reform while again deluding a confiding people whom their policies have so long and so outrageously robbed. Of course the 6,000,000 people who voted against the dominant party are not deceived. They expected nothing and got exactly what they expected. Have the labored efforts of the President and his party leaders to prevent tariff reform while pretending to bring it about deceived the good men in their own party? The public press does not so indicate. The conference report will not be the end, but really the beginning, of new, more earnest, more powerful, and overwhelming tariff agitation. The conference report goes beyond all precedents, violating decency and morality in its wanton, unparalleled, unnecessary, and uncalled-for knavery. Even the inordinate rapacity of insatiate greed has in some instances repudiated benefits offered unasked in that bill. They have read about "killing the goose that laid the golden egg." The distinguished authors of this production evidently believe that the goose is immortal. This bill will not satisfy the honest toiling masses. It will increase the prices the people pay for necessaries. It will not put sufficient money in the Treasury, and it will unjustly transfer from the pockets of the people billions to the coffers of greed. The fraudulent, contemptible spawn of hypocrisy and instrument of robbery will soon arouse the people to renew the demand for reform. If any man imagines it will bring long quiet, he deceives himself.

If damming up the Mississippi until it inundates the valley for 500 miles wide, 500 feet deep, and a thousand miles back upstream and then breaking the dam would dry up that Father of Waters and promote the safety and prosperity of the people in the valley, then the adoption of the report of the conferees will put an end to tariff reform agitation and make the people rich and happy under the ruthless exploitation of protection favorites. The long-protracted effort to line up Republican tariff reformers so as to prevent them from cooperating with Democrats and effecting actual tariff reform has been a remarkable one, but not surprising to those acquainted with the history of Republican politics. From the beginning of the extra session the all-absorbing effort has been to pass a new tariff bill satisfactory to the people without making any improvements, not slighting any possible opportunity to make it a little worse. The House did the worst it could, and from the newspaper discussions and the talk of some Members, seems to have succeeded in fooling the people. Intoxicated with that success, the Republicans in another place went further and presented the spectacle of the Republican party fooling itself. It was absolutely necessary to prevent Republicans from voting for the income tax and against the Aldrich bill, for special legislation to pile up fortunes by protective rates of duty would be rendered nugatory if those fortunes were to be tapped and reduced by an income tax; and it would never do for it to go to the country that Republican statesmen had voted against the bill, for western Republicans, long deluded by Republican leaders and from unfounded prejudice, deaf to Democratic appeals, would listen to the truth falling from Republican lips in explanation of their votes against an iniquitous bill which their eloquence and logic had torn into a thousand shreds. So the deformed and mutilated remains of a corporation-tax suggestion was held up to divert attention from the righteous levy of a fair income tax and seduce right-minded Republicans to abandon its support. The effort succeeded. All honest Republicans were not fooled, but enough were seduced to effect the purpose.

The performances of the President and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] are truly remarkable, and they expect, no doubt, to take to themselves great glory for saving their party and serving their country "by procuring the best bill possible under the circumstances." The trouble with the gentleman from New York was that he pitched his line of battle so near the known position of the enemy that the two forces occupied substantially the same ground, and left no room for the contending armies to maneuver and struggle against each other. About the only chance for a "rucas," so much admired by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], was to foment rows among the different varieties of insurgents, which made a diversion of attention from the impotency of the alleged battle while "adding to the gayety of nations." After the Senate and House bills had laid the lines of battle in such proximity and confounded confusion, the warfare was, in fact, entirely insur-

rectionary, almost guerrilla-like in character, being more fighting of factions in the respective camps than war between the two armies. Often combatants on one part of the field would suddenly reverse positions on another matter and fight just as ferociously for an opposite principle. Furious champions of free lumber would in the twinkling of an eye transfer their patriotism to advocating a duty on hides. Those demanding free iron ore would most viciously insist on protection for pulp and paper; free-coal advocates saw ruin unless oil was protected.

The plumed knight, the very flower of reform chivalry, acclaimed as the President's right arm, wanted more protection for gloves and hosiery, and knocking out that contention was the President's only real victory.

The uninitiated could better understand the extraordinary performances if they would study the game called "Snatch from the grab bag." Some light on the subject might be secured by noting the methods by which the President's celebrated sine qua non demands were secured. It is true the element of dickering and bargaining may somewhat dim the resplendent glory of his alleged immortal victory, but that is not my fault. I do not believe in making tariff bills that way. An examination of the conference report will confirm the observations made in the following extracts from the Washington Post:

On lumber some concessions were made, in spite of the fact that the President's instructions were complied with to the letter. Rough lumber was made dutiable at $1.25 per 1,000 feet; finished on one side, $1.75; finished on two sides, or one side planed and tongued and grooved, $2.15; finished on three sides, $2.52½; and finished on four sides, $2.90.

CONCILIATORY RATE ADOPTED.

To conciliate Senators PILES and JONES the conferees adopted the Senate rate of 50 cents a thousand on shingles, instead of the House rate of 30 cents.

It was in order to obtain the support of Senator HEYBURN, the industries of whose State had been assailed through the abolition of the duty on hides, the reduction in the duty on lumber, and the reduction in the differentials on pig lead in bars, that the latter schedule was reconsidered.

In view of the action of the conferees in putting hides on the free list, a concession also was made to the cattle industry by taking tallow off the free list, where it had been placed by the conferees, and restoring it to the dutiable list.

Tallow had been put on the free list by the House, but the action of the conferees makes it dutiable at 1½ cents per pound.

Senators BORAH and HEYBURN of Idaho, JONES and PILES of Washington, and BOURNE of Oregon during the afternoon held a conference on the lumber question. Shortly after 4 o'clock the five Senators emerged, and Senator BORAH went to the conference room and told Senator ALDRICH that he and his conferees on the lumber paragraph had decided to yield to the President's wishes and accept $1.25 a thousand on rough lumber.

Now you begin to realize what a truly remarkable victory that was. Every demand of the President secured at all, except, possibly, gloves, which were left too high, were in the interest of the trusts and against the people. Some of them are worse than they were in the Dingley bill, and all of them secured were paid for at the high and indecent price of allowing the trusts to pillage the people on other subjects. It was a fine trade to secure profits for some of the trusts and then pay for the so-called "concession" by conferring additional opportunities for exploitation upon other trusts. That is the truth, pure and simple, of the President's great victory.

Our Democratic leader, in discussing the Payne bill, pictured the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] in his true color, as bluntly and candidly, without any hypocrisy or concealment, trying to exclude all foreign competition. He is more to be respected for his consistency and direct method than those who deny their purpose and try to delude. Our leader at the same time described the eminent gentleman from Pennsylvania, the versatile and resourceful Mr. DALZELL, as "inactive and indifferent" in constructing the Payne bill. That is not surprising. He knows the "difference between tweedle dum and tweedle dee," and is too smart a lawyer to worry the court about it when he sees the court going his way. I think, however, that our leader exaggerated the credit due the gentleman from Michigan as having alone impressed the protective character on the Payne bill. With so many other Republican colleagues he could not have done that alone, even if aided by the masterly inactivity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The trouble with the President is, that if he really meant reform he began too late to put forth his efforts and then demanded too little, and was too easily satisfied, and paid too much for it, and paid the wrong parties. He should have plainly told Congress when convened in extra session either to reform the tariff by reducing the rates in the main schedules of the bill at least low enough to admit of competition, if not to the revenue point. Or if he preferred the other brand of revision, he should have plainly told them to elevate the rate so as to shut out competition, cripple our commerce, impoverish the people, enrich a few favorites, and then find other methods to raise money to supply the Treasury. I would not do him an injustice. Personally I like him. He has done me some kindnesses and I feel kindly to him. I believe he is doing as well as any Republican would do. I want to give him just credit for all that is due him, for he will need it all and some grace besides before he hears the last of this legislation. He kept as quiet as a mouse, like a Sphinx, when he said anything at all, according to the newspapers, giving forth utterances as ambiguous as any oracle ever delivered, until both bills had been passed, when he knew that it would be insisted under parliamentary rules that nothing could then be done except adjust the differences between the two bills. Even then he could have demanded that all decreases in both bills be accepted and all increases in both bills rejected, thus securing the best possible results out of the situation, and he could have in some measure secured atonement for the defects and vicious features of the bill by demanding the substitution of an honest and just income tax for the subterfuge and makeshift known as the "corporation tax," which was entirely permissible under the rules by agreeing to that with an amendment substantially changing its character.

But the parliamentary difficulty was a convenience, conjured up for use because it was needed, but having served its purpose the conferees have now surmounted that trouble because they desired to do so by bringing in a rule to authorize reductions in the leather schedule. "Where there is a will there is a way." They seem likewise to have encountered no difficulty in finding a way to tallow up the hide States, as that grease seemed to be convenient, and to solder up the lead, iron, and lumber States, when necessary to trade for securing the President's great victory on his demands. The cohesive power of public plunder has proven to be the most stickable thing on the face of the earth to prevent and heal breaches in the Republican ranks.

But instead of pursuing such beneficent course he deliberately sanctioned the sham battle over matters of minor importance, to which Republican leaders had limited consideration from the outset, and through the entire discussion since he enlisted in the fray it has been sought to delude the people by giving out the impression that the excellence or demerits of the bill would depend on the action secured as to those few relatively insignificant items which were gotten up solely for diversion from the main issues and about which everybody was encouraged to talk ad libitum for that purpose, and instead of talking about the honest and constitutional purposes and warrants of taxation the argument has resounded from day to day about the pledges of the party and the benevolent purposes of the administration, and the discussion of the details has abounded with talk about particular interests and what they demanded and what they conceded.

There are several main schedules in the bill—for instance, the cotton and woolen, the iron and steel, and chemical—that affect the people in all their domestic concerns. They can do nothing without paying the exorbitant tax placed upon the highly protected articles in those schedules. If the farmers in the West and in the South and the merchants and artisans and lawyers and drummers and preachers and doctors and everybody in this country who honestly work for a living will figure up what they wear on their persons and use in their families and on their farms and about their premises and in their business, they will find that they are held up for such an enormous per cent that they would resent as an insult discussion of any of the five items about which the President and the Republican leaders make such a parade. Those schedules provide for several billion dollars of unadulterated graft by taking from the pockets of the consumer and paying it to the protected interests. Instead of improving those Dingley schedules by judicious reduction by which plenty of revenue would go to the Treasury and billions be saved to the people, both bills actually made them worse. To divert attention from them, a mock fight was instituted and encouraged on those items—lumber, hides, coal, and iron ore. They are, to a certain extent, important. If lumber were free, a few people near the border and near navigable waters could buy lumber more cheaply, while western and southern lumber would not be able to compete in the markets quite so far north and east. Rough lumber brings in good revenue and has carried nothing but a revenue rate.

The Republican idea adhered to in the conference report is to reduce the rates on rough lumber and carry a high duty on dressed lumber so as to exclude the output of foreign planing mills from competition; but the aggregate duty on dressed lumber would be just as great as that insisted upon by anybody who wants to collect the duty out of rough lumber for which nobody has asked anything more than a revenue rate, but would go to the pockets of favorites instead of into the Treasury. It is true that all lumber ought to be free, not for the benefit of any local or private interest. Neither should it be dutiable for that reason, but it is an article of prime necessity and general

use such as ought to be on the free list, and I have always so voted, but I repudiate and scorn the discriminating scheme borrowed from New England of putting rough lumber only on the free list which requires six operations of the ax and saw to make a plank, and then placing the full aggregate $2 rate on the finished work of the planing mill, which runs four lines only to match a plank and dress it on both sides. That scheme was insisted upon in this House by the gentleman from Minnesota, and for voting against it Members were slandered over the country with the false accusation of voting against free lumber and against the Democratic platform. Such accusers forget that the gentleman from Minnesota is not a Democratic leader, but is one of the stanchest and mightiest leaders of the Republican party in this House, and that he was in fact selected and appealed to in dire extremity of his party's demoralization in the House to bring order out of chaos, and to persuade the discordant Republican factions to pass the Payne bill through the House.

The man who pronounces it un-Democratic to refuse to follow him is a poor judge of a Democrat. If the ultimate tax on finished lumber is to be $2 or $2.90, as fixed by the conference report, instead of being admitted free, let the entire uniform rate be placed on all lumber and we will know what we are doing. Otherwise planing mills on the northern border, appropriating all the benefit of free lumber, will take the rough lumber of their neighbors at their own figures and then, in addition to their other profit, will add the unjust tariff differentials on dressed lumber, thus paying the same lumber tax to them which has been going to the Treasury. As dressed lumber is more easily handled and shipped than rough lumber and may justify the claim of higher freight rates as it is more valuable, the scheme just described would prove far more acceptable to the railroads than to the people. Neither that scheme nor the one in the conference report promises any benefit to the consumers of lumber, but merely changes the beneficiary of the tax. So that the money will go to the planing mills instead of the Treasury. One of the items referred to in the President's sham battle is hides. It is understood to be the only revenue-producing item in the entire leather schedule. If we are to forego that revenue at the demand of manufacturers, shoes, leather, and harness ought also to be free. Their competition is insignificant anyhow and the tariff allowed on them is a gratuity amounting to a holdup. The tax on hides, which amounts to only a few cents in a pair of shoes, will be absorbed by the manufacturers if hides are placed on the free list, unless the articles into which they enter are also made free.

Both these matters and the others insisted on by the President are of small general importance when compared to the glaring iniquities in the body of the bill. Those items are of local political importance to some individual Members, and the records of Members on those subjects may control their next contest at home, but the President and the great reform gentleman from New York have made their fights on these items, which compare with the real enormities of the bill as a mole hill to a mountain, as a spring branch to the Pacific Ocean, pretendedly on broader principles, contending that they do not respect local demands, but the general good. Impartial historians will record that this sham battle was planned and encouraged by the party leaders, and afterwards confirmed, ratified, and accentuated by the President to prevent discussion and reform of the tariff.

Some of these schedules were ably and unanswerably attacked in another place, but the men who made the attack were hacked and harried by the dangers and threats of worse conditions, and not being original and full-fledged reformers anyway, were all driven into the confession that they would be satisfied now to hold the Dingley rates, claiming no reform if they could only prevent further outrage, although the Dingley rates were the very ones of which the people complained, and to reduce and reform which the present extra session was promised. If those men, after so ably exposing those schedules, vote for this conference report, such votes should seal their political doom, for judged by their own speeches, their constituents can say, "You knew your duty, but did it not."

There is one pathetic thing connected with this sham battle. Our great champion of reduced rates on a limited scale, posing as the President's right arm in the war on graft, was once able to see no harm in rewarding a political heeler for partisan services by allowing him license to rob the ladies by an unrighteous tax on gloves, and that selfsame interested heeler has been credited with rather close association with the party leaders and even with the conferees. Nor has our great chairman claimed that that tax was to go to the Treasury, but to protect against competition. It was a great pity that the luster of his valiant championship is to be somewhat dimmed by the unfortunate impression that his committee, supported by the House, desired the ladies to pay more for their hosiery, not to replenish the Treasury, but to enrich the manufacturer. But if he had credit for securing free hosiery, free gloves, free lumber, free hides, free coal, free iron ore, and free oil, all the aggregated benefits would sink into insignificance compared to the billions of graft in the body of the bill.

What a pity the President and the gentleman from New York did not direct their talents and zeal to the material parts of the bill, so as to produce sufficient revenue for the Treasury and relieve the people of billions of unjust taxes. Their aim was too low if they meant reform. They used too powerful force and too big a gun for the game they were after. It was like marshaling out an army and training a battery of 13-inch guns to kill a snowbird. The blessed Master spoke of people who "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." He also spoke of people who "pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, but have neglected the weightier matters of the law." It is evident that those distinguished statesmen have either been wofully misled themselves, or have grossly deceived the people.

A mean development in the fight is the sinister discrimination in favor of eastern cotton mills to prevent and postpone the success and multiplication of cotton mills near the cotton fields. The coarse, cheap materials made by the southern mills, which find markets at home and abroad in competition with all the world, are to be admitted at a lower rate, while the finer cotton goods made in the East, which our people would use in preference to any other fabrics, are saddled with higher rates to protect against all competition and raise the price to the home consumer. This is one of the President's boasted victories. Further discrimination will be realized in the duty of about 45 per cent on the equipment of a cotton factory, which, of course, discourages the building of new mills in the South, where there is not much idle capital.

There is another spectacle disappointing to me in the following extract from the Washington Post:

> The minority members were in the conference chamber less than an hour. At the outset, Representative GRIGGS, speaking for his associates, said they were not disposed to delay proceedings. He suggested that if the Republicans would consent to put cotton bagging on the free list they would show the utmost celerity in bringing the conference report to a vote.
>
> Many of the conferees were disposed to grant this request, but Representative MCCALL of Massachusetts protested vigorously, on the ground that it would injure the manufactories of his State which turn out cotton bagging. So emphatic were his objections that it was seen that agreement would be delayed if such action were attempted.

It is sad to have an idol shattered or an ideal "busted." I have cherished the gentleman from Massachusetts as an ideal gentleman, lawyer, and statesman. He had posed and become celebrated as a tariff reformer of the most emphatic, headlong, and reckless downward-revision variety. He was said to be the only confederate allowed to the gentleman from New York to help him do valiant battle with the trust on the conference committee, and wrest victory at a high price from obstinate and overpowering odds. He seems, however, to halt when it comes to reducing the duty on something produced in Massachusetts. Can it be that, after all, his views were only those of Massachusetts, favoring reduction on what other people produce and which Massachusetts must buy, but demanding increases on what Massachusetts produces for sale? In sorrow I abandon my ideal, but in bidding him a reluctant farewell I will remind him that there can be only two sound reasons for placing articles on the free list. First, where the articles are of common use and prime necessity. Second, when the revenue is not needed or can be otherwise supplied. E converso, if they are not articles of general use and prime necessity, or the revenue is needed, then they should not go on the free list. It will be observed that the gentleman from Massachusetts does not assign either of these reasons, but rests his objection on the sordid claim that his constituents have a vested right to rob. There is a court on high where the Ten Commandments will not be held obsolete. Neither will long practice raise a statutory bar nor establish prescription. That court, before which all are hastening, will hold that taking money from another without his consent, even though sanctioned by unjust legislation which abuses the taxing power, is morally as culpable stealing as filching surreptitiously or holding up on the highway. Intelligent men have had little hope of bagging and ties being placed on the free list by the dominant political party, the entire history and policy of which has been destructive to the prosperity of the cotton grower.

The meanest thing in connection with this whole session has been the persistent effort of our adversaries, expressed often in papers which have not supported a Democratic ticket in fifteen years, trying to shade and discount the guilt and shame of the Republicans by claiming Democratic condonation for the atrocities in this bill. The slanders about Democratic votes for pro-

tection have all come from outside our party and made for political effect in the next campaign. They are absolutely unwarranted. With few eminent exceptions (three or four only) of such long standing and practice as to be immune from criticism and incapable of disappointing anybody by their pro-Republican votes and tendencies, which have ripened into prescription, those elected by Democratic constituencies have voted against prohibitory protection. The duties voted for by them have been revenue duties, the only honest and constitutional duties. It is to be regretted that some Democrats have been unwise enough to sanction false charges thus made by their party adversaries against their comrades. Such admissions are inconsiderate and impertinent. Men should limit their confessions to their own sins and not extend their admissions to slanders made by the enemy against their own comrades. Certainly neither the party nor the comrades can be bound thereby. Neither will intelligent and honest people be longer deceived by the other misrepresentation often made in this session that tariff for revenue is only a new expression for demanding protection. It is the time-honored Democratic demand on which the Government was founded. A man who does not understand the difference between a tax which brings in revenue, because low enough to permit competition, although stimulating some lines of business by affording incidental protection, and the Republican contention of levying duty so high as to exclude all competition, thereby enabling the protected interests to pillage the domestic consumer at will, both by selling to him at arbitrary high prices and buying from him produce at arbitrary low prices, would deny the difference between honest exchange on the one hand and outright grand larceny on the other.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature. The Republican party knows that regular tribute extorted from the people and placed in the coffers of the trusts operates in effect to impound it for their use in future campaigns, and that in trouble and stress the purse strings of the trusts will disgorge all needed contributions to retain them in power. The Republicans know and care so little about the Constitution that when they try to use its provisions they invoke the wrong one and misapply it to the wrong purposes. The provision to support the Government by levying import duties they prostitute into a license to enrich special interests and pauperize the masses into subjection to a nefarious industrial system, which in the last analysis would produce conditions worse than legalized slavery. Now, they propose to use the constitutional warrant to collect internal and excise taxes for the openly avowed purpose of regulating corporations, when another provision of the Constitution expressly confers ample authority to regulate interstate commerce sufficient for all purposes of honest and fair regulation. Those high in authority have lately renewed the demand for greater powers in the Federal Government. Politeness will not permit charging ignorance to men of such pretensions, nor will charity allow the imputation of malice or wrong intention to magnates of such putative greatness and goodness, but people who study the Constitution and the history of the men who made it know that the strength of the Federal Government is its great glory, founded on the will of the people and the sovereign autonomy of the States, the strongest government the world ever saw destined to endure when autocratic dynasties have perished from the earth. I believe that if statesmen of our day understand it as well as its framers and desire the success of our Government as much as its framers desired it, they will find the powers of the Federal Government ample for all legitimate federal purposes.

The trouble is, some alleged statesmen, either brought up in the school of centralization or for political reasons, in political exigency, transferred thereto, refuse to understand our dual system of government. Their oaths of office to support the Constitution should constrain them to study that sacred document, and recognize that they are bound to respect local self-government by the States and the people in order properly to look after the exercise of federal functions and preserve and glorify the Federal Union. The States made the Federal Government, the States uphold it, maintain and preserve it. Officers who fail to recognize the system in its dual character fail in their duty. That system alone makes the Federal Government strong, the strongest on earth, legitimately exercising constitutional functions for the benefit of the greatest country and the greatest, best, and most glorious people the world ever saw. That Executive will be greatest and most blessed who learns and realizes these great truths and instead of overlooking existing conditions and powers already conferred jealously guards the principles of our Government and discharges his duty in accordance with the powers conferred.

There appears little hope of such a President ever coming up from the teachings and practices of the Republican party. That party abhors constitutional limitations and popular right. The doctrines of the Democratic party alone are adapted to fashioning such an official. In the history of the Government there has not been a day the Democratic party did not really have a majority of the people of this country if it could only have mobilized its strength. For the last sixty years dissensions have unhappily prevented that majority from making itself felt. It will certainly not require many more such legislative atrocities as the one now about to be inflicted on the country, through the duplicity of the Republican leaders, to induce the different Democratic factions to realize and acknowledge that success under any of them would be better and more desirable than Republican domination. When the glad day of their reunion dawns, they will bring forth from their own number a man well grounded in their principles, who will administer the Government in righteousness; and the platform upon which a reunited Democracy will redeem the country will be, first, honest and fair taxation, collected by the Government for the use of the Treasury only; second, local self-government exercised by sovereign States sustaining and glorifying an all-powerful, all-glorious, and undying Union; and, third, economy in honestly administering its Government for the good of the people.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has twenty-nine minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has forty-three.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the gentleman from Missouri should consume some of his time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL], a member of the conference committee, such time as he may desire.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour it will be practically impossible for me to fully discuss this conference report, or to show its injustice, inequalities, and deceptions. The Payne bill as it was reported to and as it passed the House was much more objectionable as a tariff measure than even the Dingley bill, which is the present law. Some of its faults I pointed out and denounced when the bill was before the House last April. It passed on April 9 and was sent to the Senate. On July 8 it passed the Senate, with 847 amendments. It was sent to the conference committee, which yesterday returned the bill to the House of Representatives and filed this conference report as agreed upon by the Republican members. This measure as it passed the Senate, with its multitudinous amendments, was more radical and extreme in favor of the protected interests than was even the Payne bill as it left the House. The bill as reported by the conference committee, while it is a material improvement over the Senate bill, is still vastly worse than the Payne bill, and much more oppressive and exacting than the present law, known as the "Dingley tariff," which in response to popular demand both political parties were pledged to revise and reform in the interest of the consumer.

Many criticisms of this report have been made by my colleagues who preceded me which I fully indorse, and for lack of time I will neither repeat nor enlarge upon them. The House understands full well that when it votes this evening upon this conference report it becomes responsible for the passage, or for the defeat, of one of the most peculiar, and destined to be one of the most famous, tariff bills that ever passed the Congress of the United States. The Republican party is accountable to the country for this legislation.

The Democratic party will not shirk its responsibilities. We will carefully observe the details of legislation, and, though powerless to prevent the enactment of the bill, or to change the course determined on by the Republican party in control of the Congress, we will expose at least some of the nefarious methods that have attended the progress of this bill and the dark and deceitful schemes of the moneyed powers to bind and despoil the great mass of producers and consumers. The Republican party made solemn pledges before the election. It was never its intention to redeem them. The purpose was to secure another four years' lease of power, in order to reach deeper into the pockets of the people and ruthlessly despoil even those who appealed to it for relief and who foolishly, though with honest hearts and hopes, intrusted it with power. I do not call upon you to redeem those promises. Full well do I know how vain such an attempt would be. The most of you on that side of the Chamber are deaf to all appeals from the people who sent you here—deaf to everything save the voice of one man and the crack of the party whip. But to-night I appeal to every white, free-born American citizen to hold the Republican party responsible for the hypocrisy displayed at this session of Congress and the monstrous outrage committed by the passage of this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What has been said and done by a few Republicans to secure reasonable and honest revision of the tariff does not excuse nor extenuate the gross infidelity of the party, but furnishes strong and convincing proof of its faithlessness. The few Republicans in both branches of Congress who have tried to do something, tried to get some little mite for the people, have utterly failed. The Republican party was trusted to revise the tariff downward and to smooth out its inequalities. In both Houses it has been revised upward, and all the time in the interest of the manufacturers and trusts. It promised the country relief to the poor struggling child of labor and to the oppressed millions of consumers, but this bill breaks every promise that was made along that line, and the Republican party standing unveiled in this House has the effrontery—I know not what other word will better fit that is more parliamentary—has the effrontery to proclaim even in the Halls of Congress that they did not promise a revision downward; and, with astounding self complacency, they coolly tell us that for revising the tariff upward the responsibility is on them and not on us.

One significant circumstance, Mr. Speaker, should not escape our notice, and that is that practically every fight in both Houses of Congress on any item in any schedule has been in reference to a trust-made or a trust-controlled article, and the trust forces have been successful with shameful and shameless uniformity. Take, for instance, the oil trust: No lawless concern in any country is more hateful, or more hated by the people, than it; and yet, in the legislative department of the Government, composed of men supposed to be the servants of the people, it has dominated the controlling political party and has gained signal victories in both Houses of Congress. It has no recognized representatives; yet, with a powerful though unseen force, it gets in its work. Although, until a short time ago, petroleum and its products were popularly supposed to be on the free list, yet, as a matter of fact, by the terms of what is called a "countervailing duty," there was really a prohibitive rate which prevented all competition from abroad. No doubt a majority of the Republicans as well as the Democrats were unaware of the fact when this provision was first put in the law, but such trickery, instead of shocking the legislative conscience, is referred to as a "joker" in the tariff bill. The Republican managers in the House endeavored to retain this provision in the law; and when the Democrats, with the help of some Republican "insurgents," prevented this being done, an effort was made to put a duty of 25 per cent on petroleum and its products. But this was voted down, putting them on the free list.

Mr. HARDY. Do not forget that oil itself under this bill is given a tax of one-half the rate imposed by an importing country. They just changed it to one-half. There is no free oil.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If that is the case, we have a prohibitive tax on petroleum. As I understood it from the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, petroleum was, under any circumstances, absolutely free. I will ask him, in order to be sure, if petroleum is on the free list under all circumstances? Is there no countervailing duty on it?

Mr. PAYNE. Petroleum, crude or refined, including kerosene, naphtha, gasoline, and benzine, and like products, are on the free list, and there is no countervailing duty on any of them.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is the way I understood the bill. It did pass the Senate with half the countervailing duty, did it not? It is the Senate print of the bill my colleague [Mr. HARDY] was reading. The bill was amended in the Senate, and one-half of the former "countervailing" duty was restored, thus leaving still a clearly prohibitive rate. The conference committee, however, has put petroleum, crude or refined, including kerosene, naphtha, benzine, and gasoline, and similar oils produced from petroleum, on the free list; but all other products of petroleum would come under the general clause assessing a tariff of 25 per cent ad valorem. This result might be considered a "dog fall," as neither side won the battle, and yet both might boast of having accomplished something. This is one of the remarkable feats recently advertised as a great presidential victory. It is not a victory, however, like that of David when he killed Goliath with a stone. This is a case where the so-called "David" had a friendly conference with Goliath and divided the chestnuts between them instead of letting Goliath have them all. And so a peace was established; David was heralded as a victor and the people made great acclaim, but Goliath still lives and stalks abroad in all his power. It may also be observed that David and Goliath are good friends, and Goliath is often called into consultation as to the management of David's kingdom. The people, of course, are well looked after.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reference to iron: It is declared by men who have made their fortunes in iron, and who are admitted by the whole country to be experts upon the subject, that no part of the iron schedule, from the standpoint of a protectionist even, needs any protection. We know that the revenue from it does not pay, because it is so small in comparison with the increased cost to the people on the three billions of iron products annually consumed in this country, and no man claims that it is economical to raise a revenue that way.

The iron manufacturers do not need protection. They are protected by their situation. They own the iron mines of the country and have the power in some way to make a fight in this Congress that makes it impossible even to put iron ore on the free list. They own, it is estimated, 85 per cent of the beds of iron ore in America. The Payne bill admitted iron ore free. Under the present law—the Dingley bill—it is 40 cents per ton. After a vigorous fight in the Senate, the duty was placed at 25 cents per ton. The conference committee reduced it to 15 cents.

In the administrative section of the bill it is provided:

That from and after the 31st day of March, 1910, except as otherwise specially provided for in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States the rates of duty prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem; which rates shall constitute the maximum tariff of the United States.

The maximum tariff is applied by operation of law to each foreign country after the 31st day of March, 1910, unless the President should declare by proclamation, among other things, "That such foreign country pays no export bounty or imposes no export duty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent." Upon issuing such proclamation the tariff on articles imported from such country would be at the rate prescribed in the tariff bill now under consideration, which is 1.71 per cent higher than the present law known as the "Dingley tariff act." This provision applies to iron ore and all dutiable articles, and will be enforced by operation of law with reference to all countries except Cuba, which is specially excepted.

The value of iron ore is from $2.50 to $4 per ton. Count the average ton at $3, and we have provided for here 15 cents a ton and 25 per cent ad valorem, making 75 cents additional; total 90 cents per ton for iron ore which was formerly 40 cents a ton—125 per cent increase. And this is another one of the President's glorious victories over the Goliath sent out by the tariff Philistines to plunder the people. The 15 cents a ton sounds very small; but, instead of 15 cents a ton, it means 90 cents a ton. How long will the American people stand such jugglery? The iron manufacturers tried to make it appear, when the Payne bill provided for free iron ore in the House, that this was a concession to the mills of the Atlantic seaboard equal to the amount of the present tariff. The actual fact, however, was easy to detect. On investigation it was found that the steel trust and affiliated interests, owned about 85 per cent of the iron ore in the United States, and as soon as taken from the ground each ton would be enhanced in value to the extent of the tariff, which means hundreds of millions into the pockets of the iron and steel millionaires.

The whole iron and steel schedule is on a par with this instance of discrimination, and turns over the markets of the United States to the triumphant trusts whose products are consumed in this country to the amount of more than $3,000,000,000 per year. Under the present law the rates in the iron and steel schedules amount to more than 30 per cent, costing the people about $900,000,000, which they are compelled to pay as a bonus to the manufacturers of the $3,000,000,000 worth of their product consumed in the United States. But the tariff paid into the Treasury on this schedule in 1907 was only $21,811,184, thus costing the consumers $41 for each dollar of taxes paid to the Government. The monstrous extravagance and infamous exactions of such a system beggar description. But when we consider that after the 31st day of March next, 25 per cent more is to be added to this tariff wall, our senses become paralyzed with amazement.

In the great Mississippi Valley and west of the Mississippi River, if not hampered by this tariff wall, independent manufacturers with home or foreign capital could, by reason of the distance from the present iron mines and furnaces of the United States, mine and import iron ore and compete with the trust-controlled industries that now have monopoly of the market. Even the hope of such relief is cut off by this bill.

In order to prove to you that the pending bill is not a reduction, but is an increase over the present Dingley law, I will read you a carefully prepared statement.

The first column contains the Dingley revenue for 1907 by schedules, and the second is estimated by applying the rates of

the conference bill to the imports of that year. The duties of the conference bill will be largely increased by the changed classification of the cotton and silk schedules and the many new items of taxation introduced.

Estimated revenues of the conference tariff bill upon the Payne-Aldrich bill.

[Increase (+). Decrease (−).]

Schedule—	Dingley duties.	Conference duties.	Percentage of the latter on the former.
			Per cent.
A. Chemicals, etc	$11,186,860	$11,816,214	+ 5.63
B. Earthenware, etc	15,349,939	15,290,932	− .32
C. Metals, etc	21,811,184	20,370,396	− 6.65
D. Wood, etc	3,705,022	3,128,553	−15.53
E. Sugar, etc	60,338,523	60,335,866	− .004
F. Tobacco, etc	26,125,037	26,125,037	No change.
G. Agricultural products	19,181,888	20,454,646	+ 6.63
H. Spirits, etc	16,318,220	20,705,369	+26.88
I. Cotton, etc	14,291,026	15,835,112	+10.80
J. Flax, etc	49,900,580	49,776,276	− .24
K. Wool, etc	36,554,816	36,426,214	− .35
L. Silk, etc	20,313,706	23,458,747	+15.48
M. Pulp, paper, etc	4,136,629	4,550,492	+10.02
N. Sundries	29,896,500	26,484,490	−11.41
Total	329,109,342	334,758,344	

Increase over Dingley, $5,649,002, or increase of 1.71 per cent above the present law.

Thus we see by actual calculation that the Republican party proposes, instead of revising the tariff downward, to increase it 1.71 per cent and place an additional 25 per cent in operation on the 31st of next March, thus making a total increase of 26.71 per cent. If the Republican party had declared before the last election that such a villainous measure would be passed by this Congress, it would not have carried 10 States in the Union. The beneficiaries of the tariff presume upon the ignorance of the American people in reference to conditions and the fraudulent claims by the advocates of protection. The plea for protection is based principally upon the alleged difference in the cost of labor in the United States and in foreign countries, and on the pretense of covering this difference they get protective rates covering in most instances the whole cost of labor in this country, and in many cases several times the amount of the labor cost. Take cotton goods, for instance. It is authoritatively stated that the average tariff rate for all imports in 1907 was very nearly three times the labor cost. Thus, as compiled from the census reports for the year 1907, for the manufacture of cotton goods labor received $96,205,000, and the product was valued at $450,467,000. The whole labor cost was 21 per cent. But the tariff on cotton cloths was from 38 to 72 per cent; yarns and thread, 33 per cent; unbleached cloths, 19 to 74 per cent; tablecloths, 50 per cent; bindings, 45 per cent; belting, 45 per cent; lamp wicking, 49 per cent; pillow shams, 45 per cent; shirtings, 45 per cent; collars and cuffs, 88 per cent; knit shirts, 57 per cent, the tariff on the whole list thus averaging more than double the entire labor cost of production. This is the more astonishing when we consider that the United States is the principal cotton-producing country in the world, and therefore the raw material can be produced here cheaper than elsewhere. We are great exporters of cotton, this staple crop making the balance of trade in our favor. These figures clearly show that raising the tariff rate does not inure to the profit of the wage-earner, and that under the present law the wages could be doubled and still all the labor cost would be covered by the advantage given the manufacturer by the tariff. In this connection it is hard to suppress a righteous indignation when one considers the low wages received by the factory hands and realizes that thousands of children of tender years have been sacrificed to the rapacity of the cotton manufacturer; and yet the present bill proposes to increase the rate on the cotton schedule 10.8 per cent in addition to the 25 per cent that will go into effect in March.

The tariff, both directly and indirectly, creates conditions which are unfavorable to the building of cotton mills in the United States, thereby forcing us to ship our raw material to England principally, where manufacturing profit is made and conditions created which enables that country to control the neutral markets of the world. In other words, owing to the tariff wall, our manufacturers can not produce cotton goods at a price that in neutral markets will control the trade.

Of a total of 130,000,000 spindles in the world, we have less than 25,000,000, while England has 55,000,000. Of the output of our spindles in 1905, viz, $450,000,000, less than $50,000,000 worth was sent to neutral markets or exported. That is to say, about 90 per cent was consumed at home at prices abnormally high on account of the tariff when compared with like prices for the home consumption of cotton goods in England.

In 1905 we produced 10,575,017 bales of cotton, of which 7,268,000 bales were exported; that is, 30 per cent was held at home and 70 per cent exported. The export of raw cotton yielded our home farmers about $400,000,000, which in turn was sold by foreign manufacturers in the shape of manufactured goods for approximately $800,000,000. These foreign manufacturers consumed little of these goods at home, and therefore made their profits in the neutral markets of the world or in the export trade. Remove the protective element from the tariff and we would soon have as many spindles as England, and possibly more, thus manufacturing all our cotton at home.

England's export trade in 1907 increased in cotton goods alone by $11 per head of population, while the United States increased but $2.50 per head.

Thus the tariff not only increases prices on cotton goods to all the consumers in the home market, but also creates conditions which make it impossible for us to compete in the open markets of the world in that kind and class of goods which measures the advance of the export trade. The goods we export are the poorer and cheaper classes, a large part of which are dumped on the markets of the world and sold there at cheaper prices than they are sold at home. In other words, our cotton manufacturers are far more interested in the monopoly of the home market with its tariff prices than they are in gaining new markets abroad, except for surplus and unmerchantable stocks.

Those who desire to create a larger export trade for our cotton goods, and therefore desire a larger home consumption of the raw product of our plantations, are confronted at the very outset by a mass of conditions, tariff bred and tariff supported, which form a serious handicap to the enlargement of our cotton factories.

Sir William Holland, Member of Parliament, at a meeting of business men at Memorial Hall, Manchester, England, on July 16 of this year, said:

> Everybody in the cotton trade was aware that in a market where English manufacturers competed with the manufacturers of a protected country, both being exporters to that market, the English manufacturer, possessing the signal advantage of being able to produce under more favorable conditions, was able to sell at a profit on terms which his protected competitor could not offer.

1. The tariff makes our cotton factories cost far more than they do in England. The initial outlay for building and machinery is far heavier, being from 45 to 60 per cent greater than in England. A building or cotton factory that in England would cost $100,000 when equipped with machinery would cost here from $140,000 to $160,000. This is shown as follows:

Our tariff on cotton machinery is 45 per cent, and our import of all classes of machinery is about $2,000,000 per annum. On the two millions imported the duty would be $900,000. Every million dollars' worth in England would cost an American purchaser $1,450,000 without freight, or $1,595,000 with freight, or about 60 per cent. This tariff import of $2,000,000 is nothing in itself; but when it is considered that this 60 per cent becomes a tariff wall behind which the home manufacturer may shelter himself in the nefarious business of adding the tariff to the price, it becomes the real question at issue.

Forty-five per cent, or $900,000, was the actual duty collected by the Government on $2,000,000 worth of machinery in 1907; but the protection went beyond this to the added freight. It also created a condition whereby the importer might add a profit on the tariff paid as well as on the goods imported. Take a stated account, with and without tariff, as an illustration.

John Jones, importer, in account with an import of $100,000 worth of machinery:

	Without tariff.	With tariff.
Machinery imported	$100,000	$100,000
Tariff, 45 per cent		45,000
Freight, 10 per cent	10,000	10,000
Profit, 20 per cent	20,000	29,000
Total	130,000	184,000
Difference with tariff		54,000

The tariff is actual; the freight and profits are conditions growing out of this, which form additional protection walls for the home manufacturer, which under certain circumstances he may avail himself of and add not only the tariff rate, but the conditional freight and importers' profit rate, to the price of all home manufactured cotton or other machinery.

But for this tariff $100,000 worth of machinery would cost but $100,000; with the tariff the $100,000 worth of machinery

come to from $145,000 to $184,000. With this handicap of from 45 to 84 per cent on the initial cost of machinery it is idle to hope for any great extension of our foreign trade. We can not compete with foreigners with a handicap of from 45 to 84 per cent on the initial machinery alone. The ratio of cost of machinery to total cost of machinery and building varies with the location, but, generally speaking, is from two-thirds to three-fourths of the cost, excluding price of land. So also on the building which houses the machinery.

Twenty thousand dollars' worth of rough lumber in Canada costs $23,400 here, or 17 per cent; $5,000 worth of doors and windows abroad will cost $6,750 at the custom-house, or 35 per cent; and 35 per cent goes on very nearly all the domestic product.

Twenty thousand dollars' worth of unglazed common brick abroad costs $25,000 at our custom-house, or 20 per cent without freight, or 25 per cent; if glazed the same brick will cost $29,000, or 45 per cent. Our brickmakers have a margin of from 25 to 45 per cent on the common brick of a building which is used when there is no competition from abroad, and taken off whenever the foreigner enters our ports.

The common window glass of a factory is taxed from 41 to 87 per cent, according to size. Every $1,000 worth of foreign glass costs at the custom-house from $1,410 to $1,870 without freight, and every domestic producer charges the higher rate and more against every domestic buyer, and then clamors for higher rates. Plate glass runs from 49 to 155 per cent; that is to say, every $1,000 worth of foreign glass costs the importer from $1,490 to $2,550. The tariff rates on paints are from 20 to 39 per cent; on raw or boiled linseed oil, 49 per cent; and on white lead, 38 per cent.

When all these conditions as to imported building materials and machinery are considered, it is entirely safe to say that every $100,000 cotton factory abroad, in its initial cost for equipment and building, here costs the investor from $145,000 to $165,000, or a tariff cost on building and machinery equal to from 45 to 65 per cent. This is a very serious handicap and fully supports the contention of Sir William Holland.

2. Nor is this all.

Protection not only adds from 50 to 65 per cent to the initial cost of an American cotton mill through its buildings and machinery, but a further and very large operating cost, which in its totality can not be as accurately measured as the increase of initial cost.

Every $100 worth of belting used by an Englishman costs the American operator $20 more, or $120. Where the English operator would pay $100 for oil the American would pay $130. For $100 worth of coal in England we would pay $121, and for every $100 worth of coke we would pay $120, notwithstanding the fact that we are the greatest coal country in the world. Because our laborers have to buy in a protected market and pay the highly inflated prices which follow high-tariff rates, every $1,000 worth of labor abroad costs from $1,500 to $2,000 here; and while the condition of our own laborers is somewhat better than the condition of foreign laborers, that betterment proceeds from the greater liberty and opportunity we have here and not from the tariff law. In fact, were every tariff law abrogated beyond pure revenue demands our American labor would still hold a supremacy of condition because of liberty and opportunity, and the added reason of a lower price on all the articles entering into his living charges. He undoubtedly gets a higher nominal wage now than the foreign wage-earner, but the difference is lost to him in the higher prices he pays for the necessities of life, engendered by a protective tariff alone, so that his real wage is less than that of his English competitor.

All these things add fully from 35 to 50 per cent to the cost of operating an American cotton mill, and make it necessary to preserve the American market to American manufacturers by barring out all foreign competition.

The consumer in America pays fully 65 per cent more on the initial cost than does the Englishman, and 35 per cent more on operating cost, solely and alone because of the tariff. For this reason our home cotton factories expand no faster than the home-market demands require; and we, as the greatest cotton-producing country in the world, must depend on foreigners for a market for fully 65 per cent of our production of raw cotton, while the chief of those foreigners, England, under better conditions and no tariff, turns our raw product into a mine of wealth and captures the neutral markets of the world. We write long homilies upon the value of a large export trade in cotton goods and then through high tariffs make it impossible to attain our ends. Abolish protection from our tariffs and a condition will at once arise which will enable us to manufacture all our own cotton at a profit and meet England and all other countries in neutral markets and successfully drive them from the field.

The rates in the woolen schedule, which by the terms of the Payne bill were greatly increased, have been reduced, and in the bill reported by the conference the rates in the present law are practically retained. Preventing a revision upward in the woolen schedule is also claimed as a presidential victory, though it is hard to see where the people reap any advantage from a victory that leaves them where they were before any "revision" was begun. Their only cause for gratitude is that their burdens on this schedule were not increased. They should be truly thankful!

Another instance of the determination by the Republican party to continue the high-protectionist exactions is shown by the rates in the lumber schedule. The lumber lords have not only a monopoly of the market in this country, but, also, they own nearly all the stumpage or standing timber, and every dollar their product is raised in price by a tariff is a gift to them taken from the pockets of the people. While the cost of producing lumber in the United States has decreased in the last ten years, yet under the Dingley Act now in force the price of lumber has been steadily advancing, and this statement shows the percentage of the increase in price in 1907 over the ten-year period:

Hard maple, 122 per cent; oak, 6 inches and up, 144 per cent; shingles, 145.3 per cent; oak, white, quartered, 149 per cent; pine, yellow long-leaf, 165.2 per cent; hemlock, 2 by 4, 186 per cent; poplar, yellow, 189.7 per cent.

The lowest price of yellow pine from 1890 to 1907 was from January to April, 1896, and from June to November, 1897, and ran from $15.50 per thousand feet to $16. The highest price was from May, 1906, to December, 1907, and ran from $30 to $31 a thousand. The increase in long-leaf yellow pine in 1897 over the ten-year period of 1890 to 1900 was more than 165 per cent. In reference to white oak lumber, the highest price was from December, 1903, to July, 1904, and ran from $80 to $85 per thousand.

These prices of lumber were yard prices, averaged for the whole United States, and were taken from the publications of the Bureau of Labor for 1908. From the same source we learn that in 1900 the average mill price of yellow pine for the Southern States was $8.59 per thousand feet. This had increased in 1905 to $11.14, and in 1907 to $12.72. Again, during the ten years ending in 1907, under the Dingley law, the price of other building material had been more than doubled. I give only a few instances as fair examples in this respect:

Cement, 107 per cent; window glass, 119 per cent; lime, 125.4 per cent; window glass, firsts, 126 per cent; tar, 132 per cent; turpentine, 146 per cent; resin, strained, 246 per cent; locks, mortise, 224.8 per cent; door knobs, 265.2 per cent.

When we reflect that the gross consumption of lumber in the United States amounts to fifteen hundred million dollars a year, and that only about 1 per cent of that amount brings any revenue into the Treasury, it is easily understood why the lumber companies and those interested in them should have made such a stubborn and successful fight to hold the advantage of a protective tariff. But they have done more than this. Under the operation of the proposed bill, 25 per cent will next March be added to the tariff on lumber, thus increasing threefold the present prohibitive rates. Every home builder on the plains, every honest man in every part of the country, should give this matter special attention. The lumber interests and their employed agents and attorneys should not be permitted to dictate a tariff law for the people of the United States. The rich beneficiaries of this nefarious system live in luxurious and splendid places, while better people than they live in dugouts on the prairies because of their inability to purchase lumber at a reasonable price with which to build even modest cottages for their families. The outrageously increased price of lumber that will go into effect by the terms of the pending bill is another one of the President's "victories." Such victories may be great for the President and his party, but are terrible in their effect on the common people.

In dealing with the sugar schedule this bill is a striking example of the devotion of the Republican party to the interests of the people and of its determination to annihilate the trusts. The sugar trust has been ferociously attacked, and, despite its resisting kicks and frantic howls, its profits have been reduced four thousandths of 1 per cent, thus showing the fearless determination and overwhelming power of the present administration in its war of extermination upon the grim and terror-stricken trusts!

The treatment the farmer receives by this proposed legislation is like giving him an apple that is rotten at the core. The increased rates in the agricultural schedule are in the interest of the manufacturer and bear hard in their effect upon the wage-earner. The farmer himself receives no benefit, but must pay his portion of the extraordinary expense occasioned by the protective system. On some other occasion, when time will permit, I will make some observations and give the statistics showing the facts in reference to the agricultural schedule.

I also condemn in this bill the system of drawbacks which is used to enrich the manufacturer and permits him to sell his goods in foreign countries at less price than they can be bought by our own people.

The proposed bill can not be too severely censured for the protection it affords to products made by corporations and combinations that are known to be trust monopolies, organized and conducted in defiance of law and openly levying tribute upon the American public. There can be no excuse for the present administration in thus upholding and fostering the unholy and unlawful combinations it is pledged to suppress.

The people want an income tax. The demand for this method of raising a revenue is so general and persistent, and the claim is so just and wise, it could not be entirely overlooked; but the Republican party, ever watchful to protect the great fortunes of its moneyed allies from contributing any just proportion of the expenses of the Government, defeated an income tax in the House by adopting an inheritance tax.

This provision in the House bill was then stricken out; and in order to avoid a constitutional income tax being made a part of this bill, a provision for a corporation tax was substituted and a resolution was adopted by the Congress submitting to the several States a constitutional amendment providing for the levy of an income tax. Thus the inheritance tax is defeated, a corporation tax of 1 per cent is adopted with the avowed statement that it was not expected to last more than two years, and the question of an income tax has been indefinitely postponed. Twelve of the States can defeat the measure by rejecting the amendment or by refusing to act. If that number can be dominated by the trusts, then the Republican party has succeeded in suppressing altogether the passage of a law by the National Government taxing incomes. How can the thousands in favor of the people's rights and those who are working for honest reform place any reliance in Republican promises or entertain the slightest hope for relief while that party is in power?

While we are denouncing Republicans for their faithless disregard of party pledges there are some who answer jeeringly that Democrats are not exempt from the same criticism. Such an answer is no excuse. The wrong of one is not justified by the fault of another. A political party is not always responsible for the acts of an individual. Each man is responsible for his own act, and the political organization is responsible only when it is a party to or indorses the act. If the Republican party in its conduct of legislation at this session has carried out its pledges to the country, then it should not be condemned, even though some of its members have said and done things contrary to those pledges. But the result of legislation here is chargeable to the Republican party and its regular organization, supported by an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress and by the executive department; hence it can not expect to escape accountability to the country. The banner of the great Democratic party at the last election went down in defeat before the cheering and victorious host of bloated wealth, openly led by the trust magnates of the country.

Had Democracy been successful, her gallant leader and her patriotic Members of Congress would have redeemed every pledge made in the party platform or by its leader in the campaign. If any had been recreant and had failed to keep Democratic faith with the country, he and all like him would have been so thoroughly exposed and openly condemned by the Democratic administration that the country would acquit the Democratic party of the wrong and faithlessness of the individuals who were guilty, and their Democratic constituents would thus have been confronted with the alternative of repudiating such individuals or becoming parties to their defection. The great Democratic party is not composed of a mere aggregation of politicians and place seekers. It is composed of the great mass of American citizenship who believe in the traditions of our fathers, who look upon this Government as a constitutional, political organization for their benefit, formed to serve them and to be administered with such justice, equality, and wisdom that all men might be accorded equal rights. Special privileges should not be allowed; the door of opportunity should be opened to all, and each and all should be protected in life, liberty, and property.

There is evidently an attempt to break up and destroy, if possible, the organization of this great party. Some men, whom it has honored and who hold its commission to-day, are endeavoring to break it to pieces, change its ideals, and Republicanize its principles. These see no advantage to themselves in present Democratic success.

It is only to be expected that the corrupting influence of the trusts would reach some members of any great political party, and that some, without such corruption, would set up a standard of revolt. The political party, however, to which they belong should not be held responsible unless it encourages or sanctions their acts. I believe the time has come when the great Democratic element in this country should earnestly get together and place in position of trust none but men who are honest, capable, and disinterested, and deny public preferment to all men who are in any manner connected with the interest of those seeking legislation or any kind of favor from the Government.

I hope to speedily see the day when every man desiring equal rights to all and scorning special privilege will come with one accord under the old Democratic banner, and when all those in favor of graft and special interest, and who believe in the doctrine of spoils and that the Government should be run not in the interest of the people but in the interest of the party in power, should flock to the Republican party, where they belong; and then, in a contest where the issues will be clearly drawn, the people will triumph over the legions of protected interests, will retake the Government that belongs to them, and will administer it in righteousness and wisdom, protecting every one within our borders. Then, indeed, will this great Republic in honor and peace and progressive achievement hold aloft the banner of liberty and lead the nations of the earth through the centuries to come in prosperity and peace. This is no idle dream. It can and should be a practical result. The sooner our patriotic citizenship get out of the Republican party and into the Democratic organization the sooner we can enact a tariff bill and other legislation that will stand muster before the conscience of the people of the United States. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS AND THE WOOL TARIFF—A LETTER OF PROTEST TO SENATOR LODGE, OF MASSACHUSETTS.

GREAT CHEBEAGUE ISLAND, MAINE,
July 14, 1909.

Hon. H. C. LODGE, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 7th instant is at hand. I desire first to correct the misapprehension your letter indicates you are laboring under, that there was any reflection on you or any other Senator personally and individually in my reference to the belief that "a pact had been made between the worsted people and the woolgrowers; that this pact was relied upon to pass the bill; and so Senator WARREN delivered the western Senators and Whitman the eastern Senators." The idea I intended to convey and which, it seems to me is a plain construction of my words, is that the Senators were delivered by reason of their allegiance to a party, and that this party had been controlled by the special interests of which Senator WARREN and William Whitman are leading representatives.

You are mistaken if you think I would object if you should say that my "desire for the revision of the wool schedule was owing simply to my personal interests." I expect you will hear me as an interested witness, and all I ask is that you decide in our favor only so far as we can prove the justice of our case.

HOUSE CONCESSIONS ARE WORTHLESS.

You state that if you are mistaken regarding the House rates on by-products you were misled by the carded woolen manufacturers themselves, who appeared before the Finance Committee and "urged the reductions made in the House rates on tops and noils as the essential reductions desired for the benefit of their industry." You are wrong regarding both the reductions and who it was that misled you. The duty on tops is of no direct concern to the carded woolen manufacturers, as they do not use tops, while the following extract from the brief filed with your committee by Gordon Dobson on April 7 shows how plain the carded woolen manufacturers made it to you that the House reductions on by-products were worthless as a measure of relief to their industry:

"The Dingley duty on these by-products is prohibitory, and the Payne bill gives no relief because the rates, although slightly less, are still prohibitory."

STARVING AN INDUSTRY TO DEATH.

To assume, as you do, that a reduction from 20 cents to 18 cents on noils means anything is an affront to the carded woolen manufacturers, and, as I wrote you, will have only one effect, and that is to make them even more angry than they are now. The carded woolen manufacturers reject a specific duty on wool and by-products, regardless of shrinkage and value, as utterly unfair. They have from the beginning based their petition on an ad valorem duty. And yet you are willing to believe that shaving a prohibitory specific duty of 20 cents to the extent of 2 cents is what the carded woolen manufacturers want. The carded woolen industry is being starved to death by prohibitory duties on by-products, which, in the case of noils, vary from 60 to 160 per cent. And this outrage on justice is aggravated by the fact the low rates are on the high-priced stock and the high rates on the low-priced material suited for wool clothing for the poor.

WHAT IS JUSTICE?

I read this in your letter to me:

"You say that you only ask justice, but the woolgrowers and the worsted manufacturers take precisely the same ground, and their conception of justice differs from yours. What seems simple justice to you appears unjust to them, and what they think right you think grossly unfair."

Schedule K in the Senate and Dingley bills lays a duty rising to 700 per cent on the wool adapted for carded woolen goods, and a duty running as low as 23 per cent on the wool used by worsted mills. Do you think this is justice?

It prohibits the importation of wool by-products, depriving the carded woolen mills of an adequate supply of these necessary materials, depriv-

ing the people of warm clothing and enabling the American worsted mills to sell their by-products at a high price. Is that justice?

It allows the worsted mills to import class 2 washed worsted wools at a single duty of 12 cents a pound, and by a double duty of 22 cents prohibits the carded woolen mills from importing class 1 washed wools. Do you call that justice?

Of the total protective duty on worsted cloth 82 per cent is on yarn and only 18 per cent additional on cloth, although the labor cost on the yarn is only 40 per cent and on the cloth 60 per cent additional. This places the weavers of worsted cloth at the mercy of the spinners and is rapidly promoting a powerful worsted-yarn trust. Do you call that justice?

These questions carry their own answer.

SOPHISTRY, EVASION, OR SILENCE.

You say that "what seems simple justice to us appears unjust to the woolgrowers and worsted manufacturers." I deny it. It is not conceivable that anyone would call these things that I have mentioned just. The woolgrowers have not justified them, because they could not. Their spokesmen in the Senate—SMOOT, WARREN, CARTER, MCCUMBER, and ALDRICH—have indulged in the most ridiculous sophistry and evasion. The other Senators, of whom you are one, who voted for these things uttered no word in their defense. As for the worsted spinners, they are so brazen, they apparently feel so secure in the possession of their power, that they admit the inequalities of the tariff and defy those who complain. You will find many admissions of this kind in the tariff hearings this year.

WILLIAM M. WOOD AND THE TARIFF ON WOOL.

Here are the words of William M. Wood to the Ways and Means Committee in 1897. Mr. Wood was then treasurer of the Washington Mills and was proposing a duty in place of free wool:

"In our experience it is unjust for the woolgrowers to demand a specific duty on wool. It prevents the manufacturer, who is compelled to follow the demands of the consumer, from securing more completely the domestic market. He must make the quality of goods wanted, and if he does not the foreign manufacturer supplies the want. A specific duty, arbitrarily placing 12 cents a pound, or any rate per pound, on wool, handicaps the manufacturer under these circumstances. He is at a great disadvantage in buying the necessary foreign wool to make the particular quality of fabric desired—wools which can not be raised in this country."

Mr. Wood is now the president of the largest worsted corporation in the world—the American Woolen Company—organized and developed under the Dingley law. Managing this great corporation, reaping the advantages which that law gives to worsted mills, what are his present views as to the revision of that law? Instead of a frank statement of reasons for his course, it is silence as to his letter of 1897, a more or less secret working agreement with William Whitman, and this disingenuous statement to the public:

"I ought to say that the American Woolen Company, for fear of being misunderstood, as it has often been regarded as a trust, has nothing whatever to do in influencing the present tariff. We have studiously kept away, and although we have been invited to send a representative, we have declined to do so, being satisfied to leave it to the other woolen manufacturers of the country, believing that they were competent to take care of the situation, and whatever would be to their advantage would certainly be to ours."

Both sides to the controversy agree on the merits of the question. There can be no disagreement; the right is clear. The difficulty is in getting the people's representatives to act in accordance with the facts.

TREATED WITH CONTEMPT.

The carded woolen people went before the Finance Committee with facts and a just cause, and they were met with silence, coldness, indifference, or, in some cases, with contempt, and the statement that the committee would summon no witnesses, nothing could be done, and that the carded woolen manufacturers had better go into some other business.

LODGE CAN NOT ESCAPE RESPONSIBILITY.

You, Senator LODGE, can not escape from your share of responsibility for such methods of legislation. You have played a leading part in this extraordinary legislative proceeding; and for one who, like myself, believes in your personal integrity, there is but one explanation of your course, namely, that you have not applied your great natural abilities to the systematic and thorough study of this question so as to understand the injustice of the Senate bill; that under these circumstances you and the other Republican Senators, with the exception of the ten "progressives," have "gone along" with the party machine, deluded with the idea that the passing of a bill of some kind was paramount and that the redress of wrongs you did not understand was of minor importance.

AN UNFAIR WOOL DUTY AND FREE HIDES.

To take this view of the case is showing great consideration for you as an individual Senator, for you have been silent when the petition, not for free wool, but for the equalization of wool duties, was before the Seante and have spoken long and unreservedly for free hides. You have voted for an unjust duty on wool and for no duty at all on hides. With this record before me you will see how difficult you have made it for me to understand your course, and how much consideration is shown to you in explaining your action on the wool and wool-goods tariff as the result of party discipline.

COMPACT BETWEEN WORSTED SPINNERS AND WOOLGROWERS.

This brings us back to the question, Has this party action been in accordance with a pact between the woolgrowers and the worsted spinners? You must admit there was and is a powerful motive for such a pact. On the one hand is William Whitman, representing the worsted spinners, who, now, under the Dingley bill, are in the enjoyment of certain great advantages at the expense of the carded woolen manufacturers, of the growers of light shrinking wool in the Middle West, and of the consumers of wool goods. On the other hand are the sheep ranchmen of the far West, raising heavy shrinking wool, which is protected by prohibitory duties running up to 700 per cent. Edward Moir discovered and revealed the existence of a compact made in Chicago last October by these two parties to stand pat on Schedule K, and William Whitman then admitted it. Why has the Republican majority in the Senate stood pat with them?

LODGE MET WHITMAN ACCIDENTALLY.

You say in your letter:

"Neither my colleague nor myself can be 'delivered' by anyone, and I know of no one who would make the attempt. I met Mr. Whitman accidentally and talked with him for perhaps five minutes. He made no attempt to influence my action, and I never heard from him in regard to the subject in any way."

It is not by direct and personal appeals to individual Senators and Representatives, among whom are men as honorable as HENRY CABOT LODGE and WINTHROP MURRAY CRANE, that these great corporations "deliver" their votes. It is by hidden methods beginning before the election of the people's representatives and which leave the individuals apparently untrammeled, hugging the delusion that they are obeying the dictates of their conscience, while in reality they are only parts of a powerful political machine. To trace the influence of the worsted trust on this tariff legislation it is necessary to go back to the time last year when the Republican party was seeking the suffrages of the people and was in sore need of funds with which to conduct the campaign.

HOW MUCH DID THE WORSTED INTERESTS PAY?

I have based my argument in this letter only on known facts. They enshroud the Republican majority in the Senate with a dense cloud of suspicion, so dense that it should lead the Senators from Massachusetts to insist that it shall be lifted before the Payne-Aldrich bill becomes a law. With these facts so plain, I want to ask, Will not you and Senator CRANE make this demand? Will not you begin by demanding that the names of the contributors and the amount of each contribution to the Republican congressional campaign fund of 1908 shall be made public at once? If the publication of this list should disclose large contributions by the worsted interests, no House, Senate, or President could face the storm of opposition to the Payne-Aldrich Schedule K. If you will not make the demand that this list be published, why not?

Yours, very truly,

W. C. HUNNEMAN.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress are to be congratulated that we are now nearing the last stages of this important legislation. The expectations of the country as to what should be done at this special session were comparatively well defined and set forth in our campaign last fall in the declarations of our party leaders. It was recognized that the industries of the country, successful as they are, have reached a place where there might be some general revision of the tariff, and that it should be in a downward direction. A revision of the tariff rates downward is not an easy occupation. In the very nature of things it is a heroic task. Industries and interests accustomed to a high rate of protection are not willing voluntarily to yield much of their protection.

This process of weaning so-called "infant industries" requires courage and statesmanship of a high order, a statesmanship that can look over the entire field of American industry and with an even hand apportion out the measure of American protection, without partiality, without fear, and without favor. This, I say, is a heroic task. If there has ever been any doubt from the beginning of this attempted legislation as to who would be the real hero of this tariff revision, there is no longer any doubt upon that subject. This new tariff will properly go down into history bearing the name of the impartial and statesmanlike chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and will be known to posterity as the Payne tariff bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE has held a firm hand between free traders on the one side and high protectionists on the other, determined to keep faithfully to party pledges but not to destroy any legitimate American industry. At times he has stood almost alone in a conference beset by many difficulties. And yet he has not stood alone, for he has had behind him the people of the country, the President of the United States, and a good majority of the Republican House of Representatives.

If before this debate began there was any doubt as to whether or not this is a genuine tariff revision downward, that doubt has been entirely dissipated by this discussion. I think the leader of the minority could obtain the unqualified certificate of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] who to-day addressed this House, that the tariff rates on the industries in his district have been revised downward. For one I can testify that the duty on hides has been revised downward. I sincerely hope that hides have not been revised down and out.

But if there were still any question as to whether the general conclusions of this revision were upward or downward, that doubt has been further settled by the figures presented here by the versatile and companionable leader of the minority, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who, after passing over to us the trite and ancient saw that "liars will figure," immediately proceeded to make some figures on his own account. His conclusion is that the general result of this effort at tariff revision is a revision downward of ninety-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Small favors are thankfully received. His rate is rather small, but it is in the right direction. The demonstration of figures is always mathematical and conclusive, but much depends as to the significance of those figures upon what is the basis upon which they start. I apprehend if our friends of the Democratic party will be a little more impartial in the basis of their figuring and a little more thorough in carrying their figures out, they will be able to discover that as to the important

necessaries of American commerce and of American consumption the rate of downward revision has been considerably more than that indicated in the statement of the leader of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, there are inevitable inequalities in all tariff legislation. There are some items in this bill which, if I could have the entire control and shaping of them, would be entirely different from what they are. I can say, however, that there are very few. I candidly believe that this same tariff bill will go upon our statute books and start our industries anew, and that it will be the best piece of tariff legislation that has ever been put upon the American statute books. There are not in this whole list of revised items more than two or three the inequality or the doubtful character of which are such that I care to refer to them in a discussion of this kind. One is the question of our timber supply, which has been forcibly dwelt upon by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I quite agree with him as to much of the basis of his discussion. I entirely disagree with him as to the application of that argument to the duty of Republican Congressmen here and now. This House without question followed the lead of the gentleman from Illinois in placing the duty on print paper at $2 a ton. I would vote with him again on the same question. I verily believe the majority of this House would follow him again in a like controversy if that were the question before us at this time.

But it is not. The question here and now is not whether there may be one or more items in this bill that could be improved. The question is whether there is such a miscarriage of legislation in any particular as to justify us in throwing away entirely this tariff revision, involving over 4,000 items of American schedules. Therefore, important as are these questions relating to lumber, pulp wood, wood pulp, and print paper, all of which revolve around much of the same conditions, I do not consider them of sufficient significance and importance to justify this Republican House of Representatives in declining to accept the work that has been done by this conference committee and by the Senate and House for now nearly five months.

The conservation of our growing forests is a question of vital importance. We ought to draw as far as practicable upon the timber supply of the world. This is a question of high public policy, to which the mere consideration of one or two tariff rates should yield. In my opinion, lumber and other forest products should be on the free list. We have made an effort to accomplish this in the present bill, but have succeeded only in part. But this is no sufficient reason for declining to adopt this tariff bill.

I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois, furthermore, in the fears he entertains as to the form of the maximum and minimum provision which we are about to adopt in this legislation. To my mind the provision of the House bill was far more desirable. I believe thoroughly in the idea of a maximum and minimum rate. It gives elasticity to our tariff system. It makes possible for us to enjoy readily and promptly reciprocity in commercial dealings with the nations of the earth. But from such consideration as I have been able to give the question, I believe the inertia and power of government in the shaping of the maximum and minimum tariff should be given in the direction of the lower rates instead of the higher rates, which, under the provisions of the bill, will go into effect automatically on the 31st day of March, 1910.

If I thought that by the adoption of this report the Congress would be powerless to change the form of this maximum and minimum provision for a series of years, I would hesitate long before I would, without qualification, adopt the report. That, however, is not the question with which we are confronted.

The question we are considering is whether after five months' deliberation and effort we have reached the best solution of this entire question which we can reasonably expect to reach at this time. This maximum and minimum provision will not go into effect until the 31st day of next March. It is purely an administration provision. Undoubtedly the President of the United States and his colaborers will confer and exercise diplomatic relations with other nations with whom we have important commercial dealings in anticipation of the going into effect of this provision on the 31st day of next March. If it should be found that our immediate commercial relations would be severed with Canada and that the provision ought to be modified, we will have four months of the regular session of Congress between the first Monday of December next and the 31st day of March, when we can, with the aid of the Committee on Ways and Means, modify such provision. Therefore I can not follow the lead of the gentleman from Illinois when he urges upon us the conclusion that because this provision may not be what it ought to be, for that reason we should further disturb the business interests of the country and insist further upon disagreement with the Senate over schedules which we have tried within the reasonable limits of patience and effort to improve in a conference extending over three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, there are other inequalities in this bill. I think it is quite well known to the membership of this House that I think that the cotton-cloth schedule has been increased in rates without sufficient reason and unjustifiably; particularly unjustifiably in face of the fact that we have come together as Republicans under the injunction to make an honest revision of rates downward. The wisdom or unwisdom of that sort of injunction is not for me to discuss now. That condition is one that was upon us, and I am not at all disposed to question the wisdom of the position that the Republican party took when it said that we will revise the rates downward. I believe the time comes in every great industry when it can sustain itself on lower rates than it can in the infant period of building it up.

But here stands out a prominent exception, the cotton-cloth schedule, which we have revised upward. In what I have stated there is absolutely no conflict of figures with those which the distinguished chairman has brought to your attention.

When he tells you that there is 9 per cent increase over the Dingley rate, he is referring to the entire cotton schedule, including cotton merchandise of all kinds. When I refer to the cotton-cloth schedule, I refer to paragraphs 304 and 309 of the Dingley law, the paragraphs of countable cotton cloth. These have been revised upward 27 per cent.

I made a thorough investigation of all the changes made by the Senate in the cotton-cloth schedule. I reduced every item of change to its equivalent ad valorem. My figures were revised and certified by the Treasury Department. Their correctness has not been and can not be successfully challenged. These figures agree also with the computations made by the committee of the New York Wholesale Dry Goods Association, whose calculations I have verified. Indeed, the same increases are conclusively shown in the comparative estimates of revenue under the Dingley and Aldrich rates, based upon the importations of 1907, officially prepared for the use of the Senate Finance Committee.

And yet these increases have been beclouded and mystified in debate by the proponents of this upward revision from the time the amendments were reported to the Senate. The apparent purpose seems to have been to accomplish an upward revision by indirection when the temper of Congress and of the country would scarcely admit of such legislation directly and in the open. We were first assured that there was no increase, but simply a change from ad valorems to the equivalent specific rates; next, that the new rates were no higher than the Dingley rates were intended to be; and, finally, that the new rates are no higher than the Dingley rates would have been if the Dingley rates were higher than they are.

It is unfortunate that this effort to increase the rates on one of our oldest industries has in part succeeded. The Senate amendments were cut down in conference on the lower grades of cotton cloth. If there were opportunity to carry this battle further, without placing in jeopardy legislation which ought not to be longer delayed, I should do so. As it is, there is no alternative but to accept the bill with this glaring inequality.

It is such instances of greed that bring confusion to the principle of protection in the home of its friends. I believe in the principle of protection to American industry. It is as firmly established as any other prominent principle of American policy—as the principle of sound money or the Monroe doctrine. But the benefits of this principle can only be adequately enjoyed when distributed with absolute fairness and impartiality to all industries. The time will come when each American producer will demand and receive the same equality of protection to his particular industry that he receives in equality of freight rates upon the articles he produces.

There is a vast amount of heresy afloat upon the subject of free raw material. There is no warrant for the claim that President Taft has declared himself in support of this doctrine. He has made no such declaration. He has simply favored putting some particular items upon the free list as a part of the general plan for revision downward, without doing violence to the policy of protecting American industries.

Raw material, in an economic sense, is material in the original condition in which nature has left it. There are only two elements in wealth—what nature has provided and what man has produced. The moment you add labor to nature's material that moment it ceases to be raw material and becomes a product of labor more or less complete.

But raw material as related to particular industries, and as the expression is used in tariff discussions, is a relative term. It depends altogether upon where you begin. The soil and seed are the raw material of the farmer, the grass and corn and

steer the raw material of the cattle feeder, the hide for the tanner, the leather for the manufacturer, and the saddles, harness, and shoes are the completed products to which each producer has contributed his due measure of labor. Now, applying equitably the principle of protection, each of these producers is entitled to consideration when we are fixing American tariff rates.

In practical legislation it is not easy to apply the principle with fairness and equality. To the New England economist raw material is what New England has to buy, and finished product is what New England has to sell. Granite in the rough is about as near raw material as any that could be named, but New England has protection to the extent of 10 cents per cubic foot. Someone might otherwise haul a few loads of rock across the border. And the tombstone industry retains a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem. Protection on this item goes one step beyond the grave.

Protection has less to fear from her enemies than from her friends. The statesman who revises tariff rates must be able to see beyond the boundaries of his district and State. The present bill has as few inequalities as any other. But there is still much to be desired.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believe that it is possible to realize the dream of a scientific tariff based upon that provision of the national platform of the Republican party of last June, to wit, a tariff that shall scientifically represent the difference in cost of production in every American industry at home and abroad. I believe in the establishment of a commission that will gather together facts and information of a reliable character on that subject, and when we reach that realization we will not have the present difficulties in making an equitable revision of our tariff schedules.

An era of great industrial progress is awaiting the completion of this legislation. Our industries, already in sound condition, will take a new and vigorous bound. Under the benign effects of this act the United States will continue to maintain her proud position as the chief commercial nation of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the national Democratic party has profound cause to congratulate itself upon a full knowledge of the real condition in which this tariff bill is going to the country. Declarations complimentary to the President of the United States for what he has done recently in bringing about a settlement among the Republican conferees in their alleged differences will not be a satisfactory answer to the masses of the people as to what this bill contains. The people, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, are to-day better informed upon the tariff question than they have ever been. They are more intelligent, and they are better advised as to the distinct promises made by the Republicans to reduce the Dingley duties, and when a man goes back before them in the next campaign for election as a Member of Congress, he will be required, as solemnly warned by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in speaking about wood pulp, to answer questions which the people will ask him, and he will be compelled to answer.

It will not do for him to say that there was a comparative reduction of rates as between the Payne bill and the Aldrich bill. That is a mere Republican device to try to mislead. That is one of the ordinary, commonplace, accepted characteristics of the Republican party. That is not the question. The comparison is going to be made on the basis of the Dingley tariff. It was the high charges imposed by the Dingley tariff that the people complained of. It was the operations and high rates and duties of that law, passed thirteen years ago, that the people complain of, and they will accept nothing short of a reduction downward of that law. It must be a real, practicable reduction, giving relief to the masses of the people on articles of daily use and consumption. For all of these reasons I contend that the national Democracy stands a better chance to-day than it has ever stood since the civil war on the great question of the election of the national House of Representatives and a President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have never won a victory since the close of the civil war except on the vital principle of tariff reform.

It is demonstrated by what we have witnessed here in the last five months that the leading Republicans realize that they send this tariff bill to the country under the most discouraging circumstances to their party. They fully realize from the first step taken in this tariff legislation to the present hour that the public mind has been strongly impressed with the belief that a Republican Congress did not intend, honestly and fairly, to reduce the tariff according to the promise made to the people. That is the condition they face now, and which will continue to grow more serious every day until the election for Representatives next year. Nobody has been fooled by the ostensible differences and controversies alleged to have existed among the Republican conferees which finally brought Mr. Taft in as umpire. The fact is, the leaders among the Republicans charged with framing this tariff bill realize that the country had practically lost confidence in the Republican party, and under those circumstances these "wise men" pushed the President to the front to give him the apparent opportunity of getting all the credit for reducing the duties of the tariff law, in order to comply with the promises so often made by the President in his public declarations.

These Republican leaders readily understand that the country has far more confidence in the honesty, sincerity, and good intentions of President Taft than the country has in the leaders of the Republican party. We do not say that the items of reduction insisted on by the President are not material, but we do contend that the relief granted is not a drop in the bucket to what the people were entitled to get under the provisions of this bill. We give the President full credit for what he has done, and the apt, quick, alert tariff manipulators of his own party knew exactly what to do, on what schedules, and what reductions were necessary to be made to accomplish their end. The Democratic party stands to-day more willing and ready to assert all of its ancient faith and courage and ability in defending the rights of the people, the common masses of the people, under the tariff bill, than it has ever been called upon before to do. When I go down into my district and get to talking to the people, as all of the rest of us will have to do to their own people, they will put some pointed questions to me. I have heard it said to-day by our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and by other gentlemen on the Ways and Means Committee, representing the Democracy, that every reduction made that is worth anything in this bill applies to wealth and big corporations and combinations. Is that true? Let us take but one instance.

I have taken a great deal of interest in the cotton schedule. I believe that there are certain things upon which the comfort of men and women depend. The first is that you must have clothing. That is the most vital and important necessity of life. I believe that untold harm to the people is found in the cotton schedule, and think if we can only understand the manipulations and workings of that one schedule we will find that it is more shocking than anything else that is in this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am glad to know that even in the great body of the Senate of the United States two of the "progressive Republican" Senators stood up and fought and contended for a reduction in the cotton schedule. They earnestly contended for it. They pointed it out lucidly and clearly and earnestly. Let us take one feature, and that is "mercerized" goods. It is a fact that when they use the language "mercerized or similar process" they have transferred the lowest and cheapest character of cotton goods that the masses of the people of the country wear to the class of goods used among the rich by way of making it prohibitory.

When they use the language "or similar process" we all understand what that means. We all understand, of course, that to "mercerize" simply means to glaze. It is put there purposely to give the cloth a glitter and a shine. That is classed as the most expensive and costly cotton goods that the people get, and is controlled by the great New England mills. A lower and inferior class has a shine upon it, and will be classed with the mercerized goods because of the language "or other similar process," thus transferring it to the most expensive class of cotton goods. The statement of the Republican conferees, the statement of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is unable to tell us the increase in the cotton-goods schedule. Now, let us look at this thing for a moment. Somebody will say to me, because my people are inquisitive, "Tell us something about hosiery, about stockings, that the people wear, not merely the ladies and the gentlemen, but that everybody wears." These items have been greatly advertised throughout the country as being one of the chief resources from which the "stand-pat" Republicans intended to "raise" more money, and the people know that blow is at them.

We have had it said here that we have had "sockless" Congressmen, who did not wear socks at all. I have never seen one. But I want to call your attention to this. This is the way they put it. Take this statement made by the conference report—and I am talking now about stockings and hosiery—and if there is one item, if there is one article or schedule, that the whole people could be benefited in, it would be in reducing duties on stockings and hosiery. It is no light matter. It brings in untold millions, and how true is it illustrated what our distinguished minority leader in his great speech this morning said, that it is

upon the articles of wealth they do not reduce duties. What do they do and what is done in this bill upon the cheapest class of hosiery, the cheapest that goes to the plainest and commonest people of this country? They increase the duty on every species of hosiery that goes to the common people, and they allow that which the wealthy wear to stand as it stands in the Dingley bill to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I desire to call especial attention to Schedule I—cotton—on page 3 of the statement of changes in the tariff law by the conference report on H. R. 1438:

This schedule was reconstructed and readjusted to bring the duties up to those collected during the first four years of the operation of the Dingley law and to the rates then collected under said law. Since that time the rates have been lowered, in some cases, from 60 to 6 per cent by court decisions. These new rates are equivalent to an addition, on the whole, of 3 per cent ad valorem increase over that collected under the present law for the year 1908.

Cotton hosiery, fashioned, valued at not more than $1 per dozen, from 50 to 70 cents per dozen pairs. More than $1 and less than $1.50 per dozen pairs, from 60 cents to 85 cents per dozen pairs. More than $1.50 and not more than $2, from 70 cents to 90 cents per dozen pairs.

The remaining rates on stockings are the same as under the present law.

It will be observed that the most innocent and certainly misleading part of the above schedule consists in the following words at the conclusion of said schedule, to wit: "The remaining rates on stockings are the same as under the present law." Any person actuated by ordinary feelings of credulity would think that latter clause referred to a very insignificant rate on stockings. This item shows the duplicity of the cotton schedule, and it is but a sample that appears throughout the whole cotton schedule, if the same is carefully investigated. It will be seen that stockings valued at not more than $1 per dozen are raised in the Payne-Aldrich bill over the Dingley law from 50 to 70 cents per dozen pairs. This is the class of hosiery used by the masses of the people everywhere in this country. It is the cheapest kind of stockings. The next, all of the stockings that cost more than $1 and less than $1.50 per pair, are raised by this Payne-Aldrich bill over the present Dingley law from 60 cents to 80 cents per dozen pairs. And, again, all stockings that cost more than $1.50 and not more than $2 are raised by the Payne-Aldrich bill from 70 cents to 90 cents per dozen pairs. These constitute three different classes of stockings that quite 85 per cent of the people of this country use. And yet this bill increases largely over the Dingley bill the duties on each one of these classes on what the people are absolutely compelled to have.

All the different class of stockings valued at more than $2 per dozen pairs, and not more than $3 per dozen pairs, were not raised in duty at all and were left at the same rate now fixed in the Dingley bill at $1.20 per dozen pairs. All stockings valued at more than $3 per dozen pairs and not more than $5 per dozen pairs, $2 per dozen pairs. All valued at more than $5 per dozen pairs, 55 per cent ad valorem. It will be seen that the last three different classes of stockings are used by the rich people of this country, and yet the duty upon the three different classes used by the poor people are largely raised and increased, while the latter three classes bought by the rich people are left on the same conditions and terms in the Dingley bill that have existed for the last thirteen years. Can anybody give any reason or any excuse why the increased duties should have applied alone to the stockings of the common people of the country and not at all to the articles worn by the wealthy? Some kind of a lame excuse might have been given if a gradual increase had been made from top to bottom. But worse than all of it there is added "an additional duty on all the foregoing grades of stockings, cheap or high, 15 per cent ad valorem." I could go on and review many just such items in this tariff bill, applicable to men's and boys' cotton gloves, women's gloves, and other articles used by the masses of the people in their everyday lives.

The fact stands out in "bold relief" that the Republican party in its platform, by its President and its public speakers, solemnly promised to reduce the duties under the Dingley law. It is perfectly clear that, without including the 25 per cent maximum rate left to the judgment of the President, the Payne-Aldrich bill increases the tariff burdens of the people over the present Dingley law about 1.74 per cent. Not only that, but they admit that they intend to make the tax on net incomes of corporations a part of the financial system of this country—a law as unjust, inequitable, and unfair and discriminating among the people—more so than any law ever resorted to in this country before—to get revenue to pay the expenses of the Government. This is the first time in the history of our Republic that a corporation tax of this kind has ever been imposed. It is true that a great deal of passion and prejudice in the hands of a demagogue can, for the purposes of appeal to the the passions and prejudices of some people, be successfully used, but if it is unjust and unfair such a law will have a short life. In addition to this, this Payne tariff bill authorizes the issuance of $290,569,000 to be issued for the completion of the Panama Canal, to bear interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, making an increase of 1 per cent in interest over the former issue of $84,631,900 Panama bonds issued on 2 per cent interest. The people have a right to know why this increase in the interest of Panama bonds. Why should this immense amount of money in Panama bonds be issued so long in advance of the completion of the canal? The Republican party will be called upon by the country for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to my colleague, Mr. HARRISON, from New York, for his courtesy in yielding his time to me this evening.

I like the way, the warlike way, that my insurgent friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] addressed himself to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] in the early part of his interesting address, but, like many of the insurgent branch of the opposition, the gentleman from Kansas did not go far enough. The gentleman from Ohio called the present bill a personal victory for Mr. PAYNE and President Taft, and said the victory was over the forces of free trade on the one hand and high protection on the other. There was a little girl up in my town last week, and one of her elder friends came in and said: "Look here, Mary, I understand that you have got a sweetheart," and she blushingly refused to reply. "Why," he said, "now listen, little girl; I will give you a quarter if you will tell me what his name is," and she said, in a whisper, "Why, it is Tommy Jones;" and about two minutes afterwards she said: "Now, if you will give me another quarter, I will tell you who my other sweetheart is." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, without any big bribe, I am going to tell the Members here to-night whom the other victory and the real victory in this fight is over. Your biggest victory is over the great consuming masses of this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And your biggest victory was gained for the dishonest manufacturers of this Nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] told of the situation as it looks to a man on the inside looking out—looking out for what a great party wanted instead of what the great people of this Nation desired. Now, here is how it looks to a man on the outside looking in, trying, somewhat vainly, I must admit, to find something that the gentlemen on this side may commend. It was not a personal victory for either Mr. PAYNE or President Taft. It was a personal victory, though somewhat unsatisfactory, for the senior Senator from Rhode Island and the dishonest manufacturers that he and his kind have always represented in that body over there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Regarding the victory that you have won over the forces of free trade, Mr. LONGWORTH, where do you find that element existing in this House? Not on this side. Here we have got a solid Democratic phalanx standing for an honest tariff on a revenue basis. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A tariff that would satisfy alike the honest manufacturer and the honest American workman; a tariff founded on the principle that American goods not controlled by a trust should be protected by a duty equal to the difference on the cost of production here and abroad, supplemented for revenue purposes by a fair corporation tax to continue in force until we are able to give this Nation a fair income tax.

Instead, however, the Republicans have given this Nation a miserable makeshift—a purchased compromise—unsatisfactory alike to many of the brightest minds in the Republican party and unsatisfactory in the extreme to every Democrat in both branches of Congress. I realize that my position with regard to the tariff has been criticised by some so-called "Democratic" Members and by the New York Sun. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I do not draw my Democracy from the sands of Florida nor the bayous of Louisiana; I have not always regarded the New York Sun as the source of Jeffersonian truth, even if I do occasionally read its editorial and well-edited sporting pages.

If I ever have a greater love for a manufacturer in my district than I have for my party's principles, which God forbid, and he desired a Republican protective tariff, I will advise him to start a factory forthwith in Rhode Island, and then, to make assurance doubly sure, maintain branches in Connecticut and Massachusetts. He will be protected; well protected; maybe not to the extent that the woolen manufacturers are protected, but enough, for the Senator from Rhode Island has never been scant in his protection.

"Little Rhody" has dominated in this tariff fight, let her be given the credit on your side and incidentally the blame of 70,000,000 of Americans. I can hear now the cheers which will greet on your side the passage of the Payne bill. Cheer on and on and cheer again, for, my Republican brethren, I know, and so does your Chief Executive know, that this will be the last chance that you will have to pass amid cheers any important legislation. I believe the prophetic words of Mr. Taft will ring out from the votes of the American Nation in November, 1910, and they will return a bigger Democratic majority to the House than it has ever seen since the days of the civil war.

The honest manufacturers of my district—almost every man of them Republican—asked only for a tariff equal to the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, and the manufacturer who asks for more is dishonest and the party that gives more is dishonest. New Jersey asks nothing that she would not concede to every one of her 45 sisters, and being one of the greatest manufacturing States of the Union, is intensely interested in the outcome here to-night. But ever honest and loyal to the group of States forming this Union, her voice will ring out strong and clear against the well-planned robbery of the teeming millions of this Nation for the further enrichment of the favored few.

This is not the best bill which even a partially honest Republican majority might pass. I agree with the lovable and ever efficient minority leader [Mr. CLARK], and so well said by my friend from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the best parliamentarian this side has ever produced, that we can not expect too much from that side; but I ask you now, in view of the fact that the beef trust is known as the meanest and most cowardly of all the many combinations fostered by Republican rule—I ask you compromising Members of this once great party why did not you go the entire distance in curbing this most contemptible combination and place all Mexican and Canadian beef, mutton, pork, and so forth, on the free list with hides? I realize that hides would have never been admitted free if you could have passed your bill without so doing; I realize that the Cudahys, the Armours, the Swifts, and the Morrises have been good contributors to your campaign funds, but for once play fair with the people—you have given the beef trust millions of their hard-earned dollars. Now by placing Canadian and Mexican beef on the free list, give the honest American workman a chance to buy meat for himself and his family at honest prices. The beef trust has received already at your hands its pound of flesh—now, I ask you in the name of American manhood to stand by the voters who made it possible for you to control this House; stand by the American workman whose interests you look after so well in your party platforms; stand by 20,000,000 American homes, whether peopled by Democrats or Republicans; forget for once, if you can, the dishonest dollar and legislate for the men and women of this American Nation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'CONNELL].

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Hon. Charles S. Hamlin, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under President Cleveland, which I send to the Clerk's desk to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARLES S. HAMLIN,
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR AT LAW,
Boston, Mass., July 13, 1909.

Hon. JOSEPH F. O'CONNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to express the hope that when the tariff bill is laid before the House on the report of the conference committee, you, and the other Democrats in the House, will do all in your power to make an effective public protest against its being enacted into law, unless—a rather unlikely event—the bill may be changed by the conference committee so as to bring about a decided reduction in existing tariff taxes.

I fully appreciate that any bill which can pass both Houses must be a protective measure, as the Republican party has complete control of both Houses of Congress. The contest, however, which has been waged in Congress may be said scarcely to touch the question of protection, as that term has in the past been understood. The contest, in fact, seems to be between certain Republicans who believe that the Republican party enacted a tariff plank in the proceedings of the national convention which was meant to convey to the voters, and was so understood, a promise to reduce thoroughly and effectively existing customs taxes, and on the other hand a powerful faction in the party which seems intent upon deliberately disregarding this understanding, and of enacting the most outrageous system of increased taxation this country has ever seen. The former class believe that the measure of protection should be the difference in the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. They maintain, and have successfully demonstrated, that a large number of duties in the bill as it left both the House and the Senate, contain a measure of protection far higher than any such difference.

On the other hand, the other faction contemptuously disregard national pledges and insist that the very highest measure of increased protection shall be meted out to private interests, giving to these interests the right to lay heavy additional burdens of taxation upon the consumers of the country.

In this crisis it would seem the duty of every Democrat to have the facts clearly understood. The consumers of the country are not myths, as some would have us understand; on the contrary, they are citizens of the United States struggling to support themselves and their families on limited wages, salaries, and incomes, which have been materially reduced by the increased cost of living. They understood the Republican platform to promise decided reduction of customs taxes. They now stand aghast at the evident purpose of the leaders, and perhaps of the majority of the Republicans in Congress in defiance of party pledges, to greatly increase the existing burdensome taxation, thus raising the prices of necessaries of life to all consumers in the United States, and this wholly for the special profit of certain favored protected interests. The only hope for the consumer of the country now lies with the conference committee and the President. Little can be hoped from the conference committee, but if the Democrats of the House and Senate make clear what the disgusting scramble for increased taxes really means, there is ground for hope that the President of the United States will take upon himself the responsibility of vetoing this bill. To this end the effort of every Democrat in the House and Senate should be steadily directed until the bill either becomes law or is vetoed. If the bill in anything like its present form is enacted into law, the people of the United States will then take up the matter, and the verdict will be speedy and decisive.

Very truly, yours,
CHARLES S. HAMLIN.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for more than twelve months a dozen or more of the most gigantic and best-trained minds in this body have been concentrated in the formulation of this bill, and now the remainder of the Members, consisting of about 380 Representatives of the people, are called upon and required to pass upon the final draft, as reported by the conference committee, with less than seven hours' debate, less than seven hours to be divided among 391 Members, and yet there are those who insist that this House is a deliberative body. I do not wish to be understood, however, as complaining of the short time allotted to me. Five minutes, perhaps, is really more than an humble Member in the rear ranks of the minority should consume in the discussion of the perplexing and many-sided Payne tariff bill. For let it be understood, once and for all, that this side of the House is in no wise responsible for the many pretexts and evasions that lurk beneath its misguiding folds. It is not our party. It is not our funeral. It will doubtless prove a doleful, deathlike procession to many of the liberal Republican Members from west of the Allegheny Mountains, who have promised their revisionist constituents an actual downward revision of the tariff; and it may consign some of the best of them to a prolonged political oblivion, perhaps to an eternal political grave; but, I insist, it is none of our funeral. The burden of explanation is on you, my friends of the majority, and not upon us, for we of the Middle West on this side of the Chamber have zealously kept the faith by voting for every reduction which your special cloture rules would permit.

What are you going to do about the promises you made during the last campaign? What are you going to do when you return to the folks at home fresh from the fruition of this, the latest outrage upon the sacred rights of the people? Your failure in other regards you will doubtless attribute to the omnipotent power of the Speaker of the House; but what are you going to do about your promises to revise the tariff downward? You can not charge that to your House machine. The Speaker can not do the vicarious atonement for you upon that score. You sinned away one day of grace when you voted to refer this bill to the conference committee without instructions, and the vote on this conference report now is the final crucial test. You have your golden opportunity, for it has been announced publicly and openly, and has not been contradicted, that if a satisfactory tariff bill is not enacted by this special session of Congress, Congress will be reconvened at an early date, and another opportunity given for tariff legislation. Under these conditions, if you vote for this bill, you thereby indorse every provision in it, every maximum, every minimum, every drawback, every countervailing duty, every joker; in fact, every subterfuge concealed beneath its ambiguous phraseology. When you cast your vote for this bill you brush aside your last chance and can not truthfully lay your failure to keep the faith at the door of the Speaker of the House or the House machine.

The Members from the States carved out of the great western plains who support this bill, carrying, as has been shown by the gentleman from Illinois, a duty of from $2.50 to $3.75 on lumber, call to my mind a joint political discussion between a Republican and a Populist during the early political days of Oklahoma. The Republican on this occasion was named Hudson, and had formerly been a greenbacker. The Populist had also been playing checkers with his past political record. His name was Scott, and he had been elevated from the Republican ranks. Hudson, the Republican, opened the discussion, and exalted the great principles and achievements of the G. O. P. to the blue canopy of heaven, and eternally lambasted the vagaries of Populism to the eternal lower regions. When Scott, the Pop, made his reply, he drew forth from his old satchel a copy of a

torn and tattered greenback speech made years before by Hudson. He read and exhibited this speech as a complete refutation to the argument then being made by Hudson. The evidence was conclusive and the case looked bad for the Republican orator, but Hudson knew of Scott's former political affiliations and in his rejoinder in a dramatic and frantic manner asked Scott this question: "Mr. Scott, did you never make a political utterance for which you were ashamed, and for which you would apologize?" "Yes," said Scott, tersely and frankly. "Will you kindly explain to this audience," said Mr. Hudson, "when, where, and what it was?" "Yes," said Scott, "it was when I was living in a dugout in southwest Kansas, dirt for the top, dirt for the sides, and dirt for the bottom, with nothing but a flimsy worn-out quilt hung in the doorway to keep the chilling blasts of winter from freezing my shaking frame. I stood shaking, shivering, and howling for a high tariff on lumber."

Authority and instructions have been given by the people for a downward revision of the tariff, for an equitable adjustment of the tariff laws, and it would seem the height of inconsistency has been reached, that the very climax of the irony of fate has been attained, when such a commission has been placed in the hands of the Republican party, a political organization the fundamental principle of whose political faith is the protection of certain special interests and whose political success depends largely on campaign funds contributed by the tariff barons.

Some day we will have an equitable adjustment of the tariff, fair to all parties concerned, including the consumer; but it will not be by the Republican party. It can not be done by that party, for it is a partisan tribunal with predilection for the special interests. Some day the great mass of the people, not only from the grand old South and the boundless West, but from the thickly populated East, and the people all over this great country will awake to the fact that they are being exploited and plundered for the benefit of the few tariff barons. Then there will be a mighty upheaval. The money changers will be driven from the temple. The tariff will be revised. We will have an actual, equitable, and fair adjustment of the tariff legislation, not in favor of the special interests, but in the interest of all the people. Not, I repeat, by a subsidized auxiliary of predatory wealth, but by a just, sensible, and united Democracy, backed and fortified by public opinion at last aroused to the abuses committed in the name of Republicanism.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, there was inserted in this bill in the Senate a corporation tax for the express purpose, as avowed by its sponsor, of defeating the income tax desired by the Senate and the inheritance tax desired by the House. It seems to be a provision which nobody really wants, to take the place of two provisions which are very earnestly wanted, and so I wish to discuss the comparative merits of the three provisions—the inheritance tax which the House adopted, the income tax which apparently the Senate was eager to adopt, and the corporation tax agreed upon as a compromise.

I opposed the inheritance tax in the House, but I am aware that it is in many ways an ideal tax, easily and equably collectible, without inquisition or temptation to fraud, taken at the very moment when the victim can best afford it, bearing only upon those who have raised themselves above the serious struggle for existence, not readily or often avoided, and very remunerative. I was one of its earnest advocates when it was first adopted by the Massachusetts legislature, and my only objection to it here is that I think it should be left to the States as one of their exclusive sources of revenue. A large number of the States have already resorted to it, the tendency there is to depend upon it more and more, and I think it but fair we should give them an open field in this line of taxation and not embarrass or cripple them by laying our heavy hand on the same fruitful subject. We may forget here, as we consider how the objects of federal expenditure have broadened in recent years, requiring constantly increasing revenues, that a similar growth has been expanding in our States and municipalities, that the public is constantly assuming burdens and duties toward its constituents which were not formerly dreamed of, that the tendency is progressive, and that with the growth of expenditures there must be a discovery of new sources of revenue, and that the inheritance tax offers an admirable resource which will be needed more and doubtless made much more severe and remunerative with coming years.

On the other hand, an income tax must necessarily be a national tax if it is to bring in much return. In some of the speeches in the Senate much ridicule and criticism is vented on the assessment of the personalty of rich men, but a little reflection would show it is inevitable and no reproach to the assessors. A man of wealth is apt to have several houses, and he can claim domicile and have his personalty taxed in whatever place he selects and claims as his real residence. If in his opinion assessors in one place tax him too heavily it is easy for him to offer to the assessors of another place to take up his residence there if they will be lenient, and inasmuch as the increase derived from his estate is clear gain to them such an arrangement will not be difficult to make. I remember hearing of a rich man in Boston, who thought too much was exacted from him there in personal taxes, going to the assessors of a small town where he had a country home and asking how much they would doom him if he took up his legal residence there. As they hesitated, he remarked, "If I will pay the whole amount you now raise by taxation, you will be satisfied," as, of course, they were—and even then he paid much less than his estate was charged with in the city. That may be an exaggerated incident, but it is notorious that men move from place to place to get less taxation, and until human nature changes or fixed residence is made compulsory that process will continue, and we must count upon it. Quite recently a wealthy man has moved from Massachusetts to another State in order, as everyone believes, to get lighter taxation. Now, exactly the same motives and actions will follow if the States attempt on any serious scale an income tax. Some State or States, in order to tempt within their limits the men of large incomes, will impose on them a very low tax, and will gradually have centralized there the large fortunes of the country, much to the advantage of themselves and their citizens, but thereby wholly annulling and preventing the fair application of the tax in the country at large. We have had this experience with the personalty taxes, and the same motives and opportunities must produce the same result with the income tax. If it is to be levied at all with fairness and efficiency, it must be national, so that simple change of residence can not avoid it.

The same objection does not hold against the inheritance tax, for men as a rule are not so anxious about their property when their own use of it is over. They seldom recognize that death is imminent and will not be apt to change their legal residence in order that their heirs may at some uncertain future date escape a tax. Consequently an inheritance tax can be fearlessly enforced by the States.

I am glad to see the income tax in the form of a constitutional amendment instead of part of this bill. I should be very sorry to see that issue come again before the Supreme Court, however they might decide it. That court has the respect and confidence of the American people. We all wish it to be looked up to with increasing reliance as a last resort, where in troublous times waves of popular passion will be unfelt and a calm and safe refuge found from partisan strife. Some things have happened of late years to suggest doubt whether it is really so aloof as we love to think from the ordinary motives which govern human conduct, and whether the austere superiority to mortal frailties which we wish to ascribe to it still exists. None of us wish to see a shifting and dissenting court, but all wish that there shall be one branch of the Government where at least impartiality, uniformity, and consistency may be assured. And so I am glad that this vexed question of the constitutionality of the income tax was not again sent to the court by this bill to create the inevitable conflict and dissent there, and although it has always seemed to me that the weight of argument was with Justice White in his dissenting opinion, yet I think it much better that the judgment of the court be acquiesced in as conclusive, and that the will of the people be expressed by an amendment to the Constitution, rather than by a reversal of the court. I should dislike to see any corroboration of Mr. Dooley's gibe that the Supreme Court follows the election returns.

I think the right to levy an income tax ought to be vested in the Nation. It is a resource which it may need and ought to possess, and it is no answer to say that we already have the power with the limitation that it must be apportioned among the States according to population, because an income tax so apportioned would bear so unfairly and ludicrously that it could never be enacted.

There are, of course, serious, inevitable, and unanswerable objections to any income tax. It is always a choice of evils, a weighing of counterbalancing arguments and difficulties. Throwing open to everybody one's private affairs and business profits is unpleasant and undesirable, and the opportunity for fraud and the premium on perjury is great; but aside from these obvious and much discussed objections there are others which to me have much weight. The menace to the protective system can not be ignored. In that system the country seems generally to have acquiesced, and it seems now to be more firmly established as our national policy than ever before. The debates and votes on the pending tariff bill have indicated a more widespread recognition of its advantages by Members of both

branches of Congress than on any previous occasion. But it still has its inveterate foes. And an income tax, levied on the rich, will give the demagogue great opportunity to appeal to class feeling and the envy of wealth and to increase its yield and make customs duties unnecessary and a high tariff superfluous. And there is also great intrinsic danger of an unjust levy, for the larger the field the greater is the danger of injustice. In small communities, where the rich and poor know each other, though there may not be kindly feeling, the sense of justice and fair play is strong. Before the day of great corporations, when the head of each business knew his subordinates, though there may have been personal ill will, it was tempered by acquaintance. A mob is always more unfair and cruel than its individuals. And so I think when a tax levy extends over a vast country like ours and strikes a class against whom much can fairly be said and whom it is popular to attack, when the different sections are unacquainted and sometimes antagonistic, when selfish advantages will accrue to some, there is great danger that an income tax will often be levied not from fairness and justice, but from envy and hatred and selfishness. Still all taxes are disagreeable and have their defects, and I think the Nation should have this power over incomes, though I fear it will be used much more freely than my judgment will commend.

I think it is fairer than the corporation tax. I can see no justice in treating these artificial creatures of the States more harshly than their individual competitors in business. While the vast aggregations of capital which have excited the fears and legislation of the past few years gain perhaps enough advantage from their franchise to properly pay a special tax, we must not forget that it has become habitual, from motives of convenience, to incorporate very modest and small business concerns, and that there are thousands of them which will feel themselves discriminated against and robbed in favor of their equally large individual competitors.

Of course I appreciate that it is intended not to tax the franchise; that inasmuch as a State can not tax the franchise of a federal corporation, it would seem inconsistent to hold that the Nation can tax the franchise of a state corporation; and therefore the law has been carefully and ingeniously drafted to avoid the difficulty, and by using the very language of the Supreme Court to appear as already having its approval and indorsement. But I do not think cunning language will divert the court from the substance; and while this whole subject of the constitutionality of taxation has become wrapped in a cloud of doubt and refined into most intricate and involved and questionable distinctions, yet it seems to me it is quite uncertain what the decision of the court on this law will be, and that in endeavoring to evade one constitutional difficulty we have rushed into another.

Of course the tax will not be generally unpopular. Politically it may not be a mistake, for the great majority of the people are not stockholders in any corporation, and may not only look with indifference on taxing them, but very likely will take pleasure in that fact, regardless of the revenues brought in. A corporation has no friends; and just as in a former age it was only necessary to charge one with being a heretic or a witch to excite universal detestation, so to-day the word "trust" has a similar opprobrium. But such waves of popular feeling are extreme and often unreasonable, and it is dangerous to take advantage of them to accomplish any end not strictly just, for it may rouse an appetite and tendency which is ruinous and uncontrollable.

The great menace of the income tax, to my mind, is that it will not be reserved for emergencies, but will be used as an outlet for envy and hatred; but that tax is intrinsically fair and equable. The corporation tax is subject to the same danger, intensified by the fact that it is not originally fair. It has one excellent result much relied on by its authors which I heartily approve—it opens the way to a publicity which many agree is alone a sufficient cure for our trust evils and which everyone will be glad to see tested and will hope may prove effective, for it is the simplest and fairest and easiest of all remedies offered. I admit if this shall prove the result, the law will have vindicated itself and been worth the experiment.

But I do not think for revenue purposes any of these leaps in the dark are necessary. The new tariff may exceed expectations. Certainly there is every reason to expect a speedy expansion of business, and such temporary expedients as we have tested before can easily fill the temporary gap.

Moreover, there is the other possibility which is seldom alluded to, but which is ever with us—a reduction of expenses. To my mind the indifference of the people to our increasing outlay is one of the most disheartening signs of the time. The country has apparently become so vast that each district loses all sense of responsibility, considers only what it can extract for itself from the Treasury, and if it fares well is willing that others should do the like, and gives no heed to economy or reason. The Treasury is one huge reservoir from which each wishes to draw for his favorite project and which must be kept full enough to supply his needs. Of course Representatives must reflect the views of their constituents, and hence with the vast projects now in the air it is difficult to see any limit to the money demanded unless there is some change of sentiment. And if when such a state of mind prevails a corporation tax or an income tax is initiated, the extent to which it may be pushed is frightful.

To have some check on an income tax, some assurance that it will not be unjustly levied, I think the English practice should be followed, and the exemption should be small. I think in England it is $800. Then our ordinary current expenses should be paid from customs and internal revenue, and only when they prove insufficient should other taxes be resorted to. If with the income tax which would bear upon the rich and well to do should be coupled a small tax on some article which the whole people use, such as tea and coffee, large enough so that they would feel the sting, though not burdensome, then the whole people, the rich and poor alike, would inevitably take an interest in national expenditures, would approve the party which was economical and punish the extravagant. Such is now the case in our States and municipalities. An expensive administration is followed by high taxes and judged accordingly, but there is no motive for economy on the part of the Nation, and unless some is supplied there must ensue wanton extravagance.

This administration has made a most commendable effort to prune its estimates and reduce expenses, but Congress, reflecting the popular will, has always been the final arbiter, and unless there is a change of heart there no permanent improvement can be expected, and any new and popular source of revenue will be apt to lead to new and unnecessary outlays. But the corporation tax is in the bill. There is no way of voting against it except by defeating the whole tariff bill and commencing again that wearisome series of compromises, which has already occupied five months and whose success, if begun anew, would be even more doubtful. So those of us who distrust this new departure can only vote for it as we do for many other provisions of this bill, with reluctance and dislike, and state in the RECORD our dilemma and our opinion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the rest of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] for the privilege of saying the last word for the Democrats in this debate. In closing this debate for those on this side of the Chamber my regret is that I am limited by the rule adopted to-day confining this discussion to so brief a time. I heartily wish that I had the opportunity to show the many injustices and inequalities of this bill. I would, if my time permitted, show, I think, the sectionalism of the measure. This bill is full of jokers and snakes. It is in no wise a redemption of the promise of the Republican party to revise the tariff downward. It is a mass of deception and covert favoritism to the special interests that control the Republican party. It in no wise reduces the tariff in the interest of the consumer, the ultimate consumer, if you please, the man that pays the tariff tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This bill increases the tax on the poor man's tobacco about 35 per cent and leaves his blanket taxed 180 per cent. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said that the country would accept this bill as a satisfactory piece of legislation. That I deny, for the country will know that this is a false answer to the promise of a downward revision of the tariff. [Applause.] When the consumers who pay the taxes are heard from they will deny that assurance so gleefully uttered by the gentleman from New York.

That gentleman said another thing in which time will prove him to be a false prophet. He said that the operation of this bill when enacted into law would not stop the turning of the wheels of a single factory or mill in the United States. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just given us an instance where, if this bill as reported by the conference committee becomes a law, the paper mills of the United States will be soon compelled to stop operations; that is to say, those outside of New England. Mr. Speaker, it is well known to us that a few New England States have well-nigh controlled the legislation and the fiscal policy of the United States for many years. Her Senators and Representatives have in this bill, as in tariff bills heretofore enacted by the Republican party, secured what their comparatively small section of the country has desired. The interests of the masses of our common country have been ignored, and the mighty West and the great South have been

forgotten by the framers of this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In this bill New England gets everything she wants. She is given prohibitive protection against pulp wood and wood pulp from Canada. She is given prohibitive protection against print paper from foreign countries. She is given hides free of tariff and has her shoes and leather protected by a tariff against foreign competition.

And, Mr. Speaker, another striking sectional feature of this bill as reported by the conference committee is made manifest by the fact that the bill as it passed the House taxed jute and jute butts and bagging made therefrom, used in wrapping our cotton for market. The Senate put these on the free list, but the conference committee restored the duty on bagging but left jute and jute butts, from which bagging is made, on the free list for the additional benefit of the bagging trust. This trust has a factory in Indiana and factories in Massachusetts and New York. The Republican party put binding twine on the free list long ago for the benefit of the grain growers. This was right. But why should not the cotton grower have his bagging, in which he wraps his cotton, duty free? Especially ought bagging to be free of duty when we consider that the Government has never derived more than about $118,000 of revenue in any year from the tariff on this commodity used by the cotton producer, and the bagging trust has derived about $1,000,000 per annum from the shelter afforded by the tariff tax. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, another thing that the discussion of this bill has demonstrated, and that is that sooner of later, soon I think, Congress will pass a graduated or graded income tax. It will become, in my judgment, a permanent feature of the fiscal policy of the Government. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed two minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I object.

Mr. CLAYTON. Very well; if the truth that I have told and propose to tell hurts you, then I do not complain at your objection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the time can not be extended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLAYTON. Of course if the gentleman from New York does not want to hear any more truth, that is all right.

Mr. PAYNE. You can not extend debate.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I always listen to the gentleman from Missouri, who is the leader of the minority party, with a great deal of pleasure, although I do not find myself usually in agreement with his conclusions; but he demonstrated absolutely to-day two propositions. He first stated that he could take two men, expert in the use of figures, and could prove two antagonistic conclusions with reference to the tariff. The figures would not lie, but the experts would. And he then proceeded to present a set of figures to the House which proved that he must have employed the services of the most accomplished liar in North America. [Laughter.] And I am not questioning the figures at all, but the conclusions to which they appear to lead. His expert had taken up the different schedules of the pending bill, and attempted to show that it gave no practical reduction, and he employed figures to reach the conclusion in this way: He took the revenues that are now derived under these schedules and the revenues that he "figures" will be derived under the proposed bill, and he calculated up from the difference in the revenues that the reduction was practically nothing. But what a transparent fallacy was involved! It has been the contention of nobody that the bill before the House was going to reduce the revenues at the custom-houses. On the other hand, we have had it in view to increase those revenues. If we had made the duties prohibitive, there would be no revenue, and by this method it would be argued that we had revised the tariff downward.

We might have brought in a bill founded on the English system, where upon five articles alone, counting liquors as one, they produce a revenue at the custom-house of more than $158,000,000. Multiply that by 2, which is about the ratio of our population to that of Great Britain, and we should produce over $317,000,000 upon those five articles. A tariff bill like that would be a free-trade tariff; and yet, upon the theory of the gentleman's expert, we should have produced no downward revision of the tariff, because the revenues would not have been decreased.

Then the gentleman demonstrated another fact. Those of us who have the pleasure of knowing Mrs. Clark know that she is a woman of remarkably good sense. The gentleman from Missouri proceeded to prove that fact to the House by saying that after she had read Mr. PAYNE's report she said his tariff bill would save to the American people $5,000,000,000 every year. That, to my mind, was a highly sensible observation.

Now let us look at the striking fact brought out by the statistics that were produced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He shows that we have reduced duties upon articles which are consumed in the United States to the amount of about $5,000,000,000 every year. Well, what is the Democratic theory?

The Democratic theory is that the people are not merely taxed upon goods that are entered at the custom-house, but there is also an equivalent tax put on all those commodities produced in the United States and consumed here. Whether that theory is true in its extent or not, there is no doubt that customs duties upon goods in many cases increase the price to the consumer of the same kind of goods produced in this country; and when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shows that this bill decreases the duty upon articles consumed by the American people, necessary articles, to the amount of $5,000,000,000 a year, and that it only increases the duties upon goods consumed to the amount, excluding luxuries, of $272,000,000 a year, it seems to me he has demonstrated conclusively the tendency of this bill.

It is said that this is not a revision downward. Why, it is impossible for any fair-minded man to take these schedules and to go through them from beginning to end and deny that it is the most effective revision downward undertaken by any tariff bill ever presented to the American Congress.

You can count on the fingers of one hand in the chemical schedule the increases, if you leave out luxuries, while there is a whole page of decreases, and among them the great chemicals—sulphate of ammonia, which is put upon the free list, various forms of lead, various forms of potash—those chemicals that enter into manufacture and into the consumption of our people.

And then take the iron and steel schedule. We begin by making a reduction from 40 cents to 15 cents a ton in the duty upon iron ore, which lies at the basis of all manufactures of iron and steel. We reduced the duty upon pig iron, which is used by so many industries, from $4 to $2.50 a ton. We reduced the duty on scrap iron from $4 to $1 a ton. We cut in two the duty on steel rails. The steel schedule presents a reduction which amounts practically to cutting it in two. Yet we have adjusted these cuts to the conditions of the industry, and we believe that they will not result in harming any part of this country. The duty upon coal is cut 33 per cent. The duty upon petroleum and its products is removed altogether.

And so it is throughout the whole bill. Take the duty upon hides. They have been upon the free list ever since we have been a nation, with the exception of two or three intervals, and this bill places them there again. We do not believe that it will in any way affect the cattle-growing industry in this country; but the removal of the duty is far more than compensated for by the radical cuts made in leather, in boots and shoes, in harness and saddlery. In these paragraphs the duties are practically cut in two.

Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is: Shall this report be voted up or shall it be voted down? If it is voted down, you bring in chaos; you throw open all these hundreds of differences to amendment. You will see nothing but disintegration. You will not have tariff revision at this session, if, indeed, you have it at the next. The question before the House is: Shall we sustain a Republican President? Shall we carry out the pledges of a Republican platform?

Mr. Taft, when he was a candidate for the Presidency, took the people into his confidence and frankly announced that if he were elected he would attempt to bring about a revision of the tariff downward upon the lines of protection. That policy beyond question is reflected in this bill. It is a great government measure. It is one of the most monumental measures ever presented to an American Congress. It is a measure the passage of which is desired by a Republican President. It is the first great policy of his administration. I say to you it would be most damaging to him, it would be most damaging to the cause of a revision of the tariff, either up or down, if enough Republicans withheld their votes from this measure to defeat it. It would, at the threshold of his administration, subject him to a damaging repulse, and it would keep alive agitation; it would keep uncertainty hanging over business.

My friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does not want this report to be accepted because he thinks that the cut on print paper from $6 and $8 a ton to $3.75 a ton is not sufficiently drastic. On the other hand, the gentlemen who represent the great paper-producing districts of the country believe that a cut even to $3.75 will produce disaster. This is only an illustration of the difficulties we shall face. We will have many conflicting views of this kind. If this report is thrown open, the gentleman from Illinois will probably not see his views prevail, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] may not see his views prevail. If in a tariff bill applying to some 4,000 articles every duty must first be adjusted to please everybody, or, indeed, anybody, we should never have legislation. From necessity such a bill involves compromises. Some of the provisions of this bill, standing alone, I should vote against. But as a whole I believe it a righteous measure, and as such it will have my vote. We will have a conflict of forces, we will have disintegration and chaos, if the report is voted down; and in the interests of good legislation, and to put upon the statute books what I believe is, upon the whole, as good a tariff law as was ever passed by the American Congress, I appeal to the Members upon this side of the Chamber to give their votes in favor of the report. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the conference committee, and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANN. And on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 181, not voting 11, as follows:

YEAS—196.

Alexander, N. Y.	Ellis	Johnson, Ohio	Payne
Allen	Elvins	Joyce	Pearre
Ames	Englebright	Kahn	Perkins
Andrus	Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley
Anthony	Fairchild	Kennedy, Ohio	Poindexter
Austin	Fassett	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pratt
Barchfeld	Fish	Knapp	Pray
Barclay	Focht	Knowland	Prince
Barnard	Foelker	Kopp	Reeder
Bartholdt	Fordney	Kronmiller	Reynolds
Bates	Foss	Küstermann	Roberts
Bennet, N. Y.	Foster, Vt.	Lafean	Rodenberg
Bennett, Ky.	Foulkrod	Langham	Scott
Bingham	Fowler	Langley	Sheffield
Boutell	Fuller	Law	Simmons
Bradley	Gaines	Lawrence	Slemp
Broussard	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Smith, Cal.
Brownlow	Gardner, Mich.	Loud	Smith, Iowa
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	Loudenslager	Smith, Mich.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garner, Pa.	Lowden	Snapp
Burleigh	Gillett	Lundin	Stafford
Butler	Goebel	McCall	Steenerson
Calder	Good	McCreary	Sterling
Calderhead	Graff	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell	Graham, Pa.	McKinlay, Cal.	Sturgiss
Capron	Grant	McKinley, Ill.	Sulloway
Cassidy	Greene	McKinney	Swasey
Chapman	Griest	McLachlan, Cal.	Tawney
Cocks, N. Y.	Guernsey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Taylor, Ohio
Cole	Hamer	McMorran	Tener
Cook	Hamilton	Madden	Thistlewood
Cooper, Pa.	Hanna	Malby	Thomas, Ohio
Cowles	Haugen	Martin, S. Dak.	Tilson
Creager	Hawley	Miller, Kans.	Tirrell
Crow	Hayes	Millington	Townsend
Crumpacker	Heald	Mondell	Volstead
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Vreeland
Dalzell	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Wanger
Davidson	Hill	Morehead	Washburn
Dawson	Hinshaw	Morgan, Mo.	Weeks
Denby	Hollingsworth	Morgan, Okla.	Wheeler
Diekema	Howell, N. J.	Morse	Wiley
Dodds	Howell, Utah.	Murphy	Wilson, Ill.
Douglas	Howland	Needham	Wood, N. J.
Draper	Hubbard, Iowa	Olcott	Woods, Iowa
Driscoll, M. E.	Hubbard, W. Va.	Olmsted	Woodyard
Durey	Hughes, W. Va.	Palmer, H. W.	Young, Mich.
Dwight	Hull, Iowa	Parker	Young, N. Y.
Edwards, Ky.	Humphrey, Wash.	Parsons	The Speaker

NAYS—181.

Adair	Byrd	Cullop	Gallagher
Adamson	Byrns	Davis	Garner, Tex.
Aiken	Candler	De Armond	Garrett
Alexander, Mo.	Cantrill	Dent	Gill, Md.
Anderson	Carlin	Denver	Gill, Mo.
Ansberry	Carter	Dickson, Miss.	Gillespie
Ashbrook	Cary	Dies	Gilmore
Barnhart	Clark, Fla.	Dixon, Ind.	Glass
Bartlett, Ga.	Clark, Mo.	Driscoll, D. A.	Godwin
Beall, Tex.	Clayton	Edwards, Ga.	Goldfogle
Bell, Ga.	Cline	Ellerbe	Gordon
Boehne	Collier	Estopinal	Goulden
Booher	Conry	Ferris	Graham, Ill.
Borland	Cooper, Wis.	Finley	Gregg
Bowers	Coudrey	Fitzgerald	Griggs
Brantley	Covington	Flood, Va.	Gronna
Burgess	Cox, Ind.	Floyd, Ark.	Hamill
Burleson	Cox, Ohio	Fornes	Hamlin
Burnett	Cravens	Foster, Ill.	Hammond
Hardwick	Lenroot	Padgett	Sims
Hardy	Lever	Page	Sisson
Harrison	Lindbergh	Palmer, A. M.	Slayden
Hay	Lindsay	Patterson	Small
Heflin	Livingston	Peters	Smith, Tex.
Helm	Lloyd	Pickett	Southwick
Henry, Tex.	McDermott	Pou	Sparkman
Houston	McHenry	Pujo	Spight
Howard	Macon	Rainey	Stanley
Hughes, Ga.	Madison	Randell, Tex.	Stephens, Tex.
Hughes, N. J.	Maguire, Nebr.	Ransdell, La.	Sulzer
Hull, Tenn.	Mann	Rauch	Talbott
Humphreys, Miss.	Martin, Colo.	Reid	Taylor, Ala.
James	Maynard	Rhinock	Taylor, Colo.
Jamieson	Mays	Richardson	Thomas, Ky.
Johnson, Ky.	Miller, Minn.	Riordan	Thomas, N. C.
Johnson, S. C.	Moon, Tenn.	Robinson	Tou Velle
Jones	Moore, Tex.	Rothermel	Underwood
Keliher	Morrison	Rucker, Colo.	Wallace
Kendall	Moss	Rucker, Mo.	Watkins
Kinkead, N. J.	Murdock	Sabath	Webb
Kitchin	Nelson	Saunders	Wickliffe
Korbly	Nicholls	Shackleford	Willett
Lamb	Norris	Sharp	Wilson, Pa.
Lassiter	Nye	Sheppard	
Latta	O'Connell	Sherley	
Lee	Oldfield	Sherwood	

NOT VOTING—11.

Bartlett, Nev.	Hobson	Lovering	Sperry
Craig	Huff	Mudd	Weisse
Hitchcock	Keifer	Russell	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. HITCHCOCK.

Mr. SPERRY with Mr. CRAIG.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, to recommit the bill to the conference committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In order to save time, Mr. Speaker, I will demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 191, not voting 11, as follows:

YEAS—186.

Adair	Estopinal	Jones	Randell, Tex.
Adamson	Ferris	Keliher	Ransdell, La.
Aiken	Finley	Kendall	Rauch
Alexander, Mo.	Fitzgerald	Kinkead, N. J.	Reid
Anderson	Flood, Va.	Kitchin	Rhinock
Ansberry	Floyd, Ark.	Korbly	Richardson
Ashbrook	Fornes	Lamb	Riordan
Barnhart	Foster, Ill.	Lassiter	Robinson
Bartlett, Ga.	Gallagher	Latta	Rothermel
Beall, Tex.	Garner, Tex.	Lee	Rucker, Colo.
Bell, Ga.	Garrett	Lenroot	Rucker, Mo.
Boehne	Gill, Md.	Lever	Sabath
Booher	Gill, Mo.	Lindbergh	Saunders
Borland	Gillespie	Lindsay	Shackleford
Bowers	Gilmore	Livingston	Sharp
Brantley	Glass	Lloyd	Sheppard
Burgess	Godwin	McDermott	Sherley
Burleson	Goldfogle	McHenry	Sherwood
Burnett	Good	Macon	Sims
Byrd	Gordon	Madison	Sisson
Byrns	Goulden	Maguire, Nebr.	Slayden
Candler	Graham, Ill.	Mann	Small
Cantrill	Gregg	Martin, Colo.	Smith, Tex.
Carlin	Griggs	Maynard	Southwick
Carter	Gronna	Mays	Sparkman
Cary	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Spight
Clark, Fla.	Hamlin	Moon, Tenn.	Stanley
Clark, Mo.	Hammond	Moore, Tex.	Steenerson
Clayton	Hardwick	Morrison	Stephens, Tex.
Cline	Hardy	Moss	Sulzer
Collier	Harrison	Murdock	Talbott
Conry	Haugen	Nelson	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Hay	Nicholls	Taylor, Colo.
Cox, Ind.	Heflin	Norris	Thomas, Ky.
Cox, Ohio	Helm	Nye	Thomas, N. C.
Cravens	Henry, Tex.	O'Connell	Tou Velle
Cullop	Houston	Oldfield	Underwood
Davis	Howard	Padgett	Volstead
De Armond	Hubbard, Iowa	Page	Wallace
Dent	Hughes, Ga.	Palmer, A. M.	Watkins
Denver	Hughes, N. J.	Patterson	Webb
Dickson, Miss.	Hull, Tenn.	Peters	Wickliffe
Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	Pickett	Willett
Dixon, Ind.	James	Poindexter	Wilson, Pa.
Driscoll, D. A.	Jamieson	Pou	Woods, Iowa
Edwards, Ga.	Johnson, Ky.	Pujo	
Ellerbe	Johnson, S. C.	Rainey	

NAYS—191.

Alexander, N. Y.	Bartholdt	Burke, Pa.	Chapman
Allen	Bates	Burke, S. Dak.	Cocks, N. Y.
Ames	Bennet, N. Y.	Burleigh	Cole
Andrus	Bennett, Ky.	Butler	Cook
Anthony	Bingham	Calder	Cooper, Pa.
Austin	Boutell	Calderhead	Cooper, Wis.
Barchfeld	Bradley	Campbell	Coudrey
Barclay	Broussard	Capron	Cowles
Barnard	Brownlow	Cassidy	Creager

Crow	Greene	Loud	Reeder
Crumpacker	Griest	Loudenslager	Reynolds
Currier	Guernsey	Lowden	Roberts
Dalzell	Hamer	Lundin	Rodenberg
Davidson	Hamilton	McCall	Scott
Dawson	Hanna	McCreary	Sheffield
Denby	Hawley	McGuire, Okla.	Simmons
Diekema	Hayes	McKinlay, Cal.	Slemp
Dodds	Heald	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Cal.
Douglas	Henry, Conn.	McKinney	Smith, Iowa
Draper	Higgins	McLachlan, Cal.	Smith, Mich.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hill	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snapp
Durey	Hinshaw	McMorran	Stafford
Dwight	Hollingsworth	Madden	Sterling
Edwards, Ky.	Howell, N. J.	Malby	Stevens, Minn.
Ellis	Howell, Utah	Martin, S. Dak.	Sturgiss
Elvins	Howland	Miller, Kans.	Sulloway
Englebright	Hubbard, W. Va.	Millington	Swasey
Esch	Hughes, W. Va.	Mondell	Tawney
Fairchild	Hull, Iowa	Moon, Pa.	Taylor, Ohio
Fassett	Humphrey, Wash.	Moore, Pa.	Tener
Fish	Johnson, Ohio	Morehead	Thistlewood
Focht	Joyce	Morgan, Mo.	Thomas, Ohio
Foelker	Kahn	Morgan, Okla.	Tilson
Fordney	Keifer	Morse	Tirrell
Foss	Kennedy, Iowa	Murphy	Townsend
Foster, Vt.	Kennedy, Ohio	Needham	Vreeland
Foulkrod	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Olcott	Wanger
Fowler	Knapp	Olmsted	Washburn
Fuller	Knowland	Palmer, H. W.	Weeks
Gaines	Kopp	Parker	Wheeler
Gardner, Mass.	Kronmiller	Parsons	Wiley
Gardner, Mich.	Küstermann	Payne	Wilson, Ill.
Gardner, N. J.	Lafean	Pearre	Wood, N. J.
Garner, Pa.	Langham	Perkins	Woodyard
Goebel	Langley	Plumley	Young, Mich.
Graff	Law	Pratt	Young, N. Y.
Graham, Pa.	Lawrence	Pray	The Speaker
Grant	Longworth	Prince	

NOT VOTING—11.

Bartlett, Nev.	Hitchcock	Lovering	Sperry
Craig	Hobson	Mudd	Weisse
Gillett	Huff	Russell	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 183, not voting 10, as follows:

YEAS—195.

Alexander, N. Y.	Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer, H. W.
Allen	Edwards, Ky.	Johnson, Ohio	Parker
Ames	Ellis	Joyce	Parsons
Andrus	Elvins	Kahn	Payne
Anthony	Englebright	Kennedy, Iowa	Pearre
Austin	Esch	Kennedy, Ohio	Perkins
Barchfeld	Estopinal	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pickett
Barclay	Fairchild	Knapp	Plumley
Barnard	Fassett	Knowland	Pratt
Bartholdt	Fish	Kopp	Pray
Bates	Focht	Kronmiller	Prince
Bennet, N. Y.	Foelker	Küstermann	Reeder
Bennett, Ky.	Fordney	Lafean	Reynolds
Bingham	Foss	Langham	Roberts
Boutell	Foster, Vt.	Langley	Rodenberg
Bradley	Foulkrod	Law	Scott
Broussard	Fowler	Lawrence	Sheffield
Brownlow	Fuller	Longworth	Simmons
Burke, Pa.	Gaines	Loud	Slemp
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, Mass.	Loudenslager	Smith, Cal.
Burleigh	Gardner, Mich.	Lowden	Smith, Iowa
Butler	Gardner, N. J.	Lundin	Smith, Mich.
Calder	Garner, Pa.	McCall	Snapp
Calderhead	Gillett	McCreary	Stafford
Campbell	Goebel	McGuire, Okla.	Sterling
Capron	Good	McKinlay, Cal.	Sturgiss
Cassidy	Graff	McKinley, Ill.	Sulloway
Chapman	Graham, Pa.	McKinney	Swasey
Cocks, N. Y.	Grant	McLachlan, Cal.	Tawney
Cole	Greene	McLaughlin, Mich.	Taylor, Ohio
Cook	Griest	McMorran	Tener
Cooper, Pa.	Guernsey	Madden	Thistlewood
Cooper, Wis.	Hamer	Madison	Thomas, Ohio
Coudrey	Hamilton	Malby	Tilson
Cowles	Hanna	Martin, S. Dak.	Tirrell
Creager	Hawley	Miller, Kans.	Townsend
Crow	Hayes	Millington	Vreeland
Crumpacker	Heald	Mondell	Wanger
Currier	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Pa.	Washburn
Dalzell	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Weeks
Davidson	Hill	Morehead	Wheeler
Dawson	Hinshaw	Morgan, Mo.	Wiley
Denby	Hollingsworth	Morgan, Okla.	Wilson, Ill.
Diekema	Howell, N. J.	Morse	Wood, N. J.
Dodds	Howell, Utah	Murphy	Woodyard
Douglas	Howland	Needham	Young, Mich.
Draper	Hubbard, W. Va.	Norris	Young, N. Y.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hughes, W. Va.	Olcott	The Speaker
Durey	Hull, Iowa	Olmsted	

NAYS—183.

Adair	Anderson	Bartlett, Ga.	Booher
Adamson	Ansberry	Beall, Tex.	Borland
Aiken	Ashbrook	Bell, Ga.	Bowers
Alexander, Mo.	Barnhart	Boehne	Brantley
Burgess	Gill, Mo.	Lassiter	Richardson
Burleson	Gillespie	Latta	Riordan
Burnett	Gilmore	Lee	Robinson
Byrd	Glass	Lenroot	Rothermel
Byrns	Godwin	Lever	Rucker, Colo.
Candler	Goldfogle	Lindbergh	Rucker, Mo.
Cantrill	Gordon	Lindsay	Sabath
Carlin	Goulden	Livingston	Saunders
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Lloyd	Shackleford
Cary	Gregg	McDermott	Sharp
Clark, Fla.	Griggs	McHenry	Sheppard
Clark, Mo.	Gronna	Macon	Sherley
Clayton	Hamill	Maguire, Nebr.	Sherwood
Cline	Hamlin	Mann	Sims
Collier	Hammond	Martin, Colo.	Sisson
Conry	Hardwick	Maynard	Slayden
Covington	Hardy	Mays	Small
Cox, Ind.	Harrison	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Tex.
Cox, Ohio	Haugen	Moon, Tenn.	Southwick
Cravens	Hay	Moore, Tex.	Sparkman
Cullop	Heflin	Morrison	Spight
Davis	Helm	Moss	Stanley
De Armond	Henry, Tex.	Murdock	Steenerson
Dent	Houston	Nelson	Stephens, Tex.
Denver	Howard	Nicholls	Stevens, Minn.
Dickson, Miss.	Hubbard, Iowa	Nye	Sulzer
Dies	Hughes, Ga.	O'Connell	Talbott
Dixon, Ind.	Hughes, N. J.	Oldfield	Taylor, Ala.
Driscoll, D. A.	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Taylor, Colo.
Edwards, Ga.	Humphreys, Miss.	Page	Thomas, Ky.
Ellerbe	James	Palmer, A. M.	Thomas, N. C.
Ferris	Jamieson	Patterson	Tou Velle
Finley	Johnson, Ky.	Peters	Underwood
Fitzgerald	Johnson, S. C.	Poindexter	Volstead
Flood, Va.	Jones	Pou	Wallace
Floyd, Ark.	Keifer	Pujo	Watkins
Fornes	Keliher	Rainey	Webb
Foster, Ill.	Kendall	Randell, Tex.	Wickliffe
Gallagher	Kinkead, N. J.	Ransdell, La.	Willett
Garner, Tex.	Kitchin	Rauch	Wilson, Pa.
Garrett	Korbly	Reid	Woods, Iowa
Gill, Md.	Lamb	Rhinock	

NOT VOTING—10.

Bartlett, Nev.	Hobson	Mudd	Weisse
Craig	Huff	Russell	
Hitchcock	Lovering	Sperry	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of explaining my objections to this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JAMES. I make the point of order that under the rule adopted by the House the gentleman has the right to extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Vermont objects.

Mr. CLAYTON. I will state to the gentleman from Ohio that there is general leave to print under the order adopted to-day.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand that, but I want this consent for the purpose stated.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order!

PHILIPPINE TARIFF.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 9135) to raise revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration and that the statement of the conferees be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman presents a conference report on the Philippine tariff and asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report, and for its immediate consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman what is the necessity for this?

Mr. HILL. There are a great many Members who want to get away.

Mr. MANN. And who want a chance to vote on the report without seeing it.

Mr. HILL. I do not think there is any objection to it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard, and the conference report (H. Rept. No. 22) will be printed under the rules.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOEHNE, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. ADAMSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. BOWERS, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting a report of Special Agent Mack H. Davis on the flour and wheat trade in European countries and the Levant (S. Doc. No. 149), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 11989) to provide for the removal of present grade crossing and construction of a new grade crossing on the line of Q street NE., District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11990) providing for the licensing of gas fitters and the supervision of the business of gas fitting in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 11991) increasing limit of cost of public building at Washington, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11992) for the relief of persons who have conveyed lands to the United States under certain conditions—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 11993) to provide for improving the navigable capacity of the Calcasieu and the Mermentau rivers, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11994) for the completion of the jetties at Calcasieu Pass and the construction of a channel through Calcasieu Lake and appropriating $1,150,000 therefor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GILMORE: A bill (H. R. 11995) authorizing the Mississippi River Commission to settle claims for damages in certain cases resulting from collisions—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11996) to place on the pension roll all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served in the United States Army during any period of the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 11997) to authorize the preliminary survey and to determine the approximate cost of certain national highways, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 11998) authorizing the purchase by the United States of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal in the States of Virginia and North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 11999) to provide for the erection of a statue to Maj. Gen. George A. Custer—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 12000) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the several States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12001) to prevent the Government, or any officer, employee, or agent of the Government, the Territories, and the District of Columbia, from contracting for products of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McLACHLAN of California: A bill (H. R. 12002) to establish on the coast of the Pacific States a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine fishery interests of that region—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PAYNE: Resolution (H. Res. 103) in regard to the conference report on the bill H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 12003) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius McGuire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 12004) granting a pension to Margaret T. O'Keefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12005) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12006) granting an increase of pension to Johnston Winters—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12007) granting an increase of pension to John Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12008) granting an increase of pension to William W. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12009) granting an increase of pension to Granville Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12010) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12011) granting an increase of pension to Francis Keating—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12012) granting an increase of pension to Israel S. Dear—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12013) granting an increase of pension to John R. Means—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12014) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12015) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12016) granting an increase of pension to Donald McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12017) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12018) granting an increase of pension to Silas Lamb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to H. G. Mechling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12020) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Pettiford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12021) granting an increase of pension to William Orr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12022) granting an increase of pension to Elias W. Routson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12023) granting an increase of pension to William N. Riley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12024) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Cole Stevenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12025) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ummelmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12026) granting an increase of pension to John W. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12027) granting an increase of pension to John A. Grover—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12028) granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Imes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12029) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Gaither—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12030) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Petticrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12031) granting an increase of pension to John Sipple—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12032) granting an increase of pension to John H. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12033) granting an increase of pension to Zachary Taylor Lemmon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12034) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Frybarger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12035) granting a pension to John W. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12036) granting a pension to Ellen C. Beam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12037) granting a pension to Newton J. Gossett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12038) granting a pension to Lafayette Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12039) granting a pension to George A. Tappan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12040) granting a pension to John Holland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12041) granting a pension to John Aydelotte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12042) granting a pension to Mrs. James Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12043) to remove the charge of desertion against Mathias Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12044) to remove charge of desertion against Henry Halteman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12045) to remove the charge of desertion against Anton Smith, alias Charles Roehmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 12046) granting an increase of pension to Herman Begeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENBY: A bill (H. R. 12047) granting a pension to the minor children of William Ferguson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILMORE: A bill (H. R. 12048) for the relief of John Streckfus—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT: A bill (H. R. 12049) for the relief of H. R. Cook and Joseph S. Penland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 12050) granting an increase of pension to John Marshall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12051) granting an increase of pension to Nathan S. Gibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12052) granting an increase of pension to Jacob S. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12053) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Gurnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 12054) granting a pension to John Wissler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12055) granting a pension to Mary E. Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12056) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Miller S. Gable—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 12057) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Randle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 12058) granting an increase of pension to John T. Haas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12059) granting a pension to Eliza Cornelius—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 12060) to grant certain lands to the town of Rifle, Colo.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12061) granting an increase of pension to Byron McKenzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12062) granting an increase of pension to Peter Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12063) granting an increase of pension to Charles Elgie, alias Charles Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12064) granting an increase of pension to David McClintock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12065) granting an increase of pension to John Bossinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 12066) to pay the claim of William O. Clough—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 12067) granting a pension to W. A. Dunkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN of California: A bill (H. R. 12068) granting a pension to Benjamin L. Gorsuch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12069) granting a pension to W. V. Feltwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12070) granting a pension to Harriet L. Burwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12071) granting a pension to Henry Gunderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12072) granting a pension to Charles F. Dunn—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12073) granting a pension to Margaret Hayes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12074) granting a pension to Mary E. Dean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12075) granting a pension to Lucy G. Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12076) granting a pension to Hans W. Hansen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12077) for the relief of John W. Magann—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12078) for the relief of Carlos Manjarrez—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12079) for the relief of Ella Phillips, widow, and the heirs of David Phillips, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12080) for the relief of the heirs of John Pace, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12081) granting an increase of pension to Ruben J. Elliott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12082) granting an increase of pension to William Lemon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12083) granting an increase of pension to James P. Garlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12084) granting an increase of pension to John O'Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12085) granting an increase of pension to Charles Truax—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12086) granting an increase of pension to William Wiley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12087) granting an increase of pension to William A. Cannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12088) granting an increase of pension to John H. Folks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12089) granting an increase of pension to William B. Bird—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12090) granting an increase of pension to William H. Munroe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12091) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Burr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12092) granting an increase of pension to William M. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12093) granting an increase of pension to Carvil H. Tredway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12094) granting an increase of pension to Jeramiah J. Hannon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12095) granting an increase of pension to R. Aurora Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12096) granting an increase of pension to James A. Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12097) granting an increase of pension to Seth B. R. Tubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12098) granting an increase of pension to George W. Corey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12099) granting an increase of pension to James J. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12100) granting an increase of pension to Samuel McFadden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12101) granting an increase of pension to Jose Maria Salazar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12102) granting an increase of pension to Bronson C. Keeler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12103) granting an increase of pension to James W. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12104) granting an increase of pension to James Barton, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12105) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Page—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12106) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso L. Stacy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12107) granting an increase of pension to William M. V. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12108) granting an increase of pension to John A. Curtis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12109) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Vallett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12110) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Russell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12111) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12112) granting an increase of pension to Gideon S. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12113) granting an increase of pension to Tilman P. Edgerton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12114) granting an increase of pension to Lyman Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12115) granting an increase of pension to Richard Burge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12116) granting an increase of pension to James H. Pope—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12117) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12118) granting an increase of pension to David Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12119) granting an increase of pension to Albert McMaster—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12120) granting an increase of pension to Irwin Metcalfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12121) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Hallock, alias Drake Hallock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12122) granting an increase of pension to Martin Markeson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12123) granting an increase of pension to Dennis P. Greeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12124) granting an increase of pension to William Lenon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12125) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Worrall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12126) granting an increase of pension to Carlos Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12127) granting an increase of pension to Howell G. Trogden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12128) granting an increase of pension to George A. Uline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12129) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12130) granting an increase of pension to James Honan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12131) granting an increase of pension to Nathan J. Woodine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12132) granting an increase of pension to Rufus M. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12133) granting a pension to George W. Flack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12134) granting an increase of pension to William Pitman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12135) granting an increase of pension to John Meyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12136) granting an increase of pension to William Lordon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12137) granting an increase of pension to Philip Gavin—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Margaret T. O'Keefe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petitions of citizens of Pierre, Highmore, Wessington, Miller, Mount Vernon, Plankinton, White Lake, Chamberlain, Pukwana, Kimball, St. Lawrence, and Wolsey, all in the State of South Dakota, against parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Iowa State Retail Merchants' Association, against parcels-post legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Akron (Pa.) Council, No. 906, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for enactment of exclusion law against Asiatics—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of Commercial Club of Litchfield, Minn., against passage of H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *August 2, 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 Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. KEAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

PETITION.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of Newfane Grange, No. 1159, Patrons of Husbandry, of Burt, N. Y., praying for a revision of the tariff along the lines promised by the Republican party before the last election, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 3094) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building in the city of Mishawaka, Ind., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I present a privileged report. I ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary proceeded to read the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, and after having read for some time——

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I think the clerk inadvertently overlooked the maximum and minimum provision. It was doubtless a mistake on the part of the clerk.

Mr. CLAPP. I have not heard any reference to the cotton schedule either.

Mr. HEYBURN. I presume it is an accident.

Mr. DANIEL. It has not been read.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not think it is a question for the clerk to settle as to what part of the report he shall read. The Senate will determine that without the assistance of the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk commenced reading where the report was passed over to him by the other clerk.

Mr. HEYBURN. I cannot help that. There is only one clerk of the Senate to read. They are all one, consolidated. I think the clerk will save trouble if he will read the report properly. It does not make any difference what some other clerk did.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Where does the Senator wish to have the clerk commence to read?

Mr. HEYBURN. Let him read the report. The clerk knows whether he has read the report or not.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is obvious to several Senators on this side of the Chamber that at least 20 pages at a time were turned, especially in one case, without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk who was reading before this clerk commenced is not now present, and the clerk can not tell where he stopped reading.

Mr. CULBERSON. I would not be surprised if it would not be admitted that just a few moments ago 20 pages at least were turned without reading.

Mr. DANIEL. I wish to give notice that before the report is submitted to the Senate I desire to make a preliminary motion and a statement of the history of the bill. I do not think it has been legally reported to the Senate. I desire to bring that matter to the Senate's attention, and I give notice now to that effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the report will be resumed.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the report, which is as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 10, 11, 18, 19, 32, 37, 44, 50, 58, 69, 73, 91, 93, 94, 115, 127, 128, 129, 195, 208, 247, 259, 262, 278, 293, 294, 304, 319, 323, 324, 327, 330, 333, 336, 337, 340, 352, 357, 359, 360, 361, 369, 376, 382, 387, 398, 399, 402, 407, 431, 441, 504, 508, 512, 514, 517, 519, 527, 529, 530, 538, 544, 546, 550, 551, 562, 565, 576, 601, 602, 609, 627, 631, 640, 645, 652, 660, 669, 675, 681, 683, 684, 688, 690, 691, 696, 697, 702, 704, 708, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 723, 730, 744, 752, 753, 763, 764, 768, 771, 773, 779, 781, 786, 830, 831, 832, 834, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, and 846.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 64, 68, 71, 72, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 113, 114, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 126, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156,