MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. George E. Bushnell, Medical Corps, to be colonel from May 1, 1911, vice Col. Blair D. Taylor, retired from active service April 30, 1911.

Maj. Merritte W. Ireland, Medical Corps, to be lieutenant colonel from May 1, 1911, vice Lieut. Col. George E. Bushnell, promoted.

Capt. Wilson T. Davidson, Medical Corps, to be major from May 1, 1911, vice Maj. Merritte W. Ireland, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from April 29, 1911.

Shelley Uriah Marietta, of Iowa.
Blase Cole, of New Jersey.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Douglas E. Dismukes to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Herbert G. Sparrow to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of January, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John E. Pond to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

Machinist Raymond L. Drake to be a chief machinist in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1911, upon the completion of six years' service as a machinist.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill vacancies:

Albert P. Niblack and
William S. Sims.

Lieut. Commander Henry J. Ziegemeier to be a commander in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Fred S. Hazelton to be postmaster at Norton, Kans., in place of Fred S. Hazelton. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

Charles G. Webb to be postmaster at Stafford, Kans., in place of Charles G. Webb. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1911.

MAINE.

Harry E. Reed to be postmaster at Millinocket, Me., in place of Charles H. Eastman, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

A. J. Glover to be postmaster at Galien, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

Herman Nelson to be postmaster at Slayton, Minn., in place of James Ruane. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

MONTANA.

Thomas J. Waddell to be postmaster at Stanford, Mont. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. Armstrong to be postmaster at Belmont, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

J. Rufus Dorsett to be postmaster at Spencer, N. C., in place of James D. Dorsett, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

Martin Baswell to be postmaster at Poteau, Okla., in place of William H. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1910.

William H. Cleveland to be postmaster at Mountain View, Okla., in place of William H. Cleveland. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

William R. South, Baypoint.

MISSISSIPPI.

Robert L. Bradshaw, Moss Point.
Martha H. Talbert, Pelahatchee.

NEVADA.

Callie B. Ferguson, Fallon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May 4, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Blessed be the name of the Lord, our God, whose glory shines around about us with ever increasing brightness and whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting, poured out in a thousand blessings anew every morning and fresh every evening. Help us by the rectitude of our behavior and with unswerving devotion to duty to prove ourselves worthy of such love and devotion. And Thine be the praise, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4413, a bill to put agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, without indorsing or criticizing his address, for I have seen a newspaper account only of it, let me say that no truer or more timely expression was ever uttered than that attributed to Hon. Woodrow Wilson when he said, at Norfolk, Va., a few days ago that—

> Programs are taking the place of philippics; and programs can be soberly examined and assessed, as unqualified criticisms and denunciations can not be.

I believe that it is but just to say that this Democratic House has furnished a conspicuous example of the truth of that assertion. For whatever questions which may have heretofore divided Democrats, it must be admitted, as a subject for Democratic felicitation at least, that the Democratic Party here has determined to bring about a reduction of import duties and a reform of the tariff system, and that to this end the majority is living up to a definite program. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That program is in harmony, as we must believe, with the latest expressed will of the majority of the American people. The program and the action under it were brought about because the people have evidenced the fact that they are no longer to be deceived by the false teachings of the Republican Party and are at the same time disgusted with the broken promises of some of its trusted leaders made before elections and for the purpose of gaining votes to keep that party in power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people have determined to control the Government according to the will of the majority and for the benefit of all, rather than in the interest of the few who profit by inequitable laws. The presence of the Democratic majority in this House attests the truthfulness of this statement, and it is not too much to hope that Republican economic heresies and Republican bad faith will be further condemned next year by the election of some great Democrat to the high office of President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

FURTHER DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY.

It is not necessary to admonish the Democrats here or elsewhere to continue to assert simple and admitted Democratic principles and to continue to endeavor to put these principles into law and practice whenever and wherever possible. The courage and unanimity of action, and the action itself, that have characterized the conduct of the majority of this House during the last 30 days have pleased the disciples of Thomas Jefferson everywhere and given new emphasis to the old faith that in government there ought to be "equal rights to all and special privileges to none," and that there "must be economy in the public expenditures that labor may be lightly burdened." [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Democratic Party has been triumphant when it demanded retrenchment and reform and has succeeded in two presidential elections in late years when it fearlessly proclaimed that a tariff law is a tax law, and that neither a tariff tax nor any other kind of a tax should be levied except for the support of the Government in all of its vigor and under economical and honest administration. It is not to be controverted that no patriotic man objects to paying taxes for the support of the Government. And it is equally true that every right-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

thinking man ought to admit that any system of taxation designed to favor individual or special interests and not for public revenue is an abuse of the taxing power of the Government, and therefore a vicious system.

Who is it that will justify the conferring of special benefits under the form of tax laws upon favorites at the expense of the masses—the masses from whom must be exacted the legitimate expenses of the organization and maintenance of the Government and the masses who must furnish the money bestowed upon the favorites by these laws? It is forever fundamentally true that taxation is not, never was, and never can be a productive force in any organized society; rather it is subtractive from the taxpayers and necessary and justifiable for the sole reason that it is essential for public governmental purposes. And this Democratic House can do its part in honest endeavor to observe these correct principles in legislation affecting the tariff.

RESPECTIVE POSITIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES.

It is difficult to define the present attitude of the Republican Party with respect to the tariff. In this House that historical party is divided into two hostile camps, known in the common parlance here as standpatters and insurgents. And the same division obtains in another distinguished body which I am, perhaps, precluded by the rules of the House from mentioning by name. In this Chamber that party recently evidenced a decided division in respect to the Canadian reciprocity trade agreement, for on the vote on that measure 60 Republicans voted with the Democrats to approve and 80 Republicans voted to disapprove that agreement, which was negotiated by the Republican President and proposed by him to the Congress. This was done in the face of repeated Republican platform declarations in favor of reciprocal trade agreements, and if the indications are borne out there will be a division in the Republican ranks when the pending bill is passed. I shall not impugn the motives of any Republican, but I hazard the prediction that the next Republican platform will at once declare for protection and for some sort of tariff reform, so that the next tariff utterance of that party will be an artistic straddle, designed to fool some people, just as their last platform sought to do when it declared—

unequivocally for the revision of the tariff by special session of the Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President.

And also said at the same time that—

in all tariff legislation the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries.

It has been ascertained that the cost of production of American manufactures is, as a rule, not greater than the cost of production of similar manufactures in foreign countries, because of the superior skill and efficiency, machinery, and methods employed by Americans. If American labor is paid more, the greater pay is more than compensated for by its greater earning capacity.

Just how there could be any real revision of the tariff in the interest of the general public and at the same time preserve the prohibitory schedules, as was done in the Payne bill, and guarantee by the same statutory law a reasonable profit to manufacturers, is a problem unsolved and apparently not capable of solution, for the Republican Party, in full control of the Congress for two years after the promise was made, did not work out that problem. And it is not to be forgotten that the special session of Congress was held and that the revision accomplished was a substantial revision upward and not downward. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is not too much to say that the Republican Party stands now and will continue to stand for a high tariff, for a tariff so high as to altogether prohibit importations in many cases, and thereby in such cases to restrict and fence in the American market as the special field for the operation of trusts and other trade conspiracies, which Republican legislation has caused and enabled to grievously afflict the great body of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republican Party has always been the champion and the servile tool of the protected interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In speaking of protective tariff, Alexander Hamilton in his celebrated report to Congress in 1790, and Albert Gallatin, the author of the Philadelphia Memorial of 1831, referred to it as restriction, trade restriction. And such is Republican protection—not protection but restriction—not wise and just taxation, but burdensome and unjustifiable trade restriction, the fruit of which is favored combinations and interests exploiting our home markets for their benefit and at an increased expense to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I may be permitted to say that a law which enables one citizen to exact tribute from another citizen under the guise of taxation is governmental authorization for the practice of a wrong. The trouble with the Republicans is that they do not write tariff laws primarily for the purpose of raising public revenue. They frame such laws for the paramount object of restricting the American market and to lay unnecessary burdens upon the American people, and in order to give, and for the real purpose of giving, unnatural and unearned increment to the business of favored manufacturers and corporations. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It may be that from the laying in some instances of an import duty for revenue there may be some advantage to the domestic manufacturer when his goods come into competition with those of the foreign manufacturer in our markets. But this is incidental and inseparable from the tariff laid in such cases for revenue. A Democratic tariff bill, covering the whole subject, ought to be defined as a measure to impose and collect duties for the purpose of raising the necessary money for the support of the Government honestly and economically administered; and such a measure would fix every duty at the lowest rate consistent with the public necessity. Such a measure would distribute equally, as nearly as practicable, the burdens of taxation, and would reduce to a minimum the incidental protection which can not be avoided under a purely revenue tariff.

The difference between the two parties is that the Democrats assert that the Government ought to levy duties primarily for the sole purpose of raising public revenue, and that this is the only rightful use of the power of taxation [applause on the Democratic side], whereas the Republicans say protection shall be the real object—protection from competition with foreign-made goods, protection to those combinations and interests which have been fostered under a high tariff and allowed to exploit the American people by increased prices at home—a system that has enabled protected manufacturers to charge the American consumer more for their goods than they charge the foreigner for the same goods in a foreign land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The raising of public revenue is merely the incident of a Republican tariff law—an incident necessary to furnish colorable constitutional authority for upholding Republican abuses of the taxing power. And in this connection it is well to recall the fact that Mr. Dingley, in explanation of schedules of the Dingley tariff law, frankly avowed that the rates fixed in some of its schedules were designedly made so high as to prohibit importations and were not intended to raise revenue. And let us be mindful of the fact that every champion of a protective tariff gives as the chief reason for the beauty of the protective system the benefits which accrue to the interests cared for in the Republican tariff bills.

Subtle and persuasive arguments and appeals are made to these beneficiaries, and in response to such arguments and appeals organized greed has furnished influence and campaign contributions to the Republican Party in the elections. And that party has been kept in control and has long since ceased to regard the rightful use of the taxing power, and has been unmindful of the taxpayers and the consumers. And that is what is the matter with the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In contrast, the Democratic Party asserts that a tariff law is justifiable because it is necessary to raise revenue to defray the expenses of the Government. In dealing with present conditions, however, grown up under a vicious and exaggerated system, it must be admitted that wholesale or radical changes would be an unwise rule, but the free list can be added to and many substantial reductions in the rates fixed by schedules can be had without doing violence to the business world or to the Public Treasury. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Perhaps it is well to state that the report made by Alexander Hamilton in 1790, the speech of Mr. Clay in the House March 30 and 31, 1824, and the speech made by Mr. Webster in the House on April 1 and 2, 1824, furnish the argument of every Republican utterance made in defense of Republican protective tariffs.

And those who hold as I do, that the Federal Government is not paternal and not authorized to bestow favors upon individuals or corporations through the medium of impost duties or other taxes do not believe that the sound economic principles of tariff taxation advanced by Robert J. Walker in his report of December 3, 1845, have ever been refuted. They are familiar to the Members of this House, but let me state some of them:

That no more money should be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government economically administered.

That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties; or, for imperative reasons, the article may be placed in the list of those free from duty.

That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on luxuries.

That all minimum and all specific duties should be abolished and ad valorem duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluations and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

RECENT EVENTS.

Mr. Chairman, it is pertinent in discussing the tariff to consider some recent events and to take our bearings in order that we here may be better guided in our conduct, and I believe it will serve the purpose of putting more courage into the hearts of the Democratic Party. I believe that the trend of events, as is evidenced by the recent occurrences, foretell further Democratic triumphs in the near future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, these events have accentuated the difference between the Republican and the Democratic theories of taxation, and have tended to make more manifest the righteousness of the Democratic position. Let us not forget that in the beginning, before highly protective and prohibitive tariffs were enacted, there was not a millionaire within the confines of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now there are probably more than a dozen multimillionaires, whose aggregated wealth runs into the billions. To call the roll of the mere millionaires of our country would weary the patience of the House, for they are too numerous and common. Republicans have admitted in their platforms and elsewhere the burdensome injustice of our tariff laws, and have time and again promised correction, and have just as often broken those promises. Corrupt and corrupting contributions have been made by the great insurance companies and other corporations to the election of Republican candidates for office. Extravagance and wastefulness in public administration was admitted by Senator Aldrich, when he declared that the Federal Government could be properly conducted for $300,000,000 per annum less than what is now expended. The stocks of transportation companies have been frequently watered, and yet the Republican Party has repeatedly refused to pass laws for the physical valuation of the property of those corporations, in order to prevent a just determination of a reasonable income to them from the property fairly valued.

In this connection, let me call your attention to Senate Report No. 912, Sixty-first Congress, second session, part 1, page 125, presented by Senator LODGE, a distinguished Republican statesman, on June 23, 1910. There it is stated that overcapitalization of transportation and industrial companies has the effect of advancing prices. The effect of overcapitalization may not be to immediately increase the amount of dividends paid, but an increase of capital usually results in a greater amount of dividends. Increased dividends must mean increased earnings, and the increased earnings come from the consumer. The increased and high cost of living is universally admitted. The easy access of the manipulators of high finance to Republicans in place and power and the baleful influence of those manipulators have been made manifest in our statutory laws. These and other causes have, let us hope, aroused the people so that the Republican Party, arrogant and reckless on account of too long lease and abuse of power, will soon be driven from the control of the Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tariff ought to be so reformed as not to afford shelter to its evil progeny, the trusts and unlawful combinations, and so reformed as to afford needed governmental revenues only. If the Standard Oil Trust is cited, as it has been in the past, as a case in refutation of Mr. Havemeyer's famous statement that the "tariff is the mother of trusts," let us recall the exposure of the "joker" in the Republican tariff laws which furnished protection to the extent of prohibition of competition to that combination. Upon examination it was found that while petroleum, or oil, was put on the free list there was a proviso in the tariff bill to the effect that such products coming from any country that levied a tax on the same products should be taxed in like amount when brought into this country; and it was then further ascertained that the only oil that could be imported into this country in competition with the product of the Standard Oil Trust was amenable to the taxation under this proviso at a prohibitive rate.

Public sentiment forced the Republican Party to adopt, in part, the Democratic demand for publicity of campaign contributions to the extent that the publication after elections of these contributions is now a requirement of the law approved by a Republican President. Within the last 30 days a Democratic House has gone further in the Democratic demand and passed here a measure requiring the publication before elections of contributions to campaign funds. This same measure has been brought before this same House when it was Republican, by Democrats, and Republicans have refused to give it their sanction. It is to be hoped that a Republican Senate and a Republican President will now further yield to the sentiment of the country against corrupt practices, so that this measure will become a law.

Another encouraging fact is the submission to the States for ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution empowering Congress to levy a tax on incomes.

For more than 100 years the power of Congress to levy a tax upon incomes was vindicated by the decisions of the courts; and it may not be too much to hope that this power will be restored to Congress by the ratification of the proposed sixteenth amendment of the Constitution. Should this be done and an income tax levied, so that millionaires and monopolists, domestic and expatriated as well, shall be compelled to contribute to the expenses of the Government, then the time will perhaps come which he avowed had not come, but which was anticipated by Mr. McKinley, when, on May 7, 1890, he said:

We have not been compelled to abolish the internal-revenue system that we might preserve the protective system, which we are pledged to do in the event the abolition of one was essential to the preservation of the other.

That is the Republican doctrine of intoxicating beverages free of taxation, and carries with it the Republican corollary that the clothing and other necessaries of life of the men, women, and children of the land shall forever be taxed, not for the purpose of raising public revenue, but for the purpose of adding to the profits of those engaged in the manufacturing industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE MORALS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Briefly let me refer to the morals of the Republican Party. In the beginning, when it was formed, in 1856, it pretended to be the party of God and morality. It made no utterances then on such sordid questions as the tariff. It spoke of and dealt with things that it claimed to be higher than mere taxation. Now it worships chiefly at the shrine of special interests and bows down before the money power, forgets the people, and resolutely praises the system of protection, which exacts tribute from the poor men, women, and children of our land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," was the morality of our fathers. Republican ethics admit, in the framing of the tariff laws, that it is proper for one man to take money from another man, provided it is done in the shadow of a protective-tariff wall. Jugglery of figures, enlarged and confusing tariff terminology, ad valorem duties, specific duties, compound duties, compensatory duties, joined together with mystifying percentages, drawbacks, bounties, lengthy and misleading testimony, specious arguments, and adroit appeals to selfish interests are resorted to by the Republicans in presenting their case "against thy neighbor"—the masses of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I will not say that they have been guilty of bearing false testimony against their neighbors, but I do say that Republican speeches and arguments and their statements in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee justify the assertion that Republicans have exhausted all the ingenuity or inventive skill of the ablest falsifiers that were ever created. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

PROTECTIONISM A GROWTH.

Protectionism is not a sudden creation, but an insidious growth; and many of our fellow citizens never comprehended its vice until the growth became malignant. In the sixties high tariffs were enacted upon the ground that they were necessary war measures, and repeal of them was promised when the necessity for their enactment should pass. But under those high tariffs, and under the McKinley higher tariff, and under the Dingley still higher tariff, and under the Payne tariff yet higher, special interests found shelter and multiplied. At every stage additional burdens were imposed upon the people. But in the year 1910 the majority of the American people realized that the constitutional power of taxation for the support of the Government was being exploited for the benefit of the comparative few who had dictated the tariff laws and to the injury of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] While in the beginning comparatively few interests found shelter behind the tariff law, it has become indisputable that in every succeeding Republican tariff enactment these beneficiaries of the law have systematically and cunningly reached out and gathered into their fold other interests, to be artificially stimulated at the expense of the taxpayers and for the purpose of increasing

the strength of the combination and making it more difficult to dislodge from control the system of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Long ago the Republican Party was forced to abandon the defense of infant industries, for American labor, genius, skill, and enterprise had brought American industrialism to such a vigorous estate that American products could successfully compete, not only at home but in every land, with the industrial fruits of the world.

LABOR AND THE TARIFF.

The argument advanced that Republican tariffs are framed for the benefit of American labor is founded not in fact but in mere pretense. Comparison of the wages paid in high-tariff Germany and those paid in free-trade England will shed light on the subject. Let me give two or three illustrations. In 1905 combers employed in woolen factories were paid upon an average in Germany $4.38 per week, while in 1906 the same character of employees were paid in the United Kingdom (Great Britain) $4.87–$5.60 per week. In cotton manufacturing in Germany in 1905 there was paid to male weavers $4.01–$4.74 per week, while the same employees were paid in England and Wales $5.35–$7.06 per week.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, and the laboring man now understands it, that the protected manufacturer has not been making a fair division of profits with him. Moreover, the American laborer, considering his skill and efficiency and the fruits of his industry, has not been fairly treated. This is the case: The protected manufacturers have, under the abuses authorized by tariff laws, exacted from the laboring man exorbitant prices for what he consumes—prices greater than those charged the foreigner in foreign markets. The laboring man has been burdened with the increased cost of living, and, furthermore, under the policy of the Republican Party, the cheap labor of foreign countries has been imported by protected manufacturers to compete with the American laborer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Thus the laborer is burdened, under the policy of the Republican Party, with the higher cost of living on one shoulder and the competition of the imported cheap foreign labor on the other shoulder. This reminds me of Jacob's blessing to his sons, told about in the forty-ninth chapter of Genesis.

I want to read it from the Bible, not so much for the edification of our Democratic brethren, but in order that Republicans on that side may not dispute my authority. The Republicans are so in the habit of contradicting anything that does not harmonize with the Republican theory of robbing the people that I want to quote from the Book of Books. If our worthy Speaker, Mr. CLARK, were present to verify the quotation it would not be necessary to produce my authority. He is, I believe, one of the best Biblical scholars in the House. [Applause.] But he is away. I am going to verify what I say by reading from the Bible itself. You old sinners who never go to church and do not know anything about the Bible, bear with me a moment while I read from the Book. [Applause.] I will read from that chapter where Jacob calls together his sons to receive his blessing and blesses Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, and so forth. In the fourteenth and fifteenth verses he pronounces some sort of a blessing on Issachar, his fifth son by Leah. He had many more sons. I do not know how many sons Jacob had altogether [laughter], but he had many. Issachar was the fifth son born to him by his wife Leah, and the Republican Party has blessed the laboring man just as Jacob blessed this son. [Laughter.] Now, then, listen.

I read the fourteenth and fifteenth verses. Jacob said:

> Issachar is a strong ass couching down between two burdens: And he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute.

I might interpolate the words "Republican tribute." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under the blessings of the Republican Party the laboring man has indeed been treated as a strong ass couching down between the Republican burden of increased cost of living and the Republican burden of competition with cheap imported labor. And the Republican Party has said that the rest is good and the land is pleasant, and has made the laboring man bow his shoulder to bear and become a servant under tribute imposed by Republican laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ELLERBE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CLAYTON. Certainly.

Mr. ELLERBE. Does not the gentleman think it is time for us to sing for the benefit of our Republican brethren the old familiar hymn—

> Come, ye sinners, poor and needy,
> Weak and wounded, sick and sore.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CLAYTON. Yes; especially for the benefit of insurgents and near-Democrats, who are sick of Republicanism and yet a little too timid to avow themselves Democrats. [Applause.]

It is now manifest that the Republican Party does not by the laws it has enacted favor or protect the American laborer. Perhaps the use of sophistry by the Republicans is nowhere more evident than in their argument of "protection for American labor."

It is interesting to note that in their platform of 1868 is the following expression on the question of the tariff and its relation to the laborer: "It is due to the labor of the Nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced * * *."

When the infant-industry appeal had lost its force, and labor began to protest against the tribute exacted of it in favor of its employers, it was necessary to discover the protection-for-American-labor argument, now proclaimed so loudly by the party of greed. But it is impossible to comprehend that a high tariff in 1868 could be to his detriment by the avowed expression of the Republican Party and yet in 1876 and 1908 be beneficial to him. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The theory of taxation as to its effect upon the masses, of whom the laborers constitute a very large proportion, could not so change in 10 or 20 or 50 years as to render beneficial what was detrimental. Principles do not change.

The measure, Mr. Chairman, in which Republican protection, so called, is claimed to be levied, is the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, and this argument is so manipulated as to attempt to deceive the laborer into the belief that the difference is the discrepancy between the foreign and American wage schedules. To adhere to such a belief would be to profess that the American laborer is not the superior of the foreign laborer.

The per diem wage is ordinarily used in making comparisons between domestic and foreign labor. Now, it is an admitted fact that the intelligence, skill, and industry of the American laborer excels that of the foreign laborer in greater proportion than the relative wages paid. Then no patriotic American will deny that the American laborer engaged in a certain pursuit will produce in a day three to four times as much as the foreign laborer plying the same trade. The following figures, taken from the Engineering Magazine for May, 1904, based on official data and prepared by Prof. William G. Clark, who is indorsed by Senator GALLINGER as an authority, will serve to illustrate the comparative productive capacity of the American laborer and the foreign laborer. The amounts represent the value of the average annual output per laborer of the respective nationalities:

American	$2,450
Canadian	1,455
Australian	900
French	640
English	556
German	460

Is it fair, in view of this, to say that the American laborer is better paid than the foreign laborer? If he can produce in one day as much as his foreign brother can produce in three days, he is entitled to more pay. Is it fair to say that he receives more than his due, that you are giving him a bonus? Who pays the bonus, anyway? His brother laborer, who also reaps the profits of this beneficent system of "protection" designed especially for his benefit, and then the latter in his turn must give back to other protected industries, whose products he must have, the excess which he has derived from this system so that the former laborer may profit thereby.

This so-called difference is simply a will-o'-the-wisp, shifting back and forth from one laborer in a protected industry to another laborer in another protected industry. And in the meantime, admitting for the sake of argument the soundness of this contention, what becomes of a laborer not employed in a protected industry? He must pay his tribute to the protected manufacturer for the alleged benefit of his brother laborers, and receive nothing in return from them. As much as 75 per cent of the employee class of the United States are not engaged in industries that have the benefit of Republican protection laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What protection do the thousands of railroad employees and the millions of other laboring people not engaged in the manufacturing industries derive from the tariff protection enjoyed by the manufacturers? What benefit to the millions of farmers, tillers of the soil, who plant and sow, gather and reap the great crops of our country, get from the high tariff laws enacted in the interest of the trusts and monopolies which own or control the manufacturing industries?

Again, of what force is the reference to the modern increase in wages when coupled with the increased prices of the necessaries

of life? Along with an increase of wages of 22 per cent in the last 10 years there has been an increase in the cost of necessaries of 60 per cent. Thus the laborer is 38 per cent worse off than he would have been had there been no increases. The Payne bill has not given any relief in the matter of the present high cost of living. The Democratic bill now under consideration, if the Republican Senate and the President will let it become a law, will give a large measure of relief.

Let me refer to the latest figures prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, those of 1905, and you can make your own comparisons. It is to be regretted that this bureau has been so busy since 1905 with other matters that it has not had time to give us later figures.

In that year the aggregate value of the finished product of all the manufacturers of the country was $14,802,147,087. The aggregate amount of wages paid for labor in such production was $2,611,540,532. You will thus see that the total amount paid to labor was only 17 per cent of the value of the manufactures, and the lowest rate of tariff on any of such manufactured articles was 30 per cent, ranging from that figure upward to 100 per cent. The discrepancy between domestic and foreign labor, if there be any such real discrepancy, was covered, and, more, the entire cost of labor is doubled, tripled, and even more than quadrupled by the tariff taxes.

Two or three examples will serve to show that the argument of "protection for American labor" advanced in support of the high tariffs is not sustained by the facts:

First. Silk manufactured products in 1905 amounted in value to $133,288,072. For labor there was paid out in their production $26,767,943 in wages to employees, or 20 per cent, and the tariff rates amounted to more than 30 per cent more than the entire cost of labor.

Second. Manufactures of iron and steel were valued during the same period at $941,071,093, and in their production but $143,809,576 was paid to the labor employed. The Payne-Aldrich law "protects" these products at more than twice the entire 15 per cent paid to the labor.

Third. Woolen manufactures in 1905 were valued at $380,934,003, and the manufacturers paid out for wages $70,797,524, or 18 per cent. Under the Payne law these products are provided with 40 per cent of "protection," thus showing that the "protection" amounts to more than twice the entire cost of labor.

Fourth. In 1905, 21 per cent of the value of cotton manufactures was spent for labor, and yet under the Payne bill protection of more than 50 per cent is afforded. And no "protection" is given the laborer who produces the raw cotton from which such manufactures are made, although that commodity furnishes the balance of trade in favor of this country.

What I have said illustrates the unfairness of Republican tariff framers to the American laborer. This unfairness on the part of the protected interests themselves for their faithful employees may be shown by the following examples of the percentages for 1905 of the wages paid to such employees in certain highly protected industries: (1) In the production of food products there was paid to the laborers employed in that industry 5.7 per cent of the gross value of such products, while the employers took for themselves a profit on their capital invested of 16.4 per cent; (2) the capital invested in the production of liquors and beverages took for itself 10 per cent and gave to their laborers 8 per cent of the gross value of all products; (3) manufacturers of chemical products took 9.9 per cent on the capital invested and gave to their employees only 8 per cent of the value of the gross products.

Numerous other illustrations might be given of the extreme injustice to the American laborer which is evinced by Republican champions in all of their "protection" measures. The interests urge the imposition of the high-tariff duties so that they may be able, as they claim, to pass on to their laborers the unearned and artificial profit which comes to them thereby.

Now, the laborer's gratitude must assume enormous proportions to-day when he realizes that, to live as well now as he did 10 years ago, when his wage was $1.50 per day, he must have now $2.40 per day, whereas his wage has increased to only $1.83 per day. Under the high protective tariff laws the manufacturer has exacted tribute from the consumers, but he has not divided fairly with his laborer. Neither the law nor his promptings of conscience compel him to so divide.

And if it be conceded that "protection" is right and proper in so far as it equalizes the alleged difference between the cost of American and foreign labor, let me quote a distinguished Senator of Republican faith, who avows his allegiance to the aforementioned test in drafting tariff schedules. Senator CUMMINS thus indicts his party:

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the duties imposed in the bill [the Payne bill] upon which we are about to vote are generally too high. I regret that they so far exceed the test established by the party to which I belong that it will become impossible for me to give them my approval by my vote. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, 1909.)

MANUFACTURERS USE FOREIGN LABOR.

So far from being protected, labor is the one unprotected class of our citizenship, and labor is unprotected by the express or implied provisions of the very statutory enactments of the Federal Government. Brief reference to our immigration laws will bear out this assertion, and a visit to the various immigrant stations of the United States would serve to reveal the protection which the American laborer gets from the liberal immigration laws of the United States. At Ellis Island will be seen daily hundreds and hundreds of the worst class of immigrants coming into this country to compete with the American laborer and to run down the price of his wage.

The compilation made and published by the Immigration Commission as to the amount of foreign-born labor that is being used by American manufacturers furnishes some very significant facts and shows unjust treatment of the American-born laborer. Without any care for the good of the American laborer, the American manufacturer is preferring foreign labor over him.

Figures collected from the abstract of the Report of the Immigration Commission submitted December 3, 1910, on "Immigrants in manufacturing and mining," pages 45 and 46 show that upon information received for 507,256 wage earners in mines and manufacturing establishments of 22 classifications 17 per cent of such wage earners are born in this country of foreign fathers, 57.9 per cent are foreign born, and only 42.1 per cent are native born. The manufacturing and mining classifications in which they are engaged are as follows:

Agricultural implement and vehicle manufacturing.
Boot and shoe manufacturing.
Cigar and tobacco manufacturing.
Clothing manufacturing.
Coal mining, anthracite.
Coal mining, bituminous.
Collar, cuff, and shirt manufacturing.
Construction work.
Copper mining and smelting.
Cotton goods manufacturing in North Atlantic States.
Furniture manufacturing.
Glass manufacturing.
Glove manufacturing.
Iron and steel manufacturing.
Iron ore mining.
Leather manufacturing.
Oil refining.
Silk goods manufacturing and dyeing.
Slaughtering and meat packing.
Sugar refining.
Woolen and worsted manufacturing.
Diversified industries. (Page 14.)

At pages 70 and 71 of the report above referred to it is shown that concerning the wage earners of the following respective industries canvassed the following results were shown: In carpet manufacturing there were employed 21 per cent of laborers of native birth but of foreign fathers, 58 per cent of foreign birth and only 42 per cent of native-born wage earners. In car building and repairing only 45 per cent of native-born labor is employed, while 54.9 per cent of foreign born labor was employed, and 16 per cent is native born but of foreign fathers.

In cutlery and tool manufacturing only 36.9 per cent of native-born labor is used, while 63.1 per cent of foreign labor was employed and 18.4 per cent of the wage earners were American born but of foreign parentage. In the manufacture of foundry and machine-shop products the American-born wage earners employed constitute 45.5 per cent of the labor, while 54.5 per cent are foreign born and 21.3 per cent are native born of foreign parentage. In manufactures of rope, twine, and hemp 77.8 per cent of foreign-born labor is used, only 22.2 per cent of American-born wage earners, while in addition to the foreign-born labor used 10.3 per cent of labor native born of foreign parents was employed. In the manufacture of sewing machines only 44.1 per cent of native-born labor was utilized, while 55.9 per cent of foreign born and 27.7 per cent of native born of foreign parentage were employed.

And, Mr. Chairman, before I leave this subject of the importation of foreign labor by manufacturers to compete with American labor, permit me to remark that I have observed a suggestion made by British cotton spinners and made by some of their agents in this country, that it would be in the interest of the cotton spinners, who want cheap cotton, to have imported into the United States cheap foreign labor for the production of cheap cotton. The cotton grower gets now no more than a fair price for his cotton—a crop of which more than 60 per cent is produced by the labor of sturdy white men, assisted by the members of their families; these constitute "a bold peasantry, their country's pride." This is merely another scheme of manufacturers engaged in spinning cotton to oppress labor, and to it I am opposed. [Applause.]

THE FREE-LIST BILL.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is for the purpose chiefly of lifting a part of the burden of Federal taxation from the American farmer and to give him a chance to buy his implements at prices as low as the prices accorded by our manufacturers to foreigners, and is, I believe, consistent with the idea that sufficient revenue can be raised from impost duties upon articles not mentioned in this bill and from internal-revenue taxes and from the taxes required of corporations, and will not encourage American manufacturers to sell their American-made goods in the American market at prices greater than the prices received by them for their goods sold in foreign markets in competition with foreign-made goods. That American-made goods have been sold in foreign markets to foreigners cheaper than they are sold at home to Americans, let me cite as proof this statement, taken from the Republican campaign book of 1906:

It is possible that some of these markets (foreign ones) have been gained in the first place through a resort to lower prices—that is, a selling of an article at a lower price abroad than at home—a practice resorted to by every other manufacturing nation with whom we must come into competition. If this has been done, it is to the glory and honor of every American manufacturer who has done it that he has increased the sales of his wares abroad, thereby increasing the volume of his output, the employ of labor, and the wages of his men, for be it understood that American workingmen get precisely the same wages for any goods that may be sold abroad at a lower price as they do for those sold in the home market.

The argument contained in the latter part of this statement quoted is not true, for it is known that the Steel Trust in the manufacture of tin since 1892 paid its employees for goods made for export 25 per cent lower wages than for making tin plate for American consumption. The authority for this is the pamphlet entitled "Export Prices to Date," by Byron W. Holt, issued by the Tariff Reform Association in October, 1906.

I insert in the RECORD the testimony given by Mr. Charles M. Schwab, president of the Bethlehem Steel Co., on December 15, 1908, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives (tariff hearings, 60th Cong., pp. 1661, 1662):

Mr. CLARK. Do you know of your own knowledge what is the greatest discrepancy there ever was between the home price of steel rails and the foreign price?

Mr. SCHWAB. The greatest discrepancy?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. SCHWAB. You mean how high in this country and how low in Europe?

Mr. CLARK. How much lower did American manufactured steel rails sell for abroad as compared with what they sold for at home?

Mr. SCHWAB. I should say probably $10; I am not sure of that, however; that is merely a guess.

Mr. CLARK. It is a habitual process to sell them cheaper abroad, is it not?

Mr. SCHWAB. Yes, sir; and a very wise process.

And, further, on page 1667 of the hearings, Mr. Schwab gave the following testimony:

Mr. COCKRAN. You said that they are selling abroad cheaper than here?

Mr. SCHWAB. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRAN. You said that it is a very wise process?

Mr. SCHWAB. Quite.

Mr. COCKRAN. Could you explain the wisdom of it to the victims of it as well as to the beneficiaries of it? From the point of view of the American consumer, where does the wisdom of it come in?

Mr. SCHWAB. I am not thinking of the consumer. I am thinking of the manufacturer. [Laughter.] I presume there is no argument there.

Mr. COCKRAN. There is no argument there. The more you get the merrier.

Mr. SCHWAB. I have said it was a wise provision for the manufacturer. You can not let a steel plant stand idle. The fires in your furnaces and the heat costs go on whether you are making steel or not.

Mr. COCKRAN. You said as a matter of fact that there are different rates charged for your products abroad, and you charge less abroad than you charge at home?

Mr. SCHWAB. We usually charge abroad what we can get.

Mr. COCKRAN. You do that at home, do you not?

Mr. SCHWAB. Yes; of course.

Mr. COCKRAN. You can not, of course, put a pistol to a man's head and take all he has.

Mr. SCHWAB. You can in some instances; yes.

And on pages 1729 and 1730 of the same hearings Judge Elbert H. Gary, chairman of the board of directors of the Steel Trust, gave the following testimony:

Mr. CLARK. Your selling price for the United States is $28 a ton. What is your selling price abroad?

Mr. GARY. For 1907, the last figures made up, the price of export rails was, on the average, about 22 cents per ton higher than the domestic price.

Mr. COCKRAN. How much higher?

Mr. GARY. Twenty-two cents per ton.

Mr. COCKRAN. Higher?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is that at the factory?

Mr. GARY. Yes; at the factory.

Mr. CLARK. What was it in 1906—how did it run?

Mr. GARY. In 1906 it was $24.08.

Mr. CLARK. Higher?

Mr. GARY. No; that would be lower, you see—$24.08 at the mill.

Mr. CLARK. That was $3.92.

Mr. GARY. The average of the domestic was $27.52; therefore that would be $3.44 lower on the export.

Mr. CLARK. In 1905?

Mr. GARY. In 1905 there was a still greater difference. The export price was $20.98, or a difference of——

Mr. COCKRAN. Seven dollars and two cents.

Mr. GARY. No; $20.98 deducted from $27.37.

Mr. COCKRAN. That would be $6.39, would it not?

Mr. GARY. I presume so.

Mr. CLARK. In 1904?

Mr. GARY. I have not gone back that far.

Mr. CLARK. Was there generally more difference or less difference, do you think, back for 10 years?

Mr. GARY. Ten years?

Mr. CLARK. Beginning in 1897; we have got into the habit of beginning there.

Mr. GARY. I should think fully as much as the figures I gave you.

Mr. CLARK. You sell all of your steel products abroad, as a rule, cheaper than you do at home?

Mr. GARY. Sometimes we do. I think maybe I can give you the figures on the average for 1907.

Mr. CLARK. We would be glad to have them.

Mr. GARY. The average mill price per ton received for exported materials was 7½ per cent less than the average price for domestic shipments.

Mr. CLARK. Now, you sell this stuff that you ship abroad at a profit, do you not?

Mr. GARY. We do, yes; our company, some of the companies we own here, at times shipped at less than profit, I think, taking into account depreciation and administration charges, and all that sort of thing. But it is a fact that manufacturers at times export at prices down to or below cost.

Mr. CLARK. Why do they not reduce the price for the domestic consumer so as to use up this surplus?

Mr. GARY. That probably would not be the result.

Mr. CLARK. There would not be any result?

Mr. GARY. I say that probably would not have the result of increasing the domestic sales. As a rule, the consumers supply their demands at the best price they can get.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. GARY. Then reducing the price would not increase the quantity, and, therefore, you would have the same surplus.

Mr. CLARK. There might be somebody around who wanted to use steel, who was prohibited from using it by the higher price.

Mr. GARY. There might be, but I think that would be exceptional.

Mr. James G. Parsons, secretary of the Tariff Reform Committee of New York, makes the following pertinent comment on Judge Gary's testimony:

THE STEEL TRUST'S JUGGLED AND MISLEADING FIGURES.

Judge Gary's statement here that the "average mill price per ton received for exported materials was 7½ per cent less than the average price for domestic shipments" in 1907 is taken from the annual report of the Steel Corporation for 1907. It is a misleading statement, apparently shrewdly prepared to convey the idea, as it seemed to do before the Ways and Means Committee, that the export price was only 7½ per cent lower than the domestic price of the same goods. This, however, is a piece of deception undoubtedly intended to conceal the extent of this difference. The trick, involving a juggle with the words "average" and "mill price," was clearly exposed by Mr. Byron W. Holt, chairman of the tariff reform committee of the Reform Club, in a specially prepared article published in Thomas Gibson's market letter of June 9, 1908, entitled "The Probable Effect of Tariff Revision on Securities." Mr. Holt said:

"The Steel Corporation has greatly increased its exports since the panic, notwithstanding that the prices of steel in foreign markets have declined far more than at home. In one instance this year 100,000 tons of tin-plate bars were exported to Wales at about $12 a ton below the home price. Tin plate, barb and other wire, and wire nails are probably exported now at from $10 to $20 a ton less than the home price.

"The report of the Steel Corporation for 1907 says (p. 29):

"'The average mill price per ton received for all exported materials was only 7½ per cent less than the average price received for all domestic shipments.'

"As the average selling price of these steel products is about $40 a ton, an average difference of 7½ per cent would mean $3 a ton. This word 'average,' however, may be, and probably is, very misleading. It is undoubtedly true that the goods exported in 1907 were, as a whole, much more highly finished than was the bulk of the goods sold at home. They consisted largely of barb and other wire, wire nails, plates, tin plates, etc. The average domestic price of this class of goods is, perhaps, $45 per ton. If they were sold for export at an average of $35 per ton, they were, in reality, sold $10 per ton below the home price, though they might have been sold only $3 per ton below 'the average price received for all domestic shipments,' which were composed largely of steel rails, billets, merchant steel, tubing, structural material, etc. The per ton price of the exported goods might easily have exceeded the per ton price of the domestic goods and still have been $10 per ton below the domestic price for the class of goods exported."

This would make the difference between export and home prices nearly 30 per cent, instead of "only 7½ per cent." It is reasonably certain that the average difference was not less than 15 or 20 per cent, even in 1907, when, as the report admits, foreign prices were nearer to domestic prices than at any time since the Steel Trust was formed.

In 1908 the difference between export and domestic prices of steel was probably much more than 30 per cent. It is known that in January, 1908, in the transaction referred to in the above quotation from Gibson's market letter, the United States Steel Products Export Co. sold for export 100,000 tons of sheet bars at 81 shillings per ton, delivered in Wales. Deducting $3.50 for freight, the Pittsburg price for these exported goods was $16 against $29, the home price. In this instance the domestic price was 80 per cent above the export price.

There has been another juggle with figures in the Steel Trust's annual report, which served to aid in concealing the enormous earnings of the trust until it also was exposed by Mr. Byron W. Holt, then editor of Moody's Magazine, in the issue of that magazine for August, 1906, and in subsequent articles. In Moody's Magazine for April, 1907, in discussing this matter editorially, Mr. Holt said:

"Our readers will remember that we, last August, called attention to the fact that the 'gross sales' and 'costs' were fictitious and that they were undoubtedly juggled to conceal the actual rate of profit. We challenged the accuracy of these two items and gave most convincing reasons for thinking that 'gross sales' and 'costs' included

sales and charges between the subsidiary companies, although there was nothing in the report to indicate this fact. We expressed the opinion that these items were padded to disguise the tariff profits of this most highly protected trust.

"The present report confesses that the 'gross sales and earnings' represents 'the aggregate gross value of the commercial transactions conducted by the respective companies and receipts of the transportation companies for services rendered both to subsidiary companies and to the public.'"

"This statement shows that our reasoning and conclusions were sound, although some of our subscribers who were stockholders were unwilling to believe that their corporation would practice deception and mislead them in this way. It is undoubtedly because of our criticism that this report admits this most peculiar and damaging fact. View it in as favorable light as we can, these figures are made to conceal facts not only from stockholders, but from the public at large, which is taxing itself nearly $100,000,000 a year for the benefit of this giant "infant" and tariff beneficiary.

"It is ridiculous that the financial statement of the Steel Corporation, a holding company and a distinct entity, should give us the gross results of all the transactions which its subsidiary companies have with each other and should not distinguish between such fictitious bookkeeping and meaningless transactions and their transactions with the outside world. And yet the report says:

"'As in previous years' reports, the statement of account, statistics, etc., presented in this report comprehend the combined results for the United States Steel Corporation and all the subsidiary companies * * * liabilities from one company to another are omitted from both liabilities and assets.'

"Of course liabilities from one company to another had to be canceled, but why were other transactions between the companies not also canceled? They are like transfers of dollars or marbles from one pocket to another.

"A street fakir may sell a penknife to Mr. E. Z. Mark for $1 that he ordinarily sells for 50 cents and that costs him only 30 cents. He then, if he is familiar with reports of the Steel Corporation, may ease his conscience by transferring the dollar from one pocket to another until he has run up gross sales to $7. His profits will then be 70 cents, or at the rate or 10 per cent on gross sales.

"Or he may transfer the knife from pocket to pocket before it is sold, charging 10 cents (in his mind) for each shift, until the 'cost' of the knife has increased from 30 to 90 cents. His conscience will then permit him to sell the knife for $1. Great head, good bookkeeping! But the ordinary fakir is too practical to waste his time and wear out his pockets in this way. However, if he had a license that gave him a monopoly of the sale of penknives in a city, and if he had to make reports of sales and profits, he might see a new light and think more favorably of the methods of the Steel Corporation for concealing profits."

And again, on another occasion, in referring to this same deception in the Steel Trust's annual report for 1907, Mr. Holt said:

"The recently issued report of the Steel Trust tells us that the gross sales and earnings for the year ending December 31, 1907, were $757,014,767 and that the net earnings, after deducting $35,000,000 for maintenance and repairs, were $160,964,673. Apparently, then, this trust sold its products at a profit of only 27 per cent on their cost price. This rate of profit does not look large to us when we consider how heavily we tax ourselves to support this prince of paupers.

"But in reality the rate of profit was about twice 27 per cent. In another part of the report we are informed that 'gross sales and earnings' include 'sales made between the subsidiary companies' as well as those to the outside world. This is ridiculous, of course, and is done for the purpose of disguising tariff profits.

"Just what were the 'gross sales' to the public the report nowhere tells us. It does, however, tell us that the total tons of 'rolled and other finished products for sale' were 10,376,742. We know the quoted prices for nearly all of these products, and we know that the average price was not, as the figures indicate, over $70 per ton. We know that it was not $60 or even $50 per ton. It probably did not exceed $40 a ton, or about $414,000,000. Adding $46,000,000—a liberal estimate—for all other possible sales and earnings—from its railroads, sales of cement, spelter, etc.—we have $460,000,000 as the total amount of the gross sales to the public.

"Deducting the net profits, we have less than $300,000,000 as the total cost of the products sold. The actual rate of profit, then, we are proud to say, was 54 per cent on the cost price of the products sold."

GARY'S FIGURES NOT RELIABLE.

These tricks of misrepresentation, characteristic of the Steel Trust's reports, must be kept in mind in considering Judge Gary's statements before the Ways and Means Committee. What he said on that occasion, however, constitutes a conclusive and authoritative admission that practically all steel products are regularly sold abroad at substantially lower prices than at home; that this practice has been going on for years and still continues; that practically all these export sales at lower prices were made at a profit to the manufacturers and from domestic materials, without any reference to drawbacks, and that the manufacturers are regularly "holding up" the domestic consumers for "the best price they can get." Of course, practically all manufacturers do, now and then, both in domestic and export trade, sell certain lots of certain articles at cost, or even less than cost, for special reasons; but Judge Gary makes it clear that any such sales of steel products for export are exceptional. He also shows that the figures quoted in the Republican Campaign Textbook for 1908 (from his statement before the House Committee on Merchant Marine in 1906) can not be depended on for accuracy. The campaign textbook figures, which did service in the presidential campaign of 1908, stated that in 1906 the price of steel rails in the United States for export was "about $26.60" per ton. In December, 1908, after the election, Judge Gary tells us under oath that it was $24.08 in 1906 and much lower in 1905. (Taken from a pamphlet prepared by Mr. Parsons, entitled "Protection's Favors to Foreigners," and printed as S. Doc. 54, 61st Cong., 1st sess.)

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, let me say, provides that the following articles and necessary utensils employed by farmers in the greatest and most useful of all business pursuits, agriculture, shall be exempt from tariff taxation:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

It is an established fact that plows and the other implements mentioned, boots and shoes, fencing wire, sewing machines, and the other articles named in the bill, are made or produced in the United States and sold in foreign markets for a lower price than at home. There is no justice in that sort of protection which enables the manufacturer to exact of Americans a greater price for plows and other things than he charges the foreigner in foreign lands.

COTTON BAGGING AND TIES.

Mr. Chairman, I must confine myself at the present time to the articles of bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton. I am glad to note that these two articles, the duty on which has cost the southern cotton farmer a million or more dollars annually, are by this beneficent measure placed upon the free list. And I sincerely hope that a Republican Senate will allow them to remain in the bill and pass the measure, and that the President will approve it. Our farmers are entitled to this consideration and to all the relief provided in the bill.

This matter of removing the duty from bagging and ties has been several times heretofore advocated by me. I beg leave to call attention to the following remarks made by me on April 7, 1909, during the consideration of the Payne bill, on that subject:

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, we are operating to-day in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and considering the tariff bill under a rule that I think not short of infamous, that denies the rights of Representatives here to offer amendments to this tariff bill, which amendments are in the interest of the people. Under this harsh rule it is probable that I will not be allowed at any time to offer amendments to put bagging and ties, in which the great cotton product of our country is baled for the market, on the free list. If I shall have the opportunity to offer these amendments, I shall offer one putting bagging on the free list, in the following words:

"Strike out all of section 350, covering bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, and transfer the same to the free list."

Then I shall offer another amendment putting cotton ties for the baling of cotton on the free list, which is in the following language:

"Strike out section 123, covering hoop or band iron, or hoop and band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton, and transfer the same to the free list."

Mr. Chairman, I elaborated what I had to say on this subject last Friday in the discussion of the pending tariff bill. I desire now to make a brief statement.

Under the Wilson tariff there were nine mills in this country making bagging for cotton. Under the Dingley bill the Bagging Trust reduced the number to three, and this trust now has a monopoly of the cotton-bagging business. The cotton farmer is compelled to pay a duty on 6½ yards of bagging per bale or a duty which is a tax of 4¾ cents on the bagging in each bale. Now, I ask that bagging be put upon the free list, because it is not an American product—the jute is raised in foreign lands—because it will benefit the great cotton industry of our country, and because it will tend to destroy the Bagging Trust.

There are about 100,000,000 yards of bagging consumed by the cotton growers in this country per annum. In 1897, 20,000,000 yards were imported before the Dingley law went into effect, paying a duty of $118,000, having a foreign unit value of 6½ cents a square yard. The three companies having a monopoly of this bagging business are located in New York, Boston, and Indiana.

The cotton farmer, I repeat, pays a duty on 6½ yards of bagging per bale, or 4¾ cents duty, and on cotton ties, which were free under the Wilson bill, the duty under the present bill is three-tenths of a cent per pound, instead of five-tenths of a cent per pound under the Dingley bill. There were imported into this country, in 1907, 716,819 pounds of cotton ties, paying a duty of $3,584; 16,216,000 pounds came in in the last year of the Wilson bill. The Dingley bill favored the Steel Trust, and the pending bill still hands out favors to this and other monopolies.

No opportunity to offer the amendments mentioned was given me, but when the distinguished gentleman now our Speaker, then the minority leader in this House, was preparing his resolution to recommit the Payne bill with instructions, he included therein at my request the following paragraphs which were prepared by me:

Fifth. Amend as follows: Strike out all of section 350, covering bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute, jute butts, or hemp, and transfer the same to the free list.

Sixth. Amend as follows: Strike out section 123, covering hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly

manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton, and transfer same to the free list.

The resolution to recommit was offered by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on April 9, 1909, the day the Payne bill passed the House of Representatives, and that resolution, including the above paragraphs relating to bagging and ties, was rejected by a Republican House.

Under the Payne law the cotton farmer must pay duty on a bale of cotton as follows:

	Cents.
6½ yards of bagging, per bale	4¾
Steel cotton ties, per bale	2 1/10
Total, per bale	7 8/10

Under the Payne law the duty on cotton bagging is six-tenths of a cent per yard. Six and one-half yards of cotton bagging are required for a bale of cotton, so that the duty on the bagging required to cover a bale of cotton is 4¾ cents. On a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton the duty on the bagging required will amount to $617,500.

Under the Payne law the duty on cotton ties is three-tenths of a cent per pound. Eight and one-half pounds of ties are required for each bale of cotton, so that the duty on the ties for a bale of cotton is 2 11/10 cents. On a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton the duty on the ties required will amount to $331,500.

It will thus be seen that the total duty imposed upon the baling of a 13,000,000-bale crop of cotton will amount to $949,000.

BINDER TWINE AND GRAIN CROPS—COMPARISON BETWEEN COTTON AND GRAIN CROPS.

Yet no duty is placed upon the binder twine used by the grain farmer in harvesting his crop, and here will be seen the unjust discrimination in favor of the grain farmer and against the southern cotton farmer which is perpetrated by the Payne law.

The following table, taken from a table furnished by Mr. O. P. Austin, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, to me under date of April 26, 1911, will illustrate the relative importance of the cotton crop, compared with grain crops, both severally and jointly:

Production and exports of domestic cereal crops and cotton during the year 1910.

Articles.	Production, calendar years.		Exports, domestic, fiscal years.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Bushels.		*Bushels.*	
Wheat	695,443,000	$621,443,000	46,679,876	$47,806,598
Oats	1,126,765,000	384,716,000	1,685,474	794,367
Rye	33,039,000	23,840,000	219,756	168,666
Barley	162,227,000	93,785,000	4,311,566	3,052,527
Buckwheat	17,239,000	11,321,000	158,160	103,138
Total	2,034,713,000	1,135,105,000	53,054,832	51,925,296
	Pounds.		*Pounds.*	
Cotton	5,551,790,000	820,320,000	3,206,708,226	450,447,243

By this table it will be seen that of cotton there was produced 5,551,000,000 pounds, with a value of $820,320,000; that there were exported for the fiscal year 3,206,000,000 pounds, having a total value of $450,000,000. [Applause.] While the entire exports for the same period of wheat, oats, rye, barley, and buckwheat aggregated $51,925,000. As I have shown, cotton exports for the same period reached the enormous sum of $450,000,000. So that the chief item of our exports, keeping up the gold supply, furnishing the balance of trade in favor of this country, is the item of cotton produced by the southern farmer. [Applause.]

I shall print in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks the table furnished to me by Mr. AUSTIN.

And, Mr. Chairman, the same consideration that has been shown to the grain grower of the West, which was a right and proper consideration, in giving him free binding twine for his grain, should be shown to the cotton farmer of the South. We contend that there should be free bagging and ties for the southern cotton farmer. [Applause.] I have here a letter, written by Mr. Rochester, explaining this whole matter of the Bagging Trust and the burdensome operations of the law made for the benefit of that trust.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1911.*

Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Pursuant to our conversation regarding cotton bagging, I thought well to call your attention to the following features in connection with the American Manufacturing Co. and the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, better known as the Bagging Trust.

These concerns, by their pooled arrangement under which the American sells about 82 per cent and the Ludlow about 18 per cent of the cotton bagging used to cover the crop of the country, by dint of the protection afforded them under the present iniquitous tariff law, are enabled not only to maintain their own price by reason of having stifled all other independent competition, but there seems to be, along with the gradually increasing price of the bagging, a corresponding decrease in quality.

The American's mills in Brooklyn being located on the East River, that copious estuary furnishes a very large percentage of the weight which goes to make up the Patent Fire-Proofing Compound, by which they set so much store, and the other ingredients of this famous "fire-proofing compound" are common salt, lime dust, barytes, and other similar cheap makeweights. The planter in buying this American-made bagging is paying about at the rate of 4 to 5 cents per pound for East River water and the other ingredients above mentioned, though he gets no benefit whatever of the water, for after the bale of cotton has stood in the sun for a few days the water has all evaporated, and even though he should sell his bale at gross for net, as claimed by some of our Republican friends—but which is not a fact—he would have no show on earth to get back the water, which evaporates into the air.

In an article in the New York Evening Mail of April 22, a notorious high-tariff trust organ, and which article is copiously illustrated with cuts, it is there claimed that the cotton-bagging industry in this country gives employment to 50,000 American laborers. The fact is that it gives employment to less than 3,000 of the poorest and most ignorant little Hungarian, Polack, and Bohemian children—mostly girls. The article in question I am handing you with this letter so that you may see from their own picture the character of American labor that, in their argument of injured innocence, they are seeking to protect.

The fact is that many of these children have no business, under our child-labor laws, to be working in a mill at all on account of their tender age. Moreover they are not American citizens in the strict sense of the word, as these corporations have their agents to take them at the piers as they land from the immigrant ships and steer them into their jute mills at starvation wages of 60 cents per day up to about $1, according to the age and time of service.

These people can not even speak English and have no voice whatever in their contract, for compensation being thankful to get anything whatever once they have landed in America and being incompetent to demand by reason of their ignorance and incompetency any fair wage.

You will also note the claim that there is $8,000,000 invested in this business. The American Manufacturing Co.'s capital stock is $2,000,000, it having cut down its capital stock by $1,000,000 a few years ago and passed it around to its stockholders with a letter of explanation that they were making money so rapidly that they could not use the extra million dollars. And this, under the Wilson law, when they claimed that they were only able to exist by dint of a cut in wages and personal overtures to their operatives to stick by them until the crisis was over.

The Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, while capitalized at a larger amount, it is fair to assume has not employed in this bagging industry more than $500,000, which, you will see on a basis of the pooled ratio above referred to, would be an ample percentage of capital for Ludlow with 18 per cent, as against the American Manufacturing Co.'s $2,000,000 to handle its 82 per cent of the bagging to cover the cotton crop of the country.

POOLED ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN MANUFACTURING CO. AND THE LUDLOW MANUFACTURING ASSOCIATES.

FALSE OR FAKED COMPETITION MAINTAINED TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC.

These matters are thoroughly covered in my letter to Mr. Roosevelt of November 28, 1908, and recorded in tariff hearings of the Sixtieth Congress at pages 4892 and 4893, and the status of which is to all intents and purposes unchanged at this time.

QUALITY OF BAGGING.

I have requested shipped to me by Mr. Harvey Jordan, of Atlanta, samples of the American Manufacturing Co.'s Dundee and the Calcutta bagging, which will be left with Mr. UNDERWOOD when I go back home, and should be glad for you to contrast the qualities of these baggings, which will more forcibly illustrate the imposition than any word of mouth or pen could.

I was glad to see, that when this question came up before, you had gone so fully into the quality of the bagging, and I know that you will give that phase of the question due consideration now, for, under existing conditions, the American cotton bale enjoys to-day the unique distinction of being the most disreputable package of merchandise shipped from any market on the face of the habitable globe. Not because good bagging could not be made and is not made, but because our tariff arrangements are such that they encourage an unscrupulous trust to force down the throat of the helpless farmer or factor the article which to them pays the greatest profit, irrespective of quality or fitness for the purpose.

FIBERS.

You are doubtless aware that the jute fiber all grows in India and comes into this country free of duty, and is used principally for the manufacture of jute bagging, though, to a smaller extent, for jute twines, carpet yarns, and so forth.

Sisal fiber is taken from a species of the cactus plant which grows in Mexico and also comes to this country free of duty, being used principally for the manufacture of binder twine and, to a smaller extent, for rope.

Manila fiber, so called (Abaca), is a product of a species of the banana plant grown, solely for commercial purposes, in the Philippine Islands, and is not only imported into this country free of duty, but ever since we have been in control of the Philippine Islands, by an act of Congress, the cordage manufacturers here have received a bounty of three-eighths of a cent per pound on every pound of Manila hemp shown to have been manufactured here into cordage or binder twine.

Russia hemp is grown in Russia, Austria, and Belgium, principally, and is imported into this country, in very small quantities, free of duty, for use in the manufacture of tarred and untarred rope or cordage.

American hemp is grown chiefly in Kentucky, California, and, to some extent, in Wisconsin, and is used principally in the manufacture of commercial twines.

You will thus see the discrimination against the southern cotton grower and in favor of the western or northern grain grower, which was so forcibly brought out in your speech on the subject during the debate on the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Yours, very truly, R. ROCHESTER.

I desire to read the following statement made by Mr. C. Lee McMillan, of New Orleans:

I also send you a photograph showing how first bale (1908) new grown Laurel, Miss., cotton looked upon its arrival by express at the New Orleans Cotton Exchange. This cotton was covered with the inferior domestic made bagging, and although it had never been touched with a cotton hook, you can easily see why the farmers loss in weight is often very great. Give the cotton farmer the chance to cover his cotton with bagging such as our Calcutta sample represents, and you will save the South millions of dollars every year.

Mr. GILLETT in his speech last week (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 835) told Congress that "the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates were in no combination with the American Manufacturing Co."

In answer to the above I will say that for about 15 or 20 years past the Ludlow people and the American Manufacturing Co. have invariably opened the bagging market upon the same day each year, and both concerns have asked exactly the same price for same quality and weight of goods to every point they did business.

The same plan exactly is followed by the cotton-tie people, and I may further state that what cotton ties the Ludlow people require they get from Messrs. Warren, Jones & Gratz, who are the selling agents for both the Carnegie Steel Co. and the American Manufacturing Co.

Mr. GILLETT also said, "We would be willing to compete with England even with the present low duty." As a matter of fact, more bagging for covering cotton during the past 20 years has been made in Great Britain than in India. One mill (Cleghorn's) of Dundee during the past five years made more cotton bagging than all Calcutta mills put together made.

There are other Dundee mills, also one in Liverpool, engaged in making this bagging for American cotton, and every one of them employs white labor.

Ask Mr. GILLETT how many of those engaged in making bagging at Ludlow own their own homes? How many speak English, and how many are voters? As a matter of fact, Ludlow has the very lowest class of eastern Europe labor, and as making bagging is the easiest of all work in fabrics, little skill is required, and the poor Hungarian gets very small wages.

The best wages paid by Ludlow doubtless goes to those who are engaged in the five other departments Ludlow so fully covered in its signed statement, which you can see if you will kindly refer to the afternoon session before Ways and Means Committee, Monday, November 30, 1908.

Mr. GILLETT stated that "all of the machinery has to be imported from England, because there is none made in the United States, and they have to pay 45 per cent duty on their machines."

I beg to inform you that the Smith & Furbush Machine Co. of Philadelphia, makes all kinds of machinery for cotton bagging, and further, I am pleased to state that the Americans did buy a lot of secondhand bagging machinery in Dundee, which can be imported free of duty.

All of the American bagging mills use a certain percentage of secondhand bagging in making yarns to go into new bagging, and the cost of the secondhand stuff is very low indeed.

The Bagging Trust did buy and dismantle the bagging mills of Louisville, New Orleans, and Galveston. The only mill in the South engaged in making new bagging is the one at Charleston, S. C., which is owned by the American Manufacturing Co., known as the trust.

Those other mills Mr. GILLETT refers to as being in the Southeast are not makers of new bagging, but said mills are engaged in making over and piecing secondhand bagging they buy from the cotton mills as it comes off cotton, and I may here state that all of those little mills put together make up not more than two or three million yards, while the American Manufacturing Co. makes new bagging and new patches for sample holes, say, forty-five or fifty million yards, and the Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, according to its signed statement (see, if you please, afternoon session of Ways and Means Committee, Monday, Nov. 30, 1908), can make 25,000,000 yards.

You will remember that both the American and Ludlow concerns are by no means dependent upon the bagging industry, as both concerns do more along other lines of manufacture than in bagging.

The Bagging Trust for years has been a buyer of Calcutta baggings, and it is now receiving Calcutta-made bagging at its Brooklyn mill. You might ask Mr. Gratz, of the American Manufacturing Co., why do they send Calcutta bagging to the Brooklyn mill? What is its weight upon arrival there? And what is its weight when it is sold and shipped south to their customers? I am sure the Bagging Trust will not protest against salt being put upon the free list, and if you will kindly examine carefully the sample marked "No. 1," I think you will detect salt contained therein, the weight of which would disappear under the rays of the sun.

Mr. Chairman, an amusing thing has been sent to me from Henderson, N. C., under date of April 24, 1911, in which an appeal is made to save the Bagging Trust. It is a circular letter over the printed signature of the Carolina Bagging Co. This circular says that a large amount of capital is invested in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and so forth, in the manufacture of bagging, and that "admitting jute into this country free of duty would ruin and close these factories and throw all their labor out of employment." Why, Mr. Chairman, the author of this lamentation and prediction did not know that jute has been admitted for years into this country free of duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Jute and jute butts were put on the free list in a Republican tariff for the benefit of the Bagging Trust. It is now the duty on the bagging that we want taken off for the benefit of the consumer, the farmer. Yet these factories have not been closed.

Let me quote from the free list of the act of August 5, 1909, known as the Payne bill:

FREE LIST.

That on and after the day following the passage of this act, except as otherwise specially provided for in this act, the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs shall, when imported into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), be exempt from duty:

* * * * *

578. Grasses and fibers: Istle or Tampico fiber, jute, jute butts, manila, sisal grass, sunn, and all other textile grasses or fibrous vegetable substances, not dressed or manufactured in any manner, and not specially provided for in this section.

Jute and jute butts were put on the free list away back in the days when the McKinley bill (see H. Rept. 1466, 51st Cong., 1st sess., p. 15) was enacted, and were retained on the free list in the Dingley law and embodied in the free list in the Payne law, as shown above. This suffices to illustrate how ignorant some tariff prophets are or how forgetful of facts they can be in making arguments for the retention of tariff duties which enable a trust—the Bagging Trust, for instance—to rob the farmer.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress I saw a man hanging around the doors of this House and about the rooms of the Committee on Ways and Means. I was told that he was the agent or lobbyist of the Bagging Trust. At the first session of the next Congress I saw that same man sitting as a Republican Member of Congress in this House. I do not know what has become of him latterly, but whether the Bagging Trust has a representative in this Chamber or not, the fact remains that that trust is furnished protection in the present tariff law, and the merchants and the farmers of the South know that methods similar to those which have been practiced by the Tie Trust are practiced by the Bagging Trust. It will be remembered that in the spring of 1906, after the cotton plant had begun to grow, it seemed apparent that there would be a very large crop on account of a large acreage and weather conditions. There were about 2,500,000 bundles of cotton ties ready for shipment, but the Steel Trust in one day sent out telegrams over the entire cotton belt raising the price of ties 10 cents per bundle, thus taking from the pockets of the cotton growers $250,000 at one time on cotton ties. If the pending bill should become a law we hope and expect to get rid of the burdensome exactions made by that trust and the Bagging Trust under the protection afforded them by the present tariff. [Applause.] Thereby the producer of cotton will be put upon the same footing as the producer of grain, who is furnished with untaxed binder twine.

Now, lest some man will say that the purchaser of the farmer's bale of cotton pays for the bagging and ties, let me refute that. Everybody knows that the great bulk of the cotton crop is exported, and wherever the bulk of any product is exported necessarily the price of that article so exported is fixed according to the foreign demand and the foreign price. So we can correctly contend that the price of cotton is fixed by the Liverpool market. Everybody knows that the price is fixed in that way and that the cotton trade does not reimburse the farmer for the amount he expends in the purchase of bagging and ties. The farmer takes that money directly out of his pocket and pays it to the retail merchant every time he has a cotton bale packed. He is out that amount for bagging and ties. Does he get it back? Not so. The consumer of the cotton—the spinner—deducts the weight of the bagging and ties as tare from the cotton when he pays for the cotton. That tare has ranged from 22 to 30 pounds per bale, according to the estimated weight of the bagging and ties. Therefore it is a total loss to the farmer; he is never reimbursed.

I have here copies of a number of letters sustaining that statement, written by the President of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange and Secretary Hester, of the same exchange, and others, and one just received by me under date of May 2, 1911, from Mr. McMillan, of New Orleans. Let me read Mr. McMillan's letter:

C. LEE MCMILLAN & CO. (LTD.),
New Orleans, May 2, 1911.

Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please permit me to state that those small bagging mills in the Southeast that are protesting so strongly against the removal of the duty on bagging are not engaged in making new bagging out of new jute, but are engaged in piecing or making over the old bagging after it is taken off cotton at the mills.

The output of such mills as described above is a very poor stuff, indeed, and it is the cause of much of the complaint heard about improper covering for American cotton.

To those who are upholding the claim of the United Steel Co. that the cotton planter reaps a large profit upon the ties he uses you may say that all European or foreign cotton buyers figure the tare for bagging and ties as being 6 per cent. The majority of the American spinners figure this tare at 5 per cent, while none of them calculates tare at less than 4 per cent.

The average bale of cotton has on it—

	Pounds.
7 yards 2-pound bagging, say	14
6 steel bands, weighing 1½ pounds each	9
Making a total of	23

so you will see that the planter gets back nothing whatever for his bagging and ties.

Yours, respectfully, C. LEE MCMILLAN.

And I now read the others:

SAVANNAH, GA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. C. L. BARTLETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Offers from Europe name a price which includes cost of freight, marine insurance, and 6 per cent tare on a 500-pound bale. Six per cent would be 40 pounds, which covers 16 pounds for 8 yards of bagging, 8 pounds for 8 ties, and 6 pounds for natural drying of cotton and consequent shrinkage in weight; nominally the farmer is paid for bagging and ties, but the spinner can't spin them. He sells them for junk; consequently the price he offers is a figure arrived at after deducting what his loss will be on the bagging and ties; also is true that farmer in reality is not paid for bagging and ties. American spinners usually get 28 pounds tare, and also deduct from price they pay for cotton the loss they will sustain on the bagging and ties.

W. W. GORDON.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Your contention in dispatch concerning tare on cotton is true. When the farmer buys bagging and ties he pays therefor some 9 cents per bale more than he would pay if free. When the spinner buys from the farmer he deducts from the worth of the cotton the amount of his loss by bagging and ties. Therefore the spinner does not pay the tariff profit that goes to the manufacturers of bagging and ties and the farmer does. But even if spinner did pay, antagonists' argument is not strengthened, because spinner would add excess to manufactured product and thus increase the cost to consumer. In either case the trust collects the profit and the people pay.

W. B. THOMPSON,
President New Orleans Cotton Exchange.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 26, 1909.*

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

It is a well-known fact that all buyers on both sides of the Atlantic allow in the prices they pay fully enough, if not more than enough, to offset the weight of bagging and ties on a bale. As a general thing 6 per cent is allowed for tare by foreign spinners. While all spinners practically buy on the basis of tare, care is generally taken that allowances always equal and frequently exceed actual tare.

HENRY G. HESTER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

All cotton sold for export deducts 6 per cent tare for bagging and ties; domestic mills claim 4 to 5 per cent tare.

NORMAN EUSTIS,
Acting Chairman Cotton Factory Association.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 27, 1909.*

A. S. BURLESON,
Washington, D. C.:

Cotton sold for export carries 6 per cent deduction for tare; domestic mills calculate about 5 per cent.

NEW ORLEANS COTTON BUYERS' AND EXPORTERS' ASSN.,
A. J. WEST, *President.*

Every man familiar with the production, handling, and sale of cotton knows what I have said to be true. It has never been challenged by any man who has witnessed the growth of the cotton plant from the time it shot up its two tender leaves, from the time it blossomed into whiteness, from the time that the pink blossoms came into the beautiful green and graceful foliage. No man who has witnessed its development into the full-grown boll; who has witnessed in the fall, as if touched by magic, the whole field becoming like an expanse of snow in its whiteness and purity—no man who has ever witnessed all these things has ever challenged the statement that under Republican tariff laws the farmer who makes the cotton loses the sum that he pays out for the ties and bagging in which he wraps his cotton, the cotton which is the common raiment of mankind and is at the same time well-nigh all the "purple and fine linen" of the poor, God's poor that our Savior loved so well. It is the learned Republican tariff doctrinaire, the pretentious disseminator of secondhand misinformation, who asserts that the spinner pays for the bagging and ties used in preparing the great cotton crop for the markets of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I thank you for your courtesy and indulgence. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Production, imports, and exports of domestic cereal crops and cotton during the years 1909 and 1910.

Articles.	Production, calendar years.		Exports, domestic, fiscal years.		Imports, fiscal years.	
	Quantity.	Value.[1]	Quantity.	Value.[2]	Quantity.	Value.[3]
Wheat:	*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*	
1909	737,189,000	$730,046,000	66,923,244	$68,094,447	41,082	$36,741
1910	695,443,000	621,443,000	46,679,876	47,806,598	164,201	150,561
Corn:						
1909	2,772,376,000	1,652,822,000	35,853,412	25,194,466	258,065	189,465
1910	3,125,713,000	1,523,968,000	36,802,374	25,427,993	[4] 117,934	72,341
Oats:						
1909	1,007,353,000	408,174,000	1,510,320	804,759	6,666,989	2,651,699
1910	1,126,765,000	384,716,000	1,685,474	794,367	1,034,511	400,920
Rye:						
1909	32,239,000	23,809,000	1,272,559	1,049,809	51	51
1910	33,039,000	23,840,000	219,756	168,666	28,374	19,265
Barley:						
1909	170,284,000	93,971,000	6,580,393	4,672,166	2,644	1,440
1910	162,227,000	93,785,000	4,311,566	3,052,527	[5] 3,989	2,650
Buckwheat:						
1909	17,438,000	12,188,000	186,702	137,413	[4] 19,514	12,231
1910	17,239,000	11,321,000	158,160	103,138	[4] 9,186	5,658
Cotton:	*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	
1909	4,783,220,000	688,350,000	4,447,985,202	417,390,665	86,518,024	13,622,802
1910	5,551,790,000	820,320,000	3,206,708,226	450,447,243	86,037,691	15,816,138

[1] Farm value December 1.
[2] Export values are those of the markets from which exported.
[3] Markets are wholesale market values of the countries whence imported.
[4] Imports for consumption.
[5] In addition 811,529 pounds of barley, pearled, patent, or hulled were imported.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
April 26, 1911.

For Hon. HENRY D. CLAYTON,
House of Representatives.

O. P. AUSTIN, *Chief of Bureau.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.

THE TARIFF.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, this house has had under discussion during recent years few measures that have occasioned as exhaustive, illuminating, and interesting debate as the Canadian reciprocity and free-list bills. Both of these measures deal with that great subject, the tariff, with which this Nation has been struggling since George Washington affixed his signature in 1789 to the original Federal tariff, the second act of the First Congress of the United States, down to the present moment, when the Sixty-second Congress is discussing the pending free-list bill. No question of governmental policy has been as continuously and widely discussed or as repeatedly advanced as a political issue. While I approach the subject from the standpoint of one who firmly believes that protection is the fixed economic policy of the Nation, it is my purpose in the time allotted to deal with the question of methods rather than the subject of schedules.

OUR TARIFF METHODS OBSOLETE.

During the 122-year period, to which I have just alluded, the progress of the country has been by leaps and bounds. In every governmental department we have striven to keep pace with the enlightened and progressive spirit of the age by adopting improved and modern methods. In the manner of framing tariff laws, however, we still follow practically the same antiquated, obsolete, and primitive methods in vogue for over a century and a quarter.

TARIFF AGITATION INVARIABLY DISTURBS BUSINESS.

The tariff affects practically every line of business in the country. It involves economic and industrial questions of the gravest importance. When a tariff agitation is on, even before the actual framing of a tariff bill commences, business is at a standstill. The mere knowledge that a revision is contemplated upsets all lines of industry. Merchants hesitate to place orders, investors are cautious, and new enterprises are delayed. Having had some little experience with financial institutions, I fully appreciate how little it takes at times to disturb conditions. When finally Congress undertakes to revise the schedules there is an impatient clamor all over the country for an early settlement, and Congress is bound to be somewhat responsive to that demand, and undue haste invariably results. And still we go along in the same old rut, failing to profit by the experience of a century and a quarter.

GROWING SENTIMENT FOR IMPROVED METHODS.

I mistake the temper of the American people if the day is not rapidly approaching when they will insistently demand that more enlightened and scientific methods be adopted in dealing with this great question and a public sentiment, national in scope, will crystallize in favor of a nonpartisan, but permanent, tariff board—a body that will confine itself to the important and necessary preliminary work of gathering and sifting information and performing the technical work so essential in placing before Congress data necessary in dealing with the various schedules, practically all of which are intricate. [Applause.]

LITTLE CHANGE IN METHODS SINCE 1789.

Let us here hastily review our system of tariff making for the last 125 years. The rather meager accounts we have of the debates upon the first tariff act reveal the fact that there existed then the same wide divergence of views and that the demagogue was in evidence even in that day, as illustrated when a duty on candles was proposed of 2 cents per pound, affording opportunity for one of the South Carolina Representatives to wax eloquent over tallow candles, protesting in the name of the people—whose spokesman the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has lately become—against "a tax on light." History does not record whether the people's champion from South Carolina nursed an ambition, like the gentleman from Kentucky, to occupy a seat in another branch of Congress and grasped at the candles to light his way thither. [Laughter.]

The ancestors of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] were agitated over fish, New England being engaged in a profitable trade with the West Indies, furnishing those tropical islands with low-grade fish and receiving in return rum and molasses, principally rum, and with their usual ability and strenuousness the New Englanders opposed any restriction on imports from these islands. From early April until July our forefathers struggled with the items in this first bill. They were handicapped then, from all accounts, as we are to-day by the scarcity of accurate and technical information.

MANY TARIFF CHANGES—LOGROLLING INTRODUCED.

Between the passage of the acts of 1789 and 1816 fully 21 changes were made in the tariff, demonstrating that our early statesmen were still groping in the dark. When it came to the act of 1816 Congress established a speed record not since equaled in tariff making. It was only 39 days from the date of introduction until the act had received Executive approval. In 1824 we find that Congress was again debating the great question and the whole country was agitated. Business was disturbed and party feeling ran high. Clay and Webster were principals in the memorable debate. The system of log-rolling between different sections and States is not a new condition, apparently, for we find that during the framing of this act New England rum and Kentucky whisky formed a partnership. Evidently sectional lines were eliminated when whisky and rum joined hands. The interest manifested was so keen and the vote so close that sick Members were brought into the House on stretchers to vote.

POLITICS ALWAYS PLAYED IMPORTANT PART.

The act of 1828—the "tariff of abominations," as it was opprobriously termed—was an illustration of tariff tinkering for political purposes. A wit of that day suggested an amendment to the title so that it would read "An act to encourage the manufacture of a President of the United States" instead of "An act for the encouragement of certain manufactures." The suggestion of a similar amendment to the pending free-list bill might cause a blush to mount the cheek of the present and popular Speaker of the House.

It is needless to go into the history of the various acts which followed, including the Clay compromise measure of 1833, when politics played an important part and caused the charge of inconsistency to be made against Clay; the Whig tariff of 1842, when the Chief Executive and Congress clashed, President Tyler vetoing two bills before one reached him that met his approval; the Walker revenue tariff of 1844, which remained in force 11 years, longer than any act with the exception of the Dingley law; the Hunter bill; the Morrill tariff of 1861; the Civil War measures of 1862 and 1864, followed by the acts of 1870, 1872, and 1875. Then came the acts of more recent date, including the McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley laws.

In the framing of each of these many acts conditions were strikingly similar. There was frequently undue haste, log-rolling was common, accurate information was difficult to obtain, business conditions were disturbed while the bills were under discussion, and politics played too important a part in determining rates of duty, as will invariably be the case, to a greater or less degree, until some nonpartisan and impartial body presents to Congress unbiased and unsuppressed facts regarding schedules, brought to light after exhaustive inquiry by a force trained in obtaining statistical and technical information. [Applause.]

RECENT TARIFF BILLS.

In framing the Payne bill, I think, it is generally admitted that more information was placed before Congress and the country by the Ways and Means Committee than by any committee in the history of previous tariff legislation. The committee first met on November 10, 1908. The bill became a law on the 5th day of August, 1909, nearly nine full months of consideration being given to the measure by the committee and Congress. The testimony before the committee covered 10,000 pages, and yet the information—the character of information so essential in the framing of any tariff bill—was of necessity incomplete. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] himself stated on this floor that if the committee had been given more time the information would have been more complete. The Payne bill contained 718 paragraphs, and the index shows upward of 4,000 articles listed.

In the hurried framing of the pending free-list bill, upon which no hearings were had, we are informed in the report of the minority that the statement was first made in the Ways and Means Committee by the sponsors of the bill that it would reduce the revenues only about $1,500,000 annually, but they now acknowledge that it will cut down the annual revenues more than $10,000,000. Is this the character of information upon which we should proceed to revise schedules? [Applause on the Republican side.]

EFFORTS IN CONGRESS TO CREATE PERMANENT TARIFF BOARD.

The sentiment for a tariff board has been given great impetus as the result of recent attempted legislation. Responsive to an enlightened public sentiment, the Republican Party, always progressive, endeavored at the last session of Congress to create a permanent nonpartisan tariff board, but as a result of a Democratic filibuster in both branches of Congress the bill finally failed of passage.

The measure passed the House on January 30 of this year by a vote of 186 to 93, only 2 Republicans being recorded in the negative, while 91 Democrats placed themselves on record in opposition to the policy of dealing with our tariff question in a businesslike manner. The bill passed another body but four hours before final adjournment by a vote of 56 to 23, a Democratic filibuster in that body preventing an earlier vote. Only 3 Democrats voted for the bill and but 2 Republicans against. When the bill, with slight amendments, reached the House a special rule was adopted for its immediate consideration with a view to concurrence in the Senate amendments; but Democratic Members, under the able leadership of one of the best parliamentarians in this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], by dilatory motions prevented a vote.

PROVISIONS OF TARIFF BOARD BILL CONSIDERED LAST SESSION.

This bill provided for a permanent tariff board of five members, not more than three to be of the same political party. Section 1 of the bill fixed the term of office at six years, the chairman to be designated by the President and to receive a salary of $7,500, the other members $7,000 each.

Section 2 provided that the principal office was to be in the city of Washington, but the board was empowered to sit in any other section of the United States or in foreign countries.

Section 3 set forth the scope of the work of the board. It was to investigate the cost of production of all articles now or hereafter the subject of tariff legislation, with special reference to wages paid domestic and foreign labor and the the prices of raw material, domestic or imported, entering into manufactured articles. The condition of domestic and foreign markets affecting American products was to be a subject of careful inquiry.

Section 4 empowered the board to investigate and furnish the President information as to the effect of tariff rates, restrictions or regulations imposed by any foreign country, and as to export bounty paid or export duty imposed upon the exportation of any article to the United States, and to assist in the application of the maximum and minimum tariffs.

Section 5 provided for the subpœnaing of witnesses and the procuring of books and papers.

Section 6 provided for the protection of confidential information obtained by the board.

Section 7 provided that the board should report the facts obtained to the President and Congress when called for, and the last section, section 8, provided that the new board should succeed the present Tariff Board.

Notwithstanding the regrettable failure of this bill, there now exists, temporarily at least, a Tariff Board created by authority of section 2 of the Payne Tariff Act, containing the maximum and minimum provisions, the concluding sentence of that section reading as follows:

To secure information to assist the President in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by this section, and the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, the President is hereby authorized to employ such persons as may be required.

This board was appointed in September, 1909, and then consisted of the following named: Henry C. Emery, former professor of political economy at Yale College; James B. Reynolds, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of customs, and Alvin H. Sanders, publisher of the Breeder's Gazette. The sundry civil bill approved June 25, 1910, carried an appropriation of $250,000 for the expenses of this board, enlarging its powers as follows:

To enable the President to secure information to assist him in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him by section 2 of the act entitled—

The Payne Act is here designated—

and the officers of the Government in administering the customs laws, including such investigations of the cost of production of commodities, covering cost of material, fabrication, and every other element of such cost of production, as are authorized by said act, and including the employment of such persons as may be required for those purposes; and to enable him to do any and all things in connection therewith authorized by law, $250,000.

The board has since been increased to five members, two Democrats being added—William M. Howard, of Georgia, an ex-Member of this body, and Thomas N. Page, formerly a professor of political economy in the University of Virginia. The sundry civil act of this year carried an appropriation of $225,000, the language of the item corresponding with that contained in the previous sundry civil bill, which will enable the board to continue in existence at least until June 30, 1912. Before this date, however, it is earnestly hoped that public sentiment, and an appreciation by Congress of the value of the board's work, will result in further provision being made for its continuance. [Applause.]

Neither under the language of the Tariff Board bill of last session nor that contained in the sundry civil bills would or does Congress surrender any of its legislative prerogatives. In framing tariff acts Congress needs facts presented by an authoritative body composed of men who command the respect not alone of Congress but of the country as well.

WORK OF THE PRESENT TARIFF BOARD.

I would suggest to Members of Congress who entertain a doubt as to the necessity of a Tariff Board, or who are unfamiliar with the scope of the investigations under way, that they visit the offices in the Treasury Building, where they will be afforded every facility to familiarize themselves with the methods adopted and learn of the intelligent, painstaking, and successful efforts of this board to obtain facts.

It should be borne in mind that the first appropriation under the language enlarging the powers of the board was passed the latter part of June of last year, so that the board has really only had about 10 months in which to conduct investigations upon any extended scale. The first work, for which an appropriation of $75,000 was made at the time of the passage of the Payne Act, was the study of foreign tariffs in connection with the maximum and minimum clause.

Experts here and in Europe are preparing reports and making analyses of different items in the tariff schedules. Experienced and competent men are employed in this work. Chemicals, earthenware and pottery, iron and steel, wool and woolens, and many other items are included. There has been undertaken a glossary of the tariff act which has been appropriately designated "a translation of the tariff into English." It permits anyone to read a complicated schedule and understand the technical and commercial facts regarding the articles put in simple language.

In conversation with the expert in charge of the work on Schedule A—the chemical schedule—he explained that for this glossary he was taking every chemical enumerated, the process by which it is manufactured, the States and countries from which the supply comes, the chief markets, figures of production, imports and exports in this and leading competing countries, and a calculation of duties collected in ad valorem terms. I doubt if there has ever been undertaken such a complete and accurate report.

Samples of foreign and domestic woolen goods are being collected with relative prices here and abroad. Costs of making the American fabrics abroad will be investigated. Agents of the board are now at domestic mills looking into the question of costs. Inquiries abroad are under way on shrinkage of foreign wools as a basis for the compensating duty, and one into foreign wages and labor efficiency in the textile industries.

In every section of the United States where wool is grown agents have been gathering information as to costs, quality, and other important facts. This investigation has been extended to Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Chile. This is but a mere outline of the work.

TARIFF COMMISSION OF 1882.

A tariff commission was provided by an act of Congress in 1882, and both the advocates and opponents of this method of solving the tariff problem cite our experience in 1882 both in favor of and against the policy of creating a permanent tariff board. I have gone into the history of this commission quite exhaustively.

The Tariff Commission of 1882 was created by an act of Congress approved on May 15 of that year. Under its provisions the President was empowered to appoint nine commissioners from civil life. The act did not provide that the commission should be nonpartisan. It was to investigate all the various questions relative to the agricultural, commercial, mercantile, manufacturing, mining, and industrial interests of the United States, so far as the same "might be necessary to the establishment of a judicious tariff, or a revision of the existing tariff, upon a scale of justice to all interests." The commission was empowered to visit different sections of the country, and to report its investigations not later than the first Monday of December of the same year, which it did, the report, including the testimony, consisting of two large volumes which I now hold in my hand.

The work was necessarily hurried, the commission holding its first meeting in July and reporting in December, a period of five months. No foreign investigation was made, but over 29 different localities were visited, 600 witnesses examined, and 2,625 printed pages of testimony taken.

The commission drew up a provisional scale of duties, which was made the basis of the tariff act of 1883, which remained in force until 1890, a period of over seven years. A comparison of the recommendations of the commission with the act of 1883 shows that Congress adopted a large majority of the rates suggested without change. It made the first scientific classification, which, in the main, has been retained to the present day. Its recommendations as to administrative features were likewise adopted and have become permanent law. It advocated and proposed a bill establishing a customs tribunal for the determination of disputed questions arising under our tariff laws.

This Tariff Commission of 1882, created only as a temporary body, was unquestionably a success, performing excellent service, considering its limited powers for investigation and the short time in which it was compelled to perform its work.

EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Foreign countries, riper in experience, have come to realize the futility of longer adhering to archaic methods in dealing with the tariff question. Germany leads with her "Special Commission for the Elaboration of Measures for Furthering Commerce." This commission consists of 30, the following organizations each having 5 members: The German Agricultural Association, the German Association of Chambers of Commerce, and the Central Association of German Manufacturers. The other 15 members were appointed by the chancellor, 6 representing the agrarian interests, 5 the manufacturers, and 4 the wholesale trade. In its entirety it is a most representative body.

This commission met for the first time in November, 1897. The new tariff bill was not ratified until December 25, 1902.

Five years of investigation! Compare this with our present methods.

The Government of Austria called into consultation a committee of the associated chambers of commerce, who rendered most valuable service in solving the tariff problems of that country. Similar enlightened methods are being adopted elsewhere. Shall we profit by their experience?

CALIFORNIA'S POSITION.

In advocating legislation for a permanent tariff board I am not alone voicing my own strong convictions upon the subject, but am likewise expressing the progressive sentiment of the Republican Party of California as affirmed in the last State platform. After declaring its "unswerving adherence to the Republican doctrine of protection without which the American standard of living can not be maintained," and expressing the opinion that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production and distribution at home and abroad, the California Republican tariff plank, after deprecating the methods heretofore prevailing in framing tariff acts, contained the following indorsement for a permanent tariff board:

We therefore join with the President in demanding the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, wholly removed from the possibility of political pressure or improper business influences. Such commission should ascertain the difference between the cost of production, which is mainly the difference of labor cost, and the distribution here and abroad. As fast as its recommendations are made Congress should revise one schedule at a time. We oppose any future general revision based upon insufficient data to determine the amount of protection actually needed.

No State in the Union has enjoyed a larger share of the prosperity resultant from the Government's policy of protection than the Commonwealth of California. This policy has been of almost incalculable benefit to our hop growers, to our sheep raisers, to our wine producers, to the raisin, Zante currant, olive, prune, lemon, orange, dried-fruit, and fig industries. All we ask, or expect, is the imposition and maintenance of such duties as will permit us to successfully compete with foreign countries where the scale of wages is so low that to admit these competing articles free, or at too low a rate of duty, would spell ruin to these industries. We court a fair, intelligent, and thorough study of conditions by an impartial tariff board, and for one I am willing to abide by the result of such an investigation, and the Representatives of any other State, or the champions of any industry, should be likewise willing to submit to facts obtained through a nonpartisan body composed of high-class men interested only in obtaining facts. It will mean the sustaining of just schedules, while those which can not stand the light of day should not survive. [Applause.]

I voted for reciprocity with Canada, and for this vote have been severely criticized—as have likewise my Republican colleagues from California who supported the measure—by certain ultra protectionists, and reprisals have been threatened against protected industries of California. The last California Republican State platform declared—

the allegiance of the Republicans of California to the policies enunciated by President Roosevelt and reaffirmed and already in part enacted into law under the administration of President Taft.

The platform continued:

We commend President Taft in his efforts and announced intentions further to carry out these policies, and look to our Senators and Representatives in Congress to cooperate with him to that end.

Reciprocity has been one of the policies most strongly urged by Theodore Roosevelt and reaffirmed by President Taft. When I can not stand upon the platform of the Republicans of the State which I in part have the honor to represent, refusing to carry out the expressed wishes of the majority, I shall so announce and immediately resign my seat in this body.

I might remark, however, that, in my opinion, our "standpat" friends and certain insurgents from the border States are unduly alarmed over the possible detrimental effects of this proposed trade agreement. We should deal with this question upon the broad grounds of closer relationship with a people who are naturally drawn toward us by ties of tradition and common aspirations. I certainly regard the policy of Canadian reciprocity as progressive and enlightened. [Applause.]

PRESENT DEBATE ILLUSTRATES NECESSITY OF HAVING AVAILABLE RELIABLE FACTS.

The debate upon Canadian reciprocity and the pending free-list bill illustrates the necessity of having available reliable facts. Every item in these bills has been discussed, and those holding opposing views have presented a different array of figures. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] has had his facts challenged by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], while the statements of many gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber are strikingly at variance.

Statistics are quoted from newspapers, from farmers, from manufacturers, and from every conceivable source. I have heard myself twenty different prices of wheat and barley quoted, and in every instance with an assurance of their correctness. We want facts, and if reliable statistics were available much of the present confusion would not exist.

I shall vote against the free-list bill because it has been presented without careful consideration and investigation. It is a political bill pure and simple, hurriedly drawn, with its possible effects not inquired into.

The haphazard manner in which this bill was drawn reminds me of a game many of us have played in our younger years. A good-sized picture of a donkey is placed against a wall, and each participant in the fun is blindfolded and furnished with a representation of the caudal appendage of that animal, to which a pin is fastened, and then an effort is made to attach it at the right place. You grope in the dark, flounder about, stabbing here and there, the donkey in the meantime being punched full of holes. So it is in this instance. Our Democratic friends, in their haste to get this measure before the House, have gone at it blindly, each Member with an item for the free list in his hand, striving to properly decorate the Democratic donkey, but already the poor animal is badly punctured. [Applause.]

REVIEW OF ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF TARIFF BOARD.

Let us sum up the arguments in favor of the retention of the present Tariff Board as a permanent body. The history of tariff legislation in this country demonstrates conclusively that improved methods are needed. Our experience with the temporary tariff commission of 1882 is a strong argument in favor of this enlightened and scientific method of tariff adjustment. The success of the German and Austrian tariff commissions multiply the reasons already advanced. Evidence of the intelligent, thorough, and unprejudiced efforts to obtain facts which the present Tariff Board is exhibiting is a final reason why this Congress should rise to the occasion, make the board a permanent body, thus announcing to the world that this Government in the future proposes to solve its tariff problems along scientific lines, enabling justice to be done to all industries, interests, and localities. [Loud applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS].

Mr. HINDS. Mr. Chairman, at this time, when the relations of the farmer to the consumer are so much in the public mind, a discussion in the Report of the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States for 1910 is of much value. It was made before the present questions as to removal of duties on foreign farm products had arisen, and therefore is not to be impeached by charges of bias on the particular questions at issue. It was made when the prices of farm products were at their highest point, from which they have already made a long recession, and therefore states at its strongest whatever case there may be against the farmer as related to the consumer. It seems to me to dispose effectually of any claim that substantial relief for the consumer is to be expected by proceeding against the farmer, to explode utterly the immature conclusion that the acres of the United States can not feed the people of the United States, and, finally, to show how brief has been the American farmer's respite of prosperity after long years of production at less than cost. The discussion is on pages 19 to 30 of the report and is as follows:

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS—FARMER'S SHARE OF CONSUMER'S COST—AN EQUALIZING PROCESS.

High prices was one of the subjects of my annual report for 1909. It was shown that for many years previous to about 1897, or a little later, the prices of farm products received by farmers were even less than the cost of production, and often little, if any, above that cost, so that during a long period of years the farmer was not thriving. It was shown also that in the upward price movement, which began about 1897, the prices received by the farmer have advanced in greater degree than those received by nearly all other classes of producers. That this should have been so was merely a matter of justice to the farmer to equalize the reward of his efforts with the rewards received in other lines of production.

INCREASE OF BEEF PRICES.

The price received by the farmer is one thing; the price paid by the consumer is far different. The distribution of farm products from the farm to consumers is elaborately organized, considerably involved and complicated, and burdened with costly features. These are exemplified in my report for 1909 by a statement of the results of a special investigation into the increased cost of fresh beef between the slaughterer and the consumer.

It was establish that in the North Atlantic States the consumer's price of beef was 31.4 per cent higher than the wholesale price received by the great slaughtering houses; 38 per cent higher in the South Atlantic States; and 39.4 per cent higher in the Western States. The average for the United States was 38 per cent.

It was found that the percentage of increase was usually lower in the larger cities than in the smaller ones and higher in the case of beef that is cheap at wholesale than of high-priced beef. It was a safe inference that the poorer people paid nearly twice the gross profit that the more well-to-do people paid.

THE DAIRYMAN GETS ONE-HALF THE MILK PRICE.

Another investigation into the increase of prices in the process of distribution was made in the last week of June, 1910. This time the object was to discover what fraction of the consumer's price was received by the farmer. It was a time of high prices, of high cost of living, and the aim was to ascertain to what extent the farmer received a return out of the high consumer's cost of farm products.

The investigation covered 78 cities scattered throughout the United States, and the information was contributed by a large number of the department's crop correspondents and by some of its special agents, who made inquiries in all of the 78 cities. The cities were divided into geographical groups for the purpose of computing averages, and these were combined into an average for the United States, all after proper weighting according to importance.

Milk was one of the commodities under investigation—a food product indispensable to a large fraction of the families of the Nation, and now a costly one to all consumers.

While it is true that the dairyman is receiving considerably more for his milk than he did before the present era of high prices, yet it was discovered in this investigation that throughout the United States he receives a scant 50 per cent, or one-half of the price paid by the consumer. The other half goes to the railway company for carriage, to the wholesale milk dealer, if there is one in the chain of distribution, and to the retailer who delivers at the consumer's door.

Freight charges for carrying milk vary according to distance, but their average may be regarded as approximately about 7 per cent of the consumer's price. With the farmer receiving about 50 per cent of that price and the railroads 7 per cent, the remaining 43 per cent of the consumer's price is received mostly by the retailer.

The milk wagon of the retailer has a long route. It stops at a house or two in one city block, perhaps passes several blocks without stopping, and so proceeds to serve customers thinly distributed along a route of miles. At the same time the milk wagons of other retailers are covering various portions of the same route, and so there is a great waste of effort and of expense in the distribution.

The division of States in which the cost of distributing milk from producer to consumer is the most is the North Central group, in which producers receive 44 per cent of the prices paid by the consumer. Next in order follow the Western States with 47 per cent, the North Atlantic States with 53 per cent, the South Central States with 55 per cent, and the South Atlantic States with 57 per cent.

The average price paid by consumers in the 78 cities is almost exactly 8 cents per quart. In the North Atlantic and North Central States the average is 7.5 cents; in the Western States, 8.9 cents; in the South Central, 9.1 cents; and in the South Atlantic States, 9.3 cents. These prices are for the last week in June, 1910.

BUTTER AND THE RETAILER.

Factory butter was included in this investigation of prices, in the three classes of creamery print, creamery tub, and renovated. Consumer's prices were taken in 78 cities in all parts of the country, and the facts were ascertained in the latter part of June, 1910.

In the distribution of creamery butter from factory to consumer the ultimate price includes the railway charge for transportation and the retailer's addition. The freight charge is about 0.6 of 1 per cent of the consumer's price.

As a general average for the 78 cities, the creamery receives 86.3 per cent of the consumer's price for creamery prints. The percentages are nearly the same in all geographic divisions, the lowest, 84.6 per cent, being found in the Western States, and the highest, 87.5 per cent, in the South Atlantic States.

In the case of creamery tub butter, the factories receive 86.5 per cent of the consumer's price in the 78 cities, the Western States again having the lowest percentage, 84.6 per cent. The highest percentage is 88 for the South Central States, and in the other divisions the percentage is between 86 and 87.

Factories that renovate butter receive a somewhat larger percentage of the consumer's price than in the case of creamery prints and tub butter. The average for the 78 cities is 88.3 per cent, with inconsiderable variations among the geographic divisions of the country.

EXHAUSTIVE INVESTIGATIONS.

The increase of price of farm products in their transfer from producer to consumer was thoroughly investigated in all parts of the country and for a large variety of products by the Industrial Commission. Although the facts obtained in that investigation are now about 10 years old, it is believed that the ratios between producer's and consumer's prices are approximately the same now as they were then. At any rate, it seems probable that the farmer is not now receiving a larger share of the consumer's price than he received 10 years ago, and he may be receiving a smaller share.

POULTRY.

Within the field of investigation it was found that poultry almost doubled in price between the farmer and the consumer; in other words, the farmer received only 55.1 per cent of the consumer's price. Inquiries were made concerning turkeys as distinct from other poultry, with the result that it was found that the farmers received 63.5 per cent of the final price. Chickens as a separate description are represented by the percentage of 68.4 when priced by the pound, and by 57.1 per cent when priced by the head.

Of the price per dozen paid by the consumer, the producer received 69 per cent in the case of eggs; dried beans, 75 per cent when bought by the bushel; cabbage, 48.1 per cent when bought by the head and 64.9 per cent when bought by the pound; cauliflower, 75 per cent when bought by the dozen; and celery, 60 per cent when bought by the bunch.

THE SMALLER THE RETAIL UNIT, THE LESS THE FARMER RECEIVES.

The general fact was that the producer's percentage of the consumer's price diminished as the quantity sold at retail was smaller. For instance, the apple grower received 55.6 per cent of the consumer's price when the consumer bought by the bushel and 66 per cent when the purchase was by the barrel. When the consumer bought corn by the bushel the farmer got 70.6 per cent of the price, but when the purchase was by the barrel the farmer received 81 per cent. The strawberry grower received 48.9 per cent of the consumer's price in purchases by the quart and 75.9 per cent in purchases by the crate. A still better illustration is found in the case of onions. In purchasing a peck at a time, the farmer received 27.8 per cent of the retail price; in purchases of a barrel, he received 58.3 per cent; and in purchases by the 100 pounds, he received 69 per cent. So in the case of oranges; when the purchase was by the dozen the grower received 20.3 per cent of the consumer's price, whereas when the purchase was by the box the grower received 59.3 per cent.

FACTS FOR MANY PRODUCTS.

Farmers received 83.3 per cent of the final price in the retail purchase of blackberries by the crate, 75 per cent in the purchase of cucumbers by the third of a bushel, 66.7 per cent in the purchase of eggplant by the crate, 60 per cent in the purchase of green peas by the quart, 70.5 per cent when hay was bought by the ton, and 82.2 per cent in the purchase of horses from retailers.

Among the many other products represented in this list are oats, with 73.6 per cent of the price going to the farmer when bought by the bushel; melons, 50 per cent when bought by the pound; parsnips, 60 per cent when bought by the bunch; potatoes, 59.3 per cent when bought by the bushel; string beans, 80 per cent when bought by the barrel; sweet potatoes, 60.8 per cent when bought by the barrel; turnips, 60 per cent in purchases by the bunch; watermelons, 33.5 per cent when bought singly.

In some cases there were purchasers from the farmer who were middlemen. It was found that cotton growers received 93 per cent of the price paid by cotton manufacturers for the raw cotton; 84.1 per cent of the price of broom corn paid by the broom manufacturers; 80 per cent of the price of calves and 91 per cent of the price of cattle paid by packers; 93 per cent of the price of hogs and 74.2 per cent of the price of lambs paid by packers; 87 per cent of the price of tobacco paid by the hogshead and 92.2 per cent when bought by the pound by manufacturers; 72.9 per cent in the case of wheat bought by millers; and 91.7 per cent in the case of wool bought by manufacturers.

FREIGHT CHARGES.

To the foregoing percentages that represent the share of the farmer in the consumer's price should be added the percentage standing for the freight charge in determining the share of the consumer's price that goes to the middlemen. With approximate accuracy it has been determined that when the farmer received 50 per cent of the consumer's price, the freight charge on butter is about 0.5 of 1 per cent of the consumer's price; eggs, 0.6 of 1 per cent; apples, 6.8 per cent; beans, 2.4 per cent; potatoes, 7.4 per cent; grain of all sorts, 3.8 per cent; hay, 7.9 per cent; cattle and hogs, 1.2 per cent; live poultry, 2.2 per cent; wool, 0.3 of 1 per cent. The foregoing allowances for freight are to be increased by one-half when the farmer receives about three-fourths of the consumer's price.

COFFEE PRICES.

The import statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor afford some striking comparisons between the original value and consumer's price. In the fiscal year 1910 four-fifths of the coffee imported into the United States came from Brazil, 17 per cent from other countries in South and Central America and from Mexico, so that 97.2 per cent of the imports were from Mexico and Central and South America. About 0.1 of 1 per cent of the coffee imports are from Aden and are the nominal Mocha coffee, and 1.3 per cent of the imports are from the East Indies and are the Java coffee.

In 1910 the coffee imported from American countries, which was 97.2 per cent of all coffee imports, had an import value of 7.8 cents per pound. To this should be added the ocean freight rate. From Rio Janeiro the rate is 0.28 of 1 cent, or about one-fourth of a cent per pound. For nearly all of this American coffee the consumers paid prices ranging from 20 to 35 cents per pound. In other words, the import value, plus the ocean freight charge, is only from 23 to 40 per cent of the principal range of prices paid for the coffee at retail.

PRICES PAID FOR TEA.

Tea may be referred to in the same way. In the fiscal year 1910 the average import value of tea was 16 cents per pound. It is assumed that nearly all of the tea consumed in this country is bought at retail prices ranging from 50 to 70 cents per pound, and, with this understanding, the import value of tea is from 23 per cent to 32 per cent of what the consumer pays.

CONSUMER'S PRICE AS AN INCREASE OF FARMER'S PRICE—PRICE GAINS FROM ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW.

In the consideration of this subject so far the aspect has been that of the producer; the farmer thinks of the price that the consumer pays for farm products and compares with them the price that he himself receives.

While the farmer is looking forward with regard to the prices of his products, the consumer is looking backard, and so regards the prices that he pays as increases upon what the farmer gets. This aspect of the matter may now be worth some attention.

It is established by the investigation of this department made last June that the milk consumers of 78 cities paid for milk an increase of 100.8 per cent above the price received by dairymen; in other words, the farmer's price was fully doubled. The lowest increase among the geographic divisions was 75.5 per cent in the South Atlantic States and the highest was 111.9 per cent in the Western States.

In the purchase of butter the consumer pays 15.8 per cent above the factory price in the case of creamery prints, 15.6 per cent above in the case of factory tub, and 13.3 per cent above the factory price in the case of renovated butter. The percentages of increase among the five divisions of States do not vary much from the averages for the United States.

Some large percentages of increase of prices were found by the Industrial Commission—135.3 per cent for cabbage bought by the head; 100 per cent for melons bought by the pound, for buttermilk sold by the quart, and for oranges sold by the crate; 260 per cent for onions bought by the peck; 400.4 per cent for oranges bought by the dozen; 111.1 per cent for strawberries bought by the quart; and 200 per cent for watermelons sold singly.

There were many cases of increase of consumer's price over farmer's price amounting to 75 per cent and over, but under 100 per cent, and among these were 90.5 per cent for apples bought by the barrel and 80.6 per cent for apples bought by the box; 75 per cent for chickens bought by the head; 83.4 per cent for onions bought by the pound; 80.5 per cent for potatoes bought by the bushel; 88.8 per cent for poultry, in general, bought by the pound; 95.8 per cent for strawberries bought by the box; 82.5 per cent for sweet potatoes bought by the bushel.

It may be worth while to extend the list of farm products that are sold to consumers at a large increase above farm prices. In the class of commodities selling for an increase of price amounting to 50 per cent and over but under 75 per cent above farm prices may be mentioned the following increases: 61.8 per cent for cabbage bought by the pound; 66.7 per cent for celery bought by the bunch,

turnips and parsnips bought by the bunch, and green peas bought by the quart; 54.4 per cent for chickens bought by the pound; 50 per cent for eggplants bought by the crate; 68.4 per cent for onions bought by the bushel; 68.7 per cent for oranges bought by the box; 60 per cent for potatoes bought by the peck; 59.8 per cent for turkeys bought by the pound.

The import price of coffee in the fiscal year 1910, which was 8 cents a pound, after the increase to 20 and 35 cents per pound to the retailer, has risen in price to the consumer from 150 to 337.5 per cent. So with tea of the same fiscal year; its import price of 16 cents per pound, after being increased to 50 to 70 cents per pound, cost the consumer an advance of 212.55 to 337.5 per cent.

Before assigning to middlemen the various increases of prices, it is proper to deduct the percentages due to freight rates. The freight charge for milk received in New York is about 18 per cent of the producer's price and in Chicago about 14.7 per cent. Of the import price of coffee, the ocean freight charge from Rio Janeiro is 3.6 per cent. The percentages of farm price for which freight charges stand in the United States may be estimated at approximately 0.9 of 1 per cent of the factory price for butter; 1.2 per cent of the farm price for clover seed; 1.6 per cent for cotton; 1.3 per cent for eggs; 13.6 per cent for apples; 4.8 per cent for beans; 14.8 per cent for potatoes; and 5 per cent for sweet potatoes. The rates for oats, rye, barley, and wheat are nearly the same, ranging from 6 per cent for oats to 7.3 per cent for barley and rye. The rate for corn is 9.2 per cent and the average for all grain is 7.7 per cent. For hay the percentage is 15.8 per cent; for cattle and hogs, 2.5 per cent; for live poultry, 4.5 per cent; and for wool, 0.6 of 1 per cent.

NO GROUND FOR COMPLAINT AGAINST THE FARMER.

From the details that have been presented with regard to the increase of the prices of farm products between farmer and consumer, the conclusion is inevitable that the consumer has no well-grounded complaint against the farmer for the prices that he pays. The farmer supplies the capital for production and takes the risk of his losses; his crops are at the mercy of drought and flood and heat and frost, to say nothing of noxious insects and blighting diseases. He supplies hard, exacting, unremitting labor. A degree and range of information and intelligence are demanded by agriculture which are hardly equaled in any other occupation. Then there is the risk of overproduction and disastrously low prices. From beginning to end the farmer must steer dextrously to escape perils to his profits and, indeed, to his capital on every hand. At last the products are started on their way to the consumer. The railroad, generally speaking, adds a percentage of increase to the farmer's prices that is not large. After delivery by the railroad the products are stored a short time, are measured into the various retail quantities—more or less small—and the dealers are rid of them as soon as possible. The dealers have risks that are practically small, except credit sales and such risks as grow out of their trying to do an amount of business which is small as compared with their number.

PROBLEM FOR CONSUMERS AND NOT FARMERS TO REMEDY.

After consideration of the elements of the matter, it is plain that the farmer is not getting an exorbitant price for his products, and that the cost of distribution from the time of delivery at destination by the railroad to delivery to the consumer is the feature of the problem of high prices which must present itself to the consumer for treatment.

Why do not consumers buy directly from the farmers? A distribution of farm products in this simple way has already begun in England, where cooperative organizations of farmers are selling by direct consignment to cooperative organizations of consumers in cities.

Farmers' cooperative selling associations are numerous in this country, but cooperative buying associations among the people of cities and towns are few. Aside from buying associations maintained by farmers, hardly any exist in this country. It is apparent, therefore, that the consumer has much to do to work out his own salvation with regard to the prices that he pays. Potatoes were selling last spring in some places where there had been overproduction for 20 cents and in some places for even 9 cents per bushel at the farm, while at the same time city consumers in the East were paying 50 to 75 cents per bushel, although there was nothing to prevent them from combining to buy a carload or more of potatoes directly from the grower and for delivery directly to themselves.

POPULATION, CROP YIELDS, AND PRICES—PRODUCTION PER ACRE OVERTAKING INCREASE OF PEOPLE—IMMIGRATION AND BIRTH RATE.

The population of the United States has increased rapidly in the past. Our doors have always stood open to immigrants from other lands. Our ancestors had large families. Our numbers have increased one-third every 10 years until 1880, and afterwards one-fourth to one-fifth. Our expanding farm area has easily provided sustenance for our increasing numbers. But with the filling up of our unoccupied spaces some have begun to fear that in the near future we shall be unable to provide all our food from our own fields. Population increases; yields decrease (so it is said), and the time is at hand when we shall have to import foodstuffs; our economic independence will then be gone.

Immigration, however, is not to be counted upon permanently to furnish any considerable annual increase in our numbers. Three-fourths of a million may enter our ports in one year; but the very next year may see a financial depression, with the tide of emigration setting away from our shores. Only the birth rate may be counted upon as a permanent force acting toward increasing the population; and the increase of the native-born population by excess of births over deaths in this country is only about 1¼ per cent a year, with a tendency toward a decreasing birth rate.

The great question, then, is this: Are the products of our agricultural lands increasing or decreasing in quantity? Is the yield per acre of our fields keeping pace with this normal increase of population by births? To the latter question the answer is that the process has begun.

RISING YIELDS PER ACRE.

Dividing the period from 1866 to 1909 into four decades and a succeeding short period of four years, the yield per acre of corn is shown by a study made in the Bureau of Statistics to have declined 2.3 per cent from the first decade to the second, declined 8.2 per cent from the second to the third, increased 7.7 per cent from the third to the fourth, and increased 7.1 per cent from the fourth decade to the succeeding four-year period.

For wheat an even better showing is made, since the figures show a continuous increase in yield per acre, namely, 3.4 per cent from first decade to second, 3.3 from second to third, 6.3 from third to fourth, and 9.6 from fourth decade to final four-year period.

For cotton, the first figure, 2.8, is a decline, but the rest are increases, namely, 2.6, 3.8, and 0.3.

For tobacco, the first figure, 3.4, is an increase; the second, 2.0, is a decline; the third, 5.2, is an increase; and so also is the last, 9.7.

Similar facts are shown for 6 other leading crops, namely, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, hay, and potatoes. Not one of the 10 crops named declined in yield per acre from the third decade to the fourth, while oats was the only one to show a decline from the fourth decade to the last period of four years. The evidence is very plain that the yields per acre of our crops are now increasing, and if the facts were assembled in detail for the States it would be found that the percentage of increase in yield in many of them is greater than the percentage of normal increase in population; that is, the increase by births over deaths in the old native element.

Such is the fact with regard to wheat for the fourth decade, as compared with the preceding one, in 26 States, and 2 of the States are all but ready to joint them. In 14 States corn production per acre has increased faster than the normal increase of population, and this is almost true of 5 more States. The number of States in this list in the case of barley is 21; rye, 30; buckwheat, 19; cotton, 3; potatoes, 24; hay, 35; and more or less States are almost ready to enter this list in the case of all crops.

A demand that is more difficult to fulfill in production per acre is for an increase that equals or exceeds the actual increase of population, including the immigrants and the temporarily high birth rate of the foreign born. But, notwithstanding the fact that this difficulty is greater in the United States than it is in all other countries that have practically ceased to take much new land into cultivation, many of the States of this Nation are each maintaining an increase of production in the case of one or more prominent crops that is greater than the actual increase of population. Ten States are doing this in the case of corn; for wheat the number is 22; for oats, 16; for cotton and tobacco, 1 each; for rye, 21; for potatoes, 15; and for hay, 25.

We can not look for any other result than that the yields per acre of all our crops shall increase at an even faster rate in the future, in view of the intense interest with which our people are turning their attention toward agricultural improvement. If there are certain forces at work which, if unchecked and made more prevalent, will in the future compel us to bid against the world for food, the counteracting forces have nevertheless been already set in motion, with the promise of increasing effect.

INCOME PER ACRE.

The farmer has benefited more than others from the changed conditions which have manifested themselves in increased cost of living. For instance, the product of 1 acre of corn in 1899 was worth on the farm $8.51, but 10 years later it was worth $15.20, an increase in farm value amounting to 78.6 per cent. Similarly, wheat increased in farm value 114 per cent, tobacco 56.2 per cent, and cotton 65.6 per cent. Ten leading crops taken together—including, besides those mentioned, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, and hay—increased 72.7 per cent in farm value.

This, of course, is no advantage to the farmer if the increase in price of the things he has to buy is still greater. To ascertain the facts in this matter, the Bureau of Statistics sent a letter to a large number of retail dealers doing business with farmers. These dealers were asked to quote the prices which prevailed in 1899 and in 1909, taking care to compare articles of the same grades. In this way the percentage of increase in the prices of about 85 articles commonly used by farmers was determined.

In three cases the prices were less in 1909 than in 1899; in four cases they were the same; but in all other cases they had increased, the increases running from 2.7 per cent in the case of manure spreaders and mowers to 53.8 per cent in the case of brooms. Coffee increased 9.8 per cent; flour, 32.4; salt, 14.9; sugar, 8.7; overalls, 22.9; rubber boots, 29; calico, 26.9; muslin, 25; and so on. For all the articles considered the average increase was 12.1 per cent.

Now, compare this with the 72.7 per cent increase in the farm value of the 10 leading crops. The farmer has evidently benefited more than the rest of the community—taken all together—from the changes in values.

Put the facts in another way. The produce of 1 acre of corn was equal in value to 1.8 barrels of flour in 1899, but to 2.4 barrels in 1909; or it would buy 118.2 yards of muslin in 1899 and 168.9 yards in 1909. The average purchasing power of all crops similarly increased from 2 barrels of flour in 1899 to 2.6 barrels in 1909, and from 132.1 yards of muslin in 1899 to 182.4 yards in 1909. And so with the whole list of articles used by farmers.

The facts may also be put in the form of percentages by letting 100 represent the purchasing power of 1 acre of farm crops in 1899. Then, in 1909 the purchasing power of 1 acre of corn is seen to have increased 90 per cent when spent for coal oil, 62 for coffee, 33 for flour, and 64 for sugar. Now, take the average purchasing power of all crops. It increased 83 per cent when spent for coal oil, 57 for coffee, 30 for flour, 59 for sugar, and so on down the list. Taking the average of all articles, corn increased 60 per cent in purchasing power, wheat 91, and cotton 48, while the grand average increase in purchasing power of all crops is 54 per cent. In other words, the farmer has received a 54 per cent benefit from the changed conditions.

No one can pretend to understand all the forces at work in these matters. Possibly the farmer's present advantage is due, in part, to temporary conditions of supply and demand that may change to his disadvantage. If it is also due, in part, to a greater appreciation of the value of the farmer's work, that, too, is something upon which no calculations can be based.

But there is no sort of doubt that a great part of the farmer's prosperity rests upon the bedrock of a greater output, a higher yield per acre. That is to say, farmers and farming have become more efficient, not only to the benefit of the farmer himself but also to the safeguarding of our national independence. The wisdom of Congress in aiding agriculture in the past, through the Federal Department and the State colleges and experiment stations, as well as the advisability of giving even greater fostering attention in the future to our most fundamental industry, is thus made plainly manifest.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Alabama, my friend Judge CLAYTON, who first addressed the House this morning, I am extremely gratified that there is so large and intelligent an audience here at this time. [Laughter and applause.]

I think that fact is perhaps occasioned by reason of some one having given out the information that I was to endeavor at this time to make a speech upon this bill, and it being about the usual lunch hour the pangs of hunger may have overcome in the minds of many of the Members the thirst for intellectual entertainment. [Applause.] I regret exceedingly, under the circumstances, that I have not any carefully prepared remarks for this occasion, and I do not know that it will be possible for me to add anything of interest to the discussion that has been going on in this House for the past two weeks upon this bill, and I do not know whether we are any of us being enlightened so very much ourselves, or whether we are enlightening the country at all upon the tariff question. It is not an entirely new question, and yet it seems that an academic discussion of the principle of protection as opposed to the principle of free trade is now on the boards as of old, and must, from the necessities of the times and the political conditions prevailing, again demand our attention and the attention of the country. The President of the United States, under the authority given him by the Constitution and with the highest and purest motives of duty and patriotism, called this Congress together for a single purpose; and that purpose was to pass upon the trade agreement that under his direction had been tentatively made with the Dominion of Canada. It seems to me that it would have been wise if this Congress, under the circumstances, had foregone the opportunity to play politics and had disposed of that one question and adjourned and gone home. I know that course would have been for the benefit of all the people of the country, and I think would have commanded their unanimous approval. This running amuck with the business interests of the country is what might have been expected from past experience and past history when the Democratic Party has been in control of this House, and, so far as I have observed in the past, that course has never led to anything of advantage to the people of this country. So far as the reciprocity agreement, or the bill carrying that agreement into effect, was concerned, I can easily see how the Democrats might differ among themselves as to the policy of that bill, and I can also see how some Republicans might favor it and how some might not. For myself, I believe, and have long believed, in the principle of reciprocity and in reciprocal trade agreements with other nations.

I believe that when we open up our markets to the other countries of the world, we ought by some sort of reciprocal arrangement, to get some benefit ourselves for so doing [applause], some equivalent for what we give; and I am eternally opposed to the Democratic doctrine of free trade, because I believe most emphatically in American markets for Americans. [Applause.] I believe in protection to all American industries and to American labor, and that our own people should have the preference in our own markets at all times, and that if we yield anything as to that policy, we ought to get an equivalent for it. I believe that the agreement which this House, so far as it is concerned, has ratified with the Dominion of Canada will, if consummated, be to the material benefit of both countries. I do not believe that it will injure the farmers of this country or any class of our people. If I did so believe, I would not be in favor of it. I have some interests myself connected with the farming industry, and I represent here a great agricultural district, one of the greatest in the United States; and I fully and firmly believe that the interests of the agricultural population of my district will be materially benefited by the consummation of this Canadian reciprocity agreement. At the same time, I realize that I also represent other industries than that of agriculture alone, for that district is also one of the greatest manufacturing districts of the country, and has within its boundaries substantially every manufacturing industry that exists in the land, and substantially every item in the Canadian reciprocity bill, and every item in this free list or free-trade bill, is produced to a greater or less extent in my district. We there manufacture each year, millions of dollars worth of agricultural machinery and implements, sewing machines, and fence wire, besides pretty nearly everything else that can be manufactured or produced in this country. I regret that my distinguished and eloquent friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] should have seen fit to characterize the reciprocity agreement as an indication of the desire of the people of this country to be annexed to Canada, or for Canada to be annexed to the United States, whichever way you choose to put it, because there is just as much danger in the one case as in the other. [Laughter and applause.]

Also my genial friend and colleague from Chicago, Mr. MADDEN, had something to say about Canadian annexation and the flag of this Union floating all the way from the Great Lakes to the North Pole, discovered by Dr. Cook. [Laughter and applause.] Now, I want to assure both of my colleagues that I do not think there is any danger of Canadian annexation or any intention whatever or any desire on the part of the people of this country for annexation at any time in the future, and I do not think it will come until long years after our enthusiastic friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] has fought to a finish his fight with Japan and wiped the Mikado and all his subjects from off the face of the earth, or off from the waters of the sea, whichever it may be. [Laughter and applause.] The time may come, and I am not sure but what it will come, when the dominions to the north of us will constitute an independent republic and when a new flag of freedom will float over all that great land from our northern border to the frozen seas of the north. That time, I say, may come, but annexation never, and all this talk of annexation is nothing more nor less than sensational bosh. The people of Canada are our friends; we have no designs upon their Government or their territory but to wish them well. Our relations can never be anything but friendly, and commercial reciprocity between Canada and the United States is in accordance with natural law and can only result for the good of the people there and here. Who would claim for a moment that unrestricted trade between our great grain-producing States in the Northwest and the other States of the Union is to the detriment of the other States. If it were possible that Minnesota and the Dakotas and Montana might be separated from the United States, and if we had a tariff barrier against their products, their grain, and their cattle, would either we or they be better off? Manifestly not. This reciprocity agreement only applies to a limited extent the same rules as to exchange of products with Canada that we now have between the several States. I would, if I could, wipe out all the trade barriers between Canada and the United States and have unrestricted trade in all the products of the soil and in all manufactures and all commodities of every name and kind the same as we have here between the several States. To my understanding, reciprocity is the natural sequence to the Republican policy of protection, and the two should go hand in hand together. Reciprocity was advocated by Blaine and McKinley and the other great Republican leaders of the past. If the Democratic Party have now taken it up, they have simply followed the wisdom of past Republican leaders and adopted past Republican platforms.

The Democratic majority in this House seem to now have taken up this doctrine of reciprocity and are supporting it with great enthusiasm. As I have read the Democratic platforms in the past I have understood that that party claimed always that all protection was robbery, and that reciprocity was only another name for protection. That that has been the doctrine of the Democratic Party, and is to-day the real belief of many of its leaders is confirmed by the speeches we have heard from that side of the House from day to day in support of the bill now pending. Let us stop and consider for a moment how wholly inconsistent the Canadian reciprocity measure is with the free-trade bill now under consideration. For, call it a farmers' free-list bill or whatever you will, this bill now under consideration is nothing more nor less than an absolute free-trade measure. There is no protection in it for any industry, and there is no reciprocity in it. In effect, the Democratic Party in this House are now saying to Canada, we have passed the reciprocity bill, but you need not ratify it there because we propose to give you more than you ask by subsequent bills and to ask nothing from you in return. That is to say, we will put on the free list, not only as to Canada, but as to all the countries of the earth, the very articles upon which we have just ratified a reciprocal arrangement for mutual duties. What consistency can there be in ratifying an agreement with Canada which fixes a certain rate of duty upon meats, agricultural implements and other commodities, reciprocal as to each country, and then before that agreement becomes effective, follow up immediately with a free-trade bill proposing to put those same things on the free list without any concessions whatever from the other contracting party. Is not this the height of Democratic inconsistency? Are you simply using this reciprocity measure, proposed by a Republican President, for the sole and only purpose of making political capital and for the purpose of having that agreement not ratified by Canada, because, if your policy prevails, they can then have our markets free without any concession whatever? Now, I thought awhile ago, and I do not know but I said once upon the floor of this House, that I believed it would be a good idea when the tariff was revised, that it might be revised schedule by schedule and one thing at a time. I have changed my mind about that. This bill shows how such a policy would work, and it is very much like cutting off the dog's head by commencing at his tail

and cutting off an inch at a time. This bill shows an intention on the part of the Democratic majority in this House to ruin certain industries one at a time, and to put certain articles a few at a time upon the free list without any protection whatever, and then to follow it up with some other articles one at a time, until the doctrine of free trade is universally established as the policy of the country and the policy of protection is gone forever.

My learned friend, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Judge CLAYTON, this morning said very truly that the line of demarcation between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party was never more clearly drawn than it is to-day; that the Republican Party was the party of protection and the Democratic Party for free trade or tariff for revenue only. That is absolutely true. No man with a drop of Republican blood in his veins can justify himself in voting for this free-trade measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This bill, it will be observed, is a free-trade bill, pure and simple—at least simple. It is not even a "tariff-for-revenue-only" bill. It never could produce any revenue whatever for the Government, because it does not propose to reduce the rates of duty, but to admit all the articles mentioned absolutely free of duty. Under the Dingley law the duty on sewing machines was 45 per cent; the Payne law reduced this duty to 30 per cent. This bill puts sewing machines on the free list, not to permit competition with foreign-made machines, but to give an actual advantage to the foreign manufacturer, and thus seriously handicap, if not entirely ruin, a great home industry. Substantially, the same is true as to the shoe and leather industry. Why, in the name of reason, if our Democratic friends consider the duties too high, do they not propose to reduce them to what they consider a revenue basis, rather than deprive the Government of all revenue and the home industry of all protection?

That is the proposition before us to-day. That is the proposition upon which both political parties are to go before the country. It is the policy of protection to American industry and American labor on the one hand, that has made this country the most prosperous upon the face of the earth, or, on the other hand, it is the policy that has always brought stagnation in business and ruin and desolation to our people, the policy of Democratic free trade. It is proved now, so that there can be no misunderstanding about it, that the Democratic Party of to-day, as it always has been in the past, is a party of free trade; that if it was in power in all of the departments of Government, and could do so, it would level every customhouse in the land, and allow all foreign products to enter and compete in our home markets in competition with our own people and without requiring any tariff tax or payment of any kind for that great privilege.

Oh, my Democratic friends, when the people of this country understand your purpose, when they understand that that is the doctrine you are advocating piece by piece, they will again relegate you to the rear, and they will again reinstate in all the departments of this Government that party that has made this country the most progressive and the most prosperous upon the face of the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Let me cite you to one little thing—a little joker, so to speak—they put in this so-called farmers' free-list bill. I wonder why they call it a farmers' free-list bill. Have you done some injury to the farmer for which you propose to recompense him? You seem at least to not have done or proposed anything that by any possibility could injure any farmers south of Mason and Dixon's line. I observe that you do not put rice and peanuts and oranges and pineapples and other products of the South upon the free list, but instead, in order to fool the people, you pick out here and there some industry in the Northern States, not in the South, that you think it safe to attack, and say "If we can pass that and wipe that industry out of existence every section of the country interested in that industry will join us and demand the same treatment for such other industries as we may wish to attack." Among the items selected and put upon the free list in this bill is sewing machines. I wonder why you put sewing machines upon the free list in this bill and why this one industry was selected for your attack. I presume it is probably true that there is not a sewing-machine factory in the entire South and consequently you will find no opposition in that section of the country to free trade in sewing machines, but why did you not propose to put all other kindred machines, such as typewriters, knitting machines, and everything else of that same nature upon the free list also by this bill? True, there are not many sewing-machine factories in this country, very few of them. Perhaps you thought you would not antagonize very many localities by singling out sewing machines for your attack.

Now, it so happens, Mr. Chairman, that I come from a little town in the State of Illinois that is known far and near as the sewing-machine town. The little city of Belvidere, with a population of between seven and eight thousand people, has one of the largest independent sewing-machine factories in this country. The National Sewing Machine Co. in that town employs on an average probably a thousand men, and is the support of at least one-half the entire population of that little city; and under this bill you propose to put sewing machines on the free list without any reason whatever being given for so doing, so far as I can understand.

I do not understand that there is any such thing as a sewing-machine trust in this country. I know that the company in my town is not connected with any trust or any other company anywhere in the world. It is an independent factory, doing a large and fairly profitable business, although the profit on each sewing machine made, under the competition that exists, is so small as to be a mere trifle. There is one large sewing machine concern known as the Singer Co., and sometimes called the sewing-machine trust, although I do not understand that it is a trust or that it has connection with subsidiary concerns; but that great company probably manufactures more than 60 per cent of all the sewing machines made in the world. It has factories in several places in the United States. It has factories in Canada and in Scotland, and, I think, in other countries of Europe. It would not be affected at all by placing sewing machines upon the free list, because it could manufacture the same machines in its factories abroad with cheap foreign labor and send those machines into this country free of duty and at prices that would crush out absolutely every independent sewing-machine concern in the land. There is but one other country, under present conditions, that could compete with us in the manufacture of sewing machines, and that is Germany. I understand that sewing machines are manufactured there on a large scale and that labor is very much cheaper than it is here, and without any tariff protection they could send their machines into the United States duty free and crush out of existence every sewing-machine company in the land except the Singer Co., which would be their only competitor, and all that, too, without making sewing machines any cheaper to the purchaser than they are to-day; and that is what would happen should this bill become a law in its present form—if our Democratic friends succeed in getting it passed and upon the statute books, which I do not believe they even hope to do. There is very little profit in sewing machines now made by these independent concerns in competition with the Singer Co. The independent concerns sell their machines to dealers, and they are again sold at very low prices. If you will take up a catalogue of one of the great department stores or mail-order houses, you will find there the prices at which such sewing machines as are made in my district are sold. Two of the largest mail-order houses, perhaps, are in Chicago, namely, Montgomery Ward & Co. and Sears, Roebuck & Co. If you will examine their catalogues, you will find that you can buy a first-class sewing machine at retail at from $8 to $21, and the machine, Mr. Chairman, that is sold by these houses at retail to-day for $8 is as good a machine in every respect as my mother paid $100 for when I was a boy. If you want a fancy piece of furniture in addition to the sewing machine, you can pay as high as $21 to one of these concerns for such a machine.

The Singer Co. does business on entirely a different plan. They sell their machines through agents all over the country and on time, with payments of from 50 cents a week to a dollar a month, or something of that kind. They have great capital and can afford to do business in that way, and thereby they get higher prices for their machines. It would not affect that company a particle to put sewing machines on the free list, but it would crush out absolutely the one great industry of my town and county and throw out of employment in that little town a thousand men, while half the people of the town would be deprived of a livelihood and forced to seek other employment. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is only one example of what our Democratic friends are proposing to do by the passage of this bill. It is only one industry that is picked out for attack, but if we are to believe what they tell us it is to be followed up by attacking other industries, one at a time, all along the line, until no vestige of protection shall be left and until foreign countries may send their manufactured products into the United States without let or hindrance in competition with our own industries, and thereby force out of employment our own people, who are now the best-paid laboring people in the world. Is that what we want? They tell us in the report on this so-called farmers' free list bill that its passage would reduce the revenues of the Government something over $10,000,000 a year, and, Mr. Chairman, the revenue we should lose is nothing compared

to the greater injury that would necessarily follow. Ten million dollars' reduction in the revenues of the country is, of course, no small item, but we could stand that if it were not for the fact that under the free-trade provisions of this bill hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of manufactured products from abroad each year, made by the cheap labor of other countries, would come into the United States in competition with our own industries, and that just so much less would be manufactured in our own factories and by our own people, so that necessarily thousands and hundreds of thousands of laborers who are dependent upon the success of American industries and American factories would be forced to seek other employment or to accept a very great reduction in wages, and possibly both. That is what the Democratic Party in this House, under its present leadership, is proposing to do to the American people. It is only a beginning, but already we can see what the effects are sure to be.

My time is almost up, and before I get through I desire to say a few words in regard to some remarks made by my good friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] the other day. He is honest and sincere and means what he says. He seems to think that one evil of the protective system is that it provides means whereby the Government may pay pensions to its old soldiers, and that does not seem to please him. Let me quote from what he said in his speech the other day:

> But as I said when I started out, we are not limited to a tariff tax; we can resort to other taxes, as we have resorted to other taxes. Internal revenue brings, I believe, something over $300,000,000. The corporation tax brought over $25,000,000 last year. Now, my friends, there is going to be a demand, I suppose, for the passage of a general pension bill, to increase the pensions of the soldiers, which will run into many millions of dollars. I have no criticism to make of the motives behind it. There were not enough gentlemen to get an aye-and-no vote in opposition to the bill that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] presented in the last Congress. If we are going to increase any kind of an expenditure by millions of dollars, we have got to raise revenue by millions of dollars to meet it. Now, there is going to come business stagnation.

Is that what you are working for? Is that what is proposed in the passage of this bill. Let me go on. I quote again from Mr. SIMS's speech:

> Now, there is going to come business stagnation. It will be impossible to avoid it. * * * You may just as well get ready for it.

Yes; that is what the Democratic majority of this House promises us, is it? Business stagnation. Yes; I am afraid it is going to come. I know, and every man in this House knows, that it is already on its way, as you can find by looking up the reports of business concerns all over the country to-day. The very threat that you make to take off tariff duties, to reduce the revenues, to wipe out of existence boot and shoe factories and sewing-machine factories and other industries, the very threat that you make to inaugurate your doctrine of free trade is already bringing business stagnation throughout this country. Oh, yes; if you have your way and the old soldiers are paid the pensions which they ought to be paid, we shall have to issue bonds, or shall have to increase the internal-revenue taxes, or we shall have to impose a stamp tax, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] says.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. SIMS. In order to have that pension law passed, if the revenues from imports are not sufficient, would you be willing to increase the internal-revenue taxes in order to do it? Would you?

Mr. FULLER. Yes; if that became necessary. I am willing to raise taxes in any way necessary or that may be possible to pay the debt we owe to the defenders of this Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor rather of raising the revenues by the indirect method of taxation upon imports, so that no man in all this country will feel that he is burdened with a tax, as he would feel it if the tax collector were to come around and ask him to plank down so much money.

Mr. SIMS. Is not the tax on whisky and on beer and on tobacco and on cigars an indirect tax?

Mr. FULLER. Certainly; it is an internal-revenue tax, levied on certain industries of this country. I am willing to increase that tax at any time when it may be necessary.

Mr. SIMS. Nobody pays it directly.

Mr. FULLER. But I say here and now that I am not willing to enter upon a period of business stagnation such as you say is sure to come for the purpose of not having revenue enough to pay the pensions that we owe to the old soldiers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman just one more question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I will ask the gentleman if he is opposed to revising any of the schedules of the tariff so as to reduce it at all, and if he would reduce it at all, would it not to some extent bring about the stagnation I have referred to?

Mr. FULLER. I will say that if you gentlemen on the other side of the House had not entered upon a filibuster upon the last day of the last session of the Sixty-first Congress, we would now have had an expert tariff commission and provision would have been made to revise the schedules of the tariff law from time to time in a scientific manner so as not to interfere with any of the industries of this country. That is what I am in favor of. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am not in favor of firing in here a bill of this kind that has never even been considered in committee and where there are no figures or statistics to support it. I am not in favor, simply to play politics, of picking out one little industry here and there, such as exists in my town, and say we will wipe that out and tell the people of this country how we are revising the tariff downward in the interest of the people. If you want to revise the tariff, go at it systematically and act upon some consistent and definite theory. I want to say to you now that I am opposed forever to what you call a revenue tariff or a free-trade tariff. I am not opposed to revising the schedules whenever they need revision, so as to equalize duties upon all products and treat all industries, all classes, and all sections of this country alike. I am in favor of just such a tariff as we have had heretofore. Just such a tariff as has built up the industries of this country and made us what we are to-day, and I agree most emphatically with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] that the line is drawn so that no man claiming to be a Republican can for one moment think of joining in this policy of destruction that you gentlemen on the Democratic side of this House are now proposing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is a great question which has been thrashed out time and again and will be discussed time and again in the future. There is a great deal of information yet to be had upon the question that we do not now have. I do not say that I am not in favor of revising certain schedules of the tariff and reducing the tariff upon certain articles, or of adjusting the tariff from time to time according to just and proper conditions. But I do insist that at all times when revision is made, it shall be scientifically done, and so as to not unjustly injure any American industry. I desire to see a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission, but at the same time I will never, while I live, consent to the passage of any bill upon the tariff question that does not maintain the principle of protection to American industries and American labor. I am unalterably and forever opposed to the doctrine of free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.] That doctrine which, whenever and wherever tried, has brought about stagnation in business, closed factories, made idle laboring men, hard times, ruin, and desolation. This is what the Democratic Party offers us now. I prefer the Republican doctrine of protection, that has always given us prosperity, employment, and good wages, prosperous farms and factories, and millions of happy homes. It is a good time for all Republicans to get back to the solid foundation of reason and common sense. [Applause.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, for some days we have listened with great interest to the discussion of what has been denominated a "farmers' tariff bill," and it has not all been wasted effort, even though Carlyle declared "Silence is the eternal duty of man," and that "England and America are going to nothing but wind and tongue." There has been every courtesy, as well as "reciprocity," extended on both sides, wide apart as may be the declaimers from unanimous agreement, and instructive and pleasurable have been the discourses to audiences in the galleries, notwithstanding the fact that one authority said he "felt intensely the social misery which a single declaimer with a powerful memory, leathern lungs, and a fluent tongue may inflict on the public."

In my home town in Pennsylvania some years ago we had a Republican club, and the president of the club was an ambitious young man named Showers. The president was a great believer in the efficiency of public meetings and held them whenever he thought an audience could be drummed up. On one occasion we had there as the orator of the evening Mr. Warwick, then mayor of Philadelphia. In introducing the mayor

Mr. Showers stepped into the spot light, put his best foot forward, and said:

Ladies and gentlemen, before presenting the speaker of the evening I wish to say a word about contrasting conditions under two national administrations. Under the administration of President Harrison you saw the mills and factories booming, employment for everybody, peace and contentment everywhere, while prosperity crossed every man's dooryard and took a seat by the glowing hearthstone of everybody's home. Under the administration of Grover Cleveland you witnessed closed shops and forges, smokeless stacks, an empty Federal Treasury, and honorable citizenship driven into the street without work, almshouses filled, souphouses overflowing, and gloom and despair written across the horizon with every setting sun. Now, which do you prefer? I think not.

[Laughter and applause.]

To-day, after weighing what I have heard on both sides of this "phony" bill, like Mr. Showers, I am constrained to say concerning this measure, I think not. And while a poet has seen fit to refer to oratory as merely "mouthfuls of spoken wind," it may be nearly so in estimating or measuring results, since a distinguished Member on the Democratic side has given notice by stronger assertion than mere inference or innuendo that this bill is a Democratic campaign document and a little political joker. This measure provides for a reduced tariff, and, of course, reduced revenue must follow, and it must also be a fact that every manufactured article imported from another country displaces that much production and labor in this country and sends the cost price in gold abroad.

After hearing what I have on both sides of this, I do not believe that the Democrats themselves regard it as the kind of a bill they would want to pass if they felt that it would be enacted. Having had notice that it is not to pass, I am not reflecting upon anybody's intelligence, but I rather compliment the Democrats when I say that I look upon it as a farce and a fraud, because it is not seriously considered; and surely it is an imposition upon the people and their time and their patience and a waste of money, if it is true that it costs $10,000 an hour, for the Members of this body to discuss a bill that is not intended to be enacted into law. So, like Mr. Showers, I think not. For one, instead of going into the merits or demerits of something that has no merit, I will pass on to another phase of this question and allow this to go, as I think should have been done at the start, paying no attention whatever to it, allowing the Democrats to talk and talk away the time, without making reply from this side.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, statements are frequently made here by Members, which are carelessly made, just like the one the gentleman has made about the debate on this bill costing $10,000 an hour. We are all paid the same salary, whether Congress is in session or not. Is not the gentleman willing to modify his remark, because it conveys the idea that in sitting here and debating this bill we are wasting an enormous amount of money, when the expense would be just the same if we did not open our mouths or were not here at all?

Mr. FOCHT. The fault is not ours. We did not call the extra session. You had to make your agreement with the White House that you would pass the "reciprocity" bill. We have nothing to do with that. You are surely responsible for printing the bill and other waste.

Mr. SIMS. Whose White House is it?

Mr. FOCHT. You claim that and everything else in sight.

Mr. SIMS. Who owns the White House?

Mr. FOCHT. You act as though you did; you act as though you really had the President now. I believe you have discounted Democratic success for 20 years ahead—or at least 16—but you are entirely mistaken.

The optimism of these Democrats reminds me of the man who jumped off the thirty-second story of the Singer Building in New York. When he got down to about the fifteenth floor he cried out, "I'm all right so far," but when he landed on the sidewalk there was not enough left of him to hold a post-mortem upon, and so it will be with you when you hit the sidewalk in 1912. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman repudiate his own President and no longer lay any claim to him?

Mr. FOCHT. I may regard a man a great statesman, a great lawyer, thoroughly honest, with a great heart, a genius, and yet he may not be perfect, and this may be the moment that our President has made a mistake, and I believe he has. I believe as patriotic, as intelligent, as loyal Republicans as live on the face of the earth will sustain what I say here now in the next election when I run for Congress.

Mr. FINLEY. How about President Taft when he runs?

Mr. FOCHT. Just give you full swing and there will be no trouble about a Republican majority.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman think the people will sustain the President?

Mr. FOCHT. Gentlemen on that side need not flatter themselves that they were really sent for. It was only by reason of the fact that Republicans remained away from the polls that they were elected.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman has stated that he himself will be sustained in the next election.

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. What is the opinion of the gentleman as to President Taft, when he runs for reelection?

Mr. FOCHT. Why, he will be elected, too. People will overlook a little mistake. In the main, he is all right. He is thoroughly honest, and we understand what he is doing; he is at least 99 per cent all right.

What the American people want to know is how much it is. They must see the bottom of things. As somebody stated about the graft in New York, that Tammany satisfied the reformers that it was only 5 per cent, and they said: "All right; we only want to know how much it is."

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Well, have they found out how much?

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman is from New York, is he?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. No; from New Jersey.

Mr. FOCHT. Well, you have a fine State; you issue charters for trusts there, but I understand you have been converted.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I hope we will be able to convert Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. We are the representatives of the people. We gather to confer, discuss, exchange views, and to ultimately arrive at compromise conclusions. Therefore I see no reason why, if I have a thought with respect to the policy, the prudence, and the wisdom and the statesmanship of events looking to annexation of Canada, I should not state it.

Now, do not think that this is such a far call, this question of Canadian annexation. While I have descended from a race of preachers back in the days of the Reformation and might quote scripture, and also tell you why Canada did not become a part of this Republic originally, I will refrain from introducing religious matters here since your forefathers eliminated this subject from the Declaration of Independence and from the Constitution.

There are enough people ready and willing to come over any day, and that can be done without any contest. It will be purely a commercial conquest. The fusion and amalgamation and complete assimilation of the great Anglo-Saxon race, the real Teuton, who must dominate the world, I say here, whether President Taft believes it or whether he likes it, that ultimately that will happen. It could happen as well to-morrow as in a hundred years. The fusion would be complete and serenely accomplished without conflict. Mighty few changes would have to be wrought to have us one people. There is but one point to which I referred that would seriously interfere, and that is worthy of deep consideration.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not there one necessary prerequisite to the annexation of Canada, and that is desire?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; and the desire is there.

Mr. SHERLEY. I spend from two to three months in Canada every year, and in the part that the gentleman speaks of. I have not found it so. Kipling voiced the Canadian sentiment when he said:

Daughter am I in my mother's house,
But mistress in my own.

Canada is feeling her sovereignty, and does not desire annexation.

Mr. FOCHT. No country has sovereignty that is obliged to send a treaty to a mother country for final ratification. The only country where real sovereignty resides with the people is the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FOCHT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. There has not been an instance in the gentleman's lifetime when a matter peculiar to Canada alone has not been settled by the will of Canada.

Mr. FOCHT. I do not see what that has to do with present momentous exigencies. I want to say that in visiting Toronto I had business with the president of a large trust company. He seemed like the high-class business men, as they all are in my State—like a bank president, or a high-class merchant, or a doctor, and I might include the lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. And do not forget the newspaper profession. [Laughter.]

M. FOCHT. And, I will say, consistent newspaper editors—those who are for free print paper and against some other things. [Laughter.] I said, "My friend, you look like a good

American, a Yankee; I do not see that you are particularly marked up with the union jack." He said, "No; I know what you mean, and that would have happened by this time had it not been that in the McKinley tariff bill you cut off our market for barley, and that incensed our people, and not only the people who raise the barley, but the great financial interests who had to help find a market and an outlet for that great product; and since then we have not warmed up very much on the question of annexation." But, Mr. Chairman, dismiss Canada. That is easy at any time.

If we want empire, however, my friends—and it looks very much as though we are very near the occupation of some other country; if we want empire, and we want to follow the lure of gold and the call of adventure—turn in another direction. You can see what is going on on the border in a land where there is no sovereignty, where the sovereignty resides in one man, and he is old and trembling and about ready to quit. With his passing from earth or earthly power the State also passes.

Now, what are we going to do if we are the policemen of the Western Hemisphere? That is the way to look at it, and our southern friends truly will not object. It will be much easier than in 1847. In fact, there will be no resistance whatever in that direction. I have a young man associated with me who just came from there, an officer of the Army, and he says they are going over and going over to stay, and we are going over to add one more little burden to the white man. From all indications the American soldier will soon stack arms on the plains of Mexico; and if he does not, it will be a close call. I would not think that the President would object. We have been absorbing everything not wanted in southern Europe for years and years, have we not? We have taken what nobody wanted in the Pacific seas—another white man's burden. We added a little more down there in the West Indies. Why could we not occupy something that is worth having and where we could be of some great good to humanity. [Laughter.] I am not a soldier of fortune. I do not expect to be at the head of the Army, but we are called upon to discuss occasionally paramount questions, and I believe this will be a mighty interesting one before Congress adjourns.

Now, to pass on, I do not want to take up too much time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] gave me one-half hour, and since I have only 10 minutes left I do not like to be pressed too hard. There is a young man over there on the Democratic side, a very eloquent young man from Georgia, who made a speech yesterday, and he, like the President, could be mistaken in his conclusions. He would have this House believe that Alexander Hamilton was a free trader. He even referred to the report he made in 1791 as Secretary of the Treasury and by the direction of Congress, and never said a word about the construction of the tariff bill or the character of it that followed. Now, it would appear that my Democratic friends stand on political ancestry, and that calls to mind a story of a young man who wanted to get the genealogy of his family and join the four hundred. So he had a high-priced professor go to work and get it up. About the time he thought he had the documents in good shape he was advised that he was an adopted son. [Laughter.] And so it is with my Democratic friends when they quote Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson and James Buchanan and Grover Cleveland. They are talking about people who are not their political ancestors, for every one was a protectionist, and you can find confirmation of this in the Messages and Papers of the Presidents in any library.

Every utterance of these Presidents was for protection, and I dare say that one-fourth of the membership on that side of the House, men who come from the active industrial centers of the South, are also protectionists, or their constituents are. I want to say that every man from the North who sits on that side of the House has a constituency that are protectionists; and as for the rest of them, as soon as we send enough energy and capital to the South to arouse the slumbering forces of that great section the whole South will be for protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, my friends, we have discussed tariff for taxation, for revenue, for protection, but I do not know, not having been here during all of these discussions, what has been said in reference to a market for what we produce. After all, is that not most important? It must be conceded as the common-sense thing, as the result of every tariff law that looked toward lower duties, that we must have a measure of protection. I can not conceive that any intelligent man would undertake for a moment to go on record as saying that we must not at least have protection against the surplus product of Europe.

And believing that to be true, then every man is in some measure a protectionist. Now, if we protect our industries and regulate the irregularities inside, and after all, my friends, I will admit that Democrats—I do not need to admit that, but I admit that any farsighted, observant citizen——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Do not admit they are farsighted; do not admit that.

Mr. FOCHT (continuing). Will say that in your attempted tariff revision, in the one instance it strikes at the farmer and in the other instance it strikes at the manufacturer and at the workingmen. You have stuck the wrong pig, you have stuck the thing that will destroy every vital commercial interest in this country; take away your revenues, take away the pension from the soldier because you have not revenue to pay it, of which we have had notice this morning, put out the fires of our factories, and drive men to idleness in the streets. Keep up this tariff properly regulated, and pursue diligently and relentlessly what the Republican Party has started to carry out—and that is the regulation of the great combinations of wealth and power at the bar of the court. And I will stop to say that at the other end of this Capitol are two great trusts standing ready, I believe, to be dissolved, and I hope that one after another may be brought there and properly regulated—not destroyed, not confiscated, but brought within reasonable bounds, so that there may be left some opportunity for individual enterprise and effort—and that they may operate within the law, that there may result a better distribution of the rewards and blessings of this great country and of its great resources. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In a conversation with the then Secretary of State, Mr. ROOT, coming from New York one day shortly after his return from a visit to South America, I made the observation that I hoped he had been successful in accomplishing some reciprocity treaties with those Republics, having in mind the fact that we did have a trade arrangement with southern Republics which gave us a good market for our products until the treaties were abrogated by our Democratic friends, when this market was largely lost. This comes directly home to me from the fact that a large flouring mill in my home town in Pennsylvania enjoyed an extensive South American trade under the reciprocal arrangement but lost it when the treaties were nullified. Then it naturally, logically follows that if we look for an opening for our products, if we maintain the Monroe doctrine there, if we are the policemen of the Western Hemisphere, let us seek it there; and I wanted to see what effort was being made on the part of the State Department to accomplish that result. The Secretary did not enter extensively into a discussion, being a State matter, but he did say that he hoped his visit would result in large commercial benefit to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to have a few more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] is not here.

Mr. FOCHT. I would like to have unanimous consent for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to have his time extended.

Mr. MURDOCK. Until he concludes.

Mr. FOCHT. For five minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, for 5 minutes or 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Following that, my friends, was the trip of an American armada that would have made that of King Philip of Spain look insignificant, along the coast of South America, around the Horn, over the Pacific, through the Mediterranean, and home. Now, you can imagine what the object of that was. I understand the South American Republics believed that we were not strong enough to support and sustain them in the maintenance of their national integrity in case they would withdraw their trade with European countries and we were admitted to their markets. When that fleet went around there they had evidence, but it seems there is something in the way, something does not work right, and while we have a most excellent Consular Service, excellent men in that service, and an increase in the appropriation, yet we have not been able to fully reach the market. The fact is, they might reach it if they take advantage of the machinery which the State Department places at their service, and to that subject I will for a moment address myself.

For a few minutes I wish to talk about a phase of American commerce which, I believe, is entitled to far more consideration than is any tariff, which at best is never altogether satisfactory, although the principle should by this time be better understood by my friends KITCHIN, of South Carolina, SIMS, of Tennessee, and HEFLIN, of Alabama. My Chairman, Mr. FINLEY, I suppose, is as badly informed as the rest, but until he goes on record I will not include him.

To my mind the most essential requisite for American prosperity is to keep our manufacturing establishments running at maximum capacity, and to do this is to first hold our own market for what we produce and find sale in foreign countries for our surplus.

The most important question is to reach the foreign consumer direct if this much-discussed surplus of American manufacturers is to be readily disposed of. Are the manufacturers of the country aware of the machinery that now exists enabling them to approach the foreign buyer direct? Are they aware of the great and valuable facilities that the Department of State and the Department of Commerce and Labor have provided? The general and insistent demand during the first half of the last decade from all sections of the country and from all classes of business concerns, from commercial bodies and the press generally, for a reorganization and the improvement in the Consular Service has resulted in bringing this branch of our Government up to a high state of efficiency. Are the manufacturers of the country aware of this efficiency? Are they making use of it?

This improvement has been attained at a considerable increase in appropriations. In 1900 the annual expense for the Consular Service was approximately $1,250,000; to-day it is $1,900,000; but the actual tangible results have more than warranted this increase. To-day, through our present efficient Consular Service, every possible market of the world for American products has been studied and reported upon. Any manufacturer may know not only the requirements of each commercial center of the world, but has published for him a carefully compiled directory of all the important business houses the world over, with information as to classes of goods each house is engaged in importing. This directory has been compiled by the Department of Commerce and Labor from reports and data furnished by the various American consuls.

In short, the organization and dissemination of commercial intelligence respecting foreign markets on practical and systematic lines for the benefit of the American manufacturer is a problem which has been fairly well worked out by the Department of State through the Consular Service, and the Department of Commerce and Labor through the Bureau of Manufactures. But it is evident that only a small portion of our manufacturers are aware of the great advantage and assistance that is available through these Government departments. The Daily Consular Reports are full of valuable information for all classes of our business houses. Information respecting foreign markets and business houses is therefore well provided for the American manufacturer, if he cares to avail himself of it.

And now the other essential service in developing our foreign trade is about to be provided. Through the plan now adopted of equipping each American consulate with card-index files every manufacturer of the country is permitted to have a brief of his catalogue prepared on cards for classifying and filing in card-index files, in the various commercial languages of the world, without any cost or fee other than the cost of printing or preparing his cards for these files. It is now up to the manufacturer seeking a foreign market to take advantage of these great privileges. This plan of providing full information respecting every line of goods produced in America in the language of the various countries in such shape that every foreign buyer may have this information not only at any American consulate, but such portion of it as his individual requirements demand, in his own office at the cost of postage in mailing it to him, is the completion of an almost perfect system in developing our foreign trade. The facilities are all at hand; it is now not only the privilege but duty of every manufacturer to use it to his utmost capacity, for in developing foreign commerce it is true, as in all other efforts, combined and persistent action is what tells.

Possibly not more than one manufacturer out of 10 throughout the United States knows that these various aids on the part of the Government exist. Just think of the result to our foreign trade if any foreign merchant in any part of the world can step into the nearest American consulate and consult a file in his own language that will give him full and accurate information respecting every line of goods manufactured or produced in the United States, and then have a duplicate of such portion as he may wish of these files placed in his own office for his constant use. Just think what a tremendous impetus this will give to our foreign commerce, and all this is possible if the press of the country will make this service known to each manufacturer, and then each manufacturer does his part in preparing the information in the required form for the consulates.

This work is undertaken by a private concern, for the reason that the special and individual service to each manufacturer and the distribution of this information to individual buyers is a work that is manifestly outside of the domain of a government office. This private organization is the Commercial Bureau Co., which has made an offer to the Department of State to equip all American consulates with a system of card-index files containing complete digests of the catalogues of all manufacturers of the United States without expense to the State Department and free to the manufacturers. The Department of State has therefore given the Commercial Bureau Co. the privilege of placing these files in each American consulate, providing no preference is shown and no fee charged to the manufacturers for the filing of these cards in the consulates. The department has no part in the service, and any manufacturer desiring to take advantage of the free service in the consulates must communicate direct with the Commercial Bureau Co., 50 Church Street, New York. But the broad policy of the Department of State in permitting a private organization to render this service to the consulates is to be commended. It is not only commendable from the standpoint of broad-minded statesmanship, but from a business point it is a great economy.

Much time and attention is now given by our consuls in transmitting inquiries to the department that can be answered instantly by these files, thus not only saving time, but a considerable expense in clerical hire and other expenses. The Government has done its part well; it is now the manufacturer who must do his part. The advantages of this publicity should be very great to all American manufacturers in all lines, and this arrangement should be studied with care by them.

It is evident from what has been said during the prolonged debate on this subject of trade with Canada, whether reciprocal or otherwise, or whether or not we are to have this proposed free list, the thing we want more than anything else, the thing that will keep our mills and factories busy and our workmen employed, is a market for our surplus products. The means of finding these markets is furnished by the Government; it is now up to the enterprise of our manufacturers to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill providing for a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada has passed this House. It has been charged by those opposing the reciprocity bill, that it was not fair to and that it discriminated against the great farming class, and particularly the farmers of the West. And it is true that there does exist among some of the farmers of the West a fear that injustice will be done them, unless some legislation is passed by this Congress manifestly in their interest. The charge has been boldly and aggressively made here by Members opposed to reciprocity, that the treaty agreement advocated by the President, and for the consideration of which Congress was called into extra session, would work an injury to the farming class, and therefore ought to be defeated as a matter of justice to that element; and this charge has been principally made by the high protectionist, who in all the years past has never heeded the prayer of the man upon the farm; and it has been further urged that it ought not to become a law, because the principle of protection was endangered or violated thereby. Regardless of these claims, the reciprocity bill passed the House by a very large vote of 267 votes for and 89 against—a majority of 178 votes. Many, however, voted for reciprocity who probably would not have been willing to so vote were it not for the fact that there was pending in the House what is known as the farmers' free-list bill—a companion measure to Canadian reciprocity—and reported at the same time, hoping by the passage thereof to remedy whatever harm, if any, there might be in the reciprocity bill; and now the opportunity is given to those who voted for and those who voted against reciprocity to help pass this free-list bill.

A majority of the Republicans voted against the reciprocity bill, alleging it was a stroke at the principle of protection—a breach in the wall of protection, if it should become a law—and that the President in proposing it was espousing a Democratic proposition. I take it that a large percentage of them will vote against this free-list bill for the same reason; but those who based their objection upon injustice done the farmer can now, at least, help the situation by voting for this bill, which seeks to do substantial justice to the farming class.

I ask to insert here the free-list bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act the following articles shall be exempt from duty when imported into the United States:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened.

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Sewing machines, and all parts thereof.

Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages.

I hope the bill will pass this House and become a law as a matter of simple justice to this class who ask only for fair treatment, a square deal, equal and exact justice to all, and special privileges to none. The farmers of the Central West feel that if reciprocity with Canada passes Congress, causing free trade in farm products between the United States and Canada, that a free-list bill should also be passed, putting upon the free list the products of manufacture used by the farmers in the raising of food products to be used by all the people.

Many feel that it is wrong to let in farm products free, unless manufactured goods and implements used by the farmers should also be free of duty. They do not ask for protection, only fair treatment, and they demand that you put on the free list the manufactured articles they daily purchase and use in the production of these food products. They know that legislation heretofore has not been in their interest. They remember that hides were put on the free list under the promise that cheaper shoes and leather goods would result, and they now point to the fact that shoes, harness, and leather products sell higher; and they urge that, since hides are free of tariff, the tariff be likewise taken off of leather products. They will not be satisfied unless this or a similar free list be passed. It may be that this free-list bill should be amended before final passage.

Many wanted the reciprocity bill amended in the House and now hope that it may be amended before it finally becomes a law by adding the free-list bill to the reciprocity bill. But in any event it is hoped that the free-list bill will be passed as a simple act of justice to that great class to which this Nation owes its support and existence. You can not get along without the farmer. You can not afford to have him dissatisfied. You have been friendly all these years to the manufacturer; never to the farmer. The farmer is more alert and restless to-day than ever before. He has grown tired of the high protective tariff walls. You will have to reckon with him in the future. If the relief asked for in this bill is withheld, if remedial legislation asked for by him is not provided by this Congress, either at this extra session or in the coming regular session, the responsibility will be upon the Republican Party for such failure. It will not be the fault of this Democratic House. At the other end of the Capitol sits a Republican Senate, and in the White House a Republican President.

The farmer wants cheaper agricultural implements, cheaper shoes and harness, cheaper wire fencing. He wants cheaper lumber, and better clothing at reasonable and honest prices. He wants cheaper sugar. These demands must be met by Congress. Old conditions will not longer be tolerated. The time will come, and is near at hand, when both branches of this National Congress will respond to the wishes and demands of the producing and consuming classes.

Direct election of Senators is a reform measure pressed to the front by the masses, not for its own sake, but in order that laws may be enacted in the interest of all the people. An income tax will in the near future become a part of the law of the land, under and by virtue of which a hundred million dollars can reasonably be collected annually from incomes of those possessed of great wealth, to help bear the burdens of the Government, and then there will be no excuse for high protective laws.

This House has made progress, responsive to the progressive thought of the masses of the people, having passed a joint resolution providing for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people of the States; having passed a bill providing for publicity of campaign expenses and contributions before election, so that Federal elections can not secretly be controlled by the undue use of money contributed by great corporate interests for selfish purposes; having also passed the reciprocity bill and the apportionment bill. All of these bills have been sent to the Senate, and there is now about ready to pass this free-list bill, a companion bill to the reciprocity bill.

I voted for reciprocity, with an almost unanimous Democracy, and I believe it will redound to the mutual benefit of both countries if it should pass and become a law. I do not believe that any harm will be done to the great State which I have the honor in part to represent, nor any substantial injury to any part of our Republic.

The entire delegation of my State voted for reciprocity, and every Democrat from Missouri will vote for the free-list bill. The right of repeal is reserved in the treaty, and if experience should prove that its enactment is injurious to American interests, a future Congress can and will repeal it. The bill has been fully discussed from every viewpoint and the probable effect it would have upon farm products in every section

Now, while the treaty might have been amended by the House and thereby better satisfied the views of many, yet it would have been charged that the amendment was put on the bill in the House for political purposes; and the Democratic Party, acting with substantial unanimity, decided to pass the bills through the House separately, and has sent the reciprocity bill to the Senate, where it can be amended by adding the free list or both may be passed as separate measures.

Expressing my personal views, and, I believe, the sentiment of many of my colleagues, I can not refrain from saying that I hope the bill will be amended in the Senate, or, rather, that the two bills will be combined by adding a new section to the reciprocity bill that will include the free-list bill, unless assured that this free-list bill shall pass and become a law, in which event it may be immaterial whether it becomes a law by attaching it to the reciprocity bill or by a separate bill.

The amendment of the reciprocity bill, by adding another section embodying the free-list bill, can be done without affecting the treaty with Canada.

In a recent speech made by President Taft in New York, and which speech is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29 as a part of the remarks of the Representative from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], the President says:

> Of course a mere reduction of our tariff or the putting of any article on the free list, without insisting on a corresponding change in the Canadian tariff, will not interfere with the contract as made with Canada.

The amendment of the bill by attaching the free list thereto will not invalidate the treaty nor interfere with ratification of the reciprocal agreement by the Canadian Parliament. It will simply require the President to approve the free-list bill at the same time he attaches his signature to the treaty, and he will be stronger thereby with the people of the West and the farmers and consumers everywhere by approving the free-list bill as an amendment or as a separate bill and immeasurably weaker before the American people if he defeats the free-list bill by the exercise of his veto power. And he can well afford to meet the wishes of the Democratic Party, that advocates this free-list bill, and thereby acknowledge his indebtedness to that party for the passage of the reciprocity bill, without whose aid it would have utterly failed.

If the free-list bill be attached to the treaty, it will operate as a free-list bill for all the world, but would not invalidate the reciprocity agreement. And who will be harmed thereby? The manufacturers are already selling their articles in foreign markets in competition with all the world; the putting of them upon the free list will simply prevent the manufacturer from longer extorting from the consumers of our country higher prices than he secures abroad. And why should the President

object if the people of the United States desire this legislation and should insist on procuring it at the same time he procures reciprocity with Canada? Why not have both by act of the same Congress? By attaching the free list to the reciprocity agreement it will insure the enactment of the free-list measure at the same time he signs the Canadian agreement. Give the President what he asks and let him at the same time give the American consumer what he demands.

However, I do not entertain any fear of harm resulting from closer and freer trade relations with a friendly neighboring people. The trade balance is now, and always has been, in our favor, and I know of no good reason why the trade balance should not continue in our favor.

I quote from a carefully prepared statement, which I will insert as a part of my remarks.

During the last five years ending June 30 last, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	$886, 417, 376
Canada sold to us	393, 913, 673
Difference in our favor	492, 503, 703

These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys more from us than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	$14, 172, 075
Canada sold to us	2, 549, 201
Difference in our favor	11, 622, 874
Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1, 578, 179
Canada sold to us	1, 193, 796
Difference in our favor	384, 383
Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17, 011, 017
Canada sold to us	904, 191
Difference in our favor	16, 106, 826
Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31, 596, 556
Canada sold to us	6, 679, 884
Difference in our favor	24, 916, 672
Corn:	
We sold in Canada	21, 704, 572
Canada sold to us	14, 350
Difference in our favor	21, 690, 222
Wheat:	
We sold in Canada	4, 442, 307
Canada sold to us	766, 254
Difference in our favor	3, 676, 053

Canada needs our products and must buy from us, and we need her lumber and forest products. She can not produce corn sufficient for her wants. Canada in 1910 raised about 25,000,000 bushels of corn, while the United States raised over 3,000,000,000 bushels in the same year—more than 100 bushels to 1. Canada has a population of less than 8,000,000, the United States about 92,000,000—3 bushels of corn for each inhabitant in Canada, while the United States has about 32 bushels for each inhabitant—and the Canadian yield is principally in Ontario, no corn of moment being raised in western Canada. Where corn is raised hogs and cattle are fattened. As to wheat, we raise a surplus, so does Canada, and the surplus of both countries is shipped abroad, where the price is fixed, based upon the surplus and production of all the world. What would be the effect of taking the tariff off of wheat?

The present tariff on wheat is 25 cents a bushel, but is really one-fourth of 1 cent a bushel when purchased to be ground into flour for export. Under the present law the American miller pays a duty of 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat imported from Canada, but when he grinds it into flour for export trade he draws back 99 per cent of the 25 cents on each bushel, leaving one-quarter of 1 cent a bushel tariff on Canadian wheat.

It is true that if imported into the United States to be ground into flour and sold here, the importer must pay 25 cents a bushel, a prohibitive tariff, and none is imported, I am informed, except for seed or to be ground into flour for export trade. Nor is there any demand for it, for we have a surplus of wheat grown in the United States, which alike is exported and sold abroad to help meet the demand for wheat and flour in the world's markets. Of what benefit to the farmer is the present tariff on wheat? Why not take off the tariff on both wheat under the reciprocity agreement and flour under the free-list bill?

A great farm journal, edited in Des Moines, Iowa, and known as Wallaces' Farmer, recently, in an editorial on reciprocity in farm products, said:

When we come to look at the matter from the farmers' standpoint, divested of prejudice, it is pretty hard to see how this treaty can seriously affect the farmers of the corn belt one way or the other. There is no possibility of any competition in growing corn. Only in Ontario is there any chance of growing any amount of corn, and this will cost far more than it does in the corn belt, as much as it does in the New England States contiguous to the Canadian line. The great production in Canada is wheat. The reciprocity treaty can not affect us at all so long as we have a surplus of wheat to send abroad. It is quite as cheap to send it from Canada to Liverpool as from the wheat fields of the Northwest. Under these conditions the prices for both countries are fixed in Liverpool.

The same journal further states:

We anticipate that our readers, who are bitterly opposed to this treaty, will not be hurt half as bad as they expect.

And further says:

Probably if this treaty could have been ratified by the President, without saying anything about it and nothing had been published in the papers about it, they would not have noticed any change.

In another issue of this same farm journal it says:

The reciprocity treaty with Canada will not, in our judgment, seriously lower the prices of farm products in the West.

In a recent issue of the Commoner, a paper owned by William J. Bryan, three times nominated for President by the Democratic Party, and published at Lincoln, Nebr., the following statement is made:

The Democrats in Congress do well when they begin tariff revision by putting upon the free list something like 100 articles largely consumed by farmers. The farmer has been the chief sufferer from the principle of protection, and it is only fair that relief should begin with him. The reciprocity treaty is a godsend to him, not so much because it confers great benefits upon him, but because it leads to greater reductions. The opponents of the reciprocity agreement have tried to hide behind the farmer, but the farmers' free list will drive them from under cover and compel them to vote with the Democrats or quit talking about the farmer.

I submit to this body these recent utterances of this great agricultural journal, and of the Commoner, both published in the Central West, regarding the probable effects of this treaty, as against the utterances of those here and elsewhere who seek to play upon the fears of the farmers in their eager desire to defeat these measures and thereby perpetuate the control of those interests that speculate in the great necessities of life. This same agricultural journal calls upon Congress to "remove the iniquities from the wool and cotton fabrics" and other manufactured products, and these things this Congress will attempt to remedy by reducing the tariffs to a revenue basis. The attempt will be fought by the high protectionist, the same influence seeking at the same time to defeat both reciprocity and the free-list bill.

The high-protection Republican Congressman assumes a peculiar rôle. He pleads for the farmer in opposing reciprocity and pleads for the manufacturer in opposing the free-list bill. Half of them seek to sustain the President in his advocacy of a reciprocity agreement and the other half violently or sorrowfully criticize him and denounce reciprocity as a fake treaty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], the very high priest of protection, while opposing at the last session the reciprocity treaty, when the Republicans were in the majority, but divided as now on the treaty, offered a free-list bill as an amendment to the McCall reciprocity bill, and at this session he actively opposes the free-list bill presented by the Democrats. Does he not play politics with a vengeance, when he proposes a free-list bill as an amendment to reciprocity in the short session last winter, and now opposes the same measure offered by Democrats at this extra session?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] voted against reciprocity and spoke against the free list, and complained because the free list was not put on as an amendment to the reciprocity bill. Is it possible that, having opposed both bills separately, he feels aggrieved because he is deprived of the opportunity of voting against both at the same time? Anticipating an attack upon what is known as schedule K, the woolen schedule, denounced even by President Taft as indefensible, the high protectionists are sending to Representatives here a scarecrow picture of Congress personified as a man with a sword dagger in his hand, thrust through schedule K, and back of it through American labor and the American sheep raiser, warning Congress to "look beyond before you thrust." This same picture is doubtless being sent to the western farmer and sheep raiser.

These great tariff beneficiaries would play upon the fears of the farmer to-day and the laborer to-morrow, and rob both every day in the year, and sell them shoddy and cheap clothing at robber prices in order that high protection may continue to

extort and enjoy excessive profits upon inferior clothing. The American farmer and laborer wants only fair treatment, but he demands the right and opportunity to buy better clothing at reasonable prices. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

So come also the manufacturers of shoes and other leather products and protest against that part of this free-list bill affecting shoes, harness, and other leather products—the same people who came two years ago to Congress asking for free hides, so they could sell better and cheaper shoes. Taking the tariff off the finished product may help to destroy the monopoly that extorts undue profits from the American consumer.

The Lumber Trust wants both reciprocity and the free-list bill defeated, but the American people are demanding free lumber so they can build homes with lumber bought at reasonable prices. On the Canadian side are almost inexhaustible forests to which our people should have access. Our forests have been in a large measure destroyed or are in the control of comparatively few owners, whose powerful hands hold the lumber supply in their grasp, and cupidity fixes the price consumers must pay. We need Canadian lumber. Free lumber we ought to have in exchange for our surplus products.

I have listened with interest to the speeches of distinguished Republicans who denounce both the reciprocity and the free-list bills. These Republicans representing agricultural districts have been telling their Republican farmer constituents about the protection given by the Republican Party to products grown on the farm, and have been calling upon them to remain loyal to the great friend of the farmer—the Republican Party. The Democrats have been saying to them that these tariffs on the products of the farm were mere paper tariffs, a delusion and a snare, and now comes the Republican President and tears the mask aside and reveals the nakedness of the professions of the Republican Party, and says in substance that these farmer tariffs are but a cloak for the speculator in farm products. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The reciprocity agreement fathered by the President angers the Republican Representative who now sees the dilemma in which he is placed, and he denounces the treaty as a fake agreement and would defeat both reciprocity and the free-list bill. When both become the law what will become of the Republican Representative who stands neither with the President nor with the farmer?

The farmer is beginning to see that their tariffs are mere paper tariffs and not real tariffs for protection. The Republican farmer who has been standing for protection is helping to bring about a reduction of the tariff, and when these paper tariffs are taken off the products he raises he will see what a sham and fraud has been perpetrated upon him all these years; or, if he feels that these tariffs were a real protection, he will want a square deal and equal treatment by reducing or taking the tariff off of the things he has to buy. And then the farmer, as never before, will become the greatest advocate in all the land for lower tariffs and freer trade and will help strike down high protection, under the shadow of whose walls trusts and monopolies have flourished and fattened at the expense of the toiling and producing masses of the American people.

Do you wonder that these Republican Representatives are maddened at their own President? Do you wonder that they see the handwriting on the wall when, with a divided party, they see before them a united and triumphant Democracy marching in complete harmony to certain victory in the early future? [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THAYER].

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not allude to the size nor the intelligence of this audience. The one is apparent and, I trust, the other will become as evident as I proceed with my discourse. I do not speak, however, merely for the information of this House, but for that far wider audience which reads the daily newspapers and occasionally dips into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Before commencing upon the subject matter of my talk I wish to say a few words to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], who preceded me. He says that a great many of his Democratic friends hold their seats in this House on account of the abstention of the Republican voters. That may be true of some, but for my district I will say that the vote cast in this last election was over 1,000 larger than that cast in 1908, and that is true of all the vote in Massachusetts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania also alluded to the expense which we would incur in this extra session. Now, the Democrats are not responsible one whit for this extra session, but it was the contumacy of the other branch of the Republican Legislature, the Senate, that caused it. But for my part I welcome this session, and I say that the slight expense to which we are putting the Government of the United States is well repaid by the relief which this House, at least, will offer to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yesterday the House listened to the able and eloquent speech of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], a colleague whose district is adjacent to my own and whose district was enriched in redistricting in 1900 by several safe Democratic towns from the third congressional district, my own, trusting in the assured Republican strength of his and in the weakness which would come to the third district; but the Democratic incumbent at that time was successful in retaining the seat for the Democracy for the two terms which he occupied. He then voluntarily retired, and in this last election the calculations of the Republicans were again upset and the third district became again Democratic. Surely the Lord tempereth the votes to the shorn district. But I bespeak from my Republican colleague in this redistricting, which happened on account of the Massachusetts Congressmen being increased from 14 to 16, a redistricting which I opposed—I bespeak from him the return of my Democratic ewe lambs and I trust he will not give me back some of those deserted shoe villages with which his county, as well as my own, is so much encumbered. I would ask his reasons for the decadence of these shoe towns, if it is due to the high tariff which has been put upon their products.

In his discussion of the altruistic business methods of the United States Shoe Machinery Co., I asked him if he had in mind the act which was passed by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1907 forbidding a clause of their lease which restricted the lessees from buying or leasing any other machinery from any other vendors or lessors except the said company, and he said he had that in mind, but when I asked him to have that act read from the Clerk's desk he said he could not take up his time to do that. I will ask the indulgence of the House, in the performance of my public duty, to have read this act of 1907 and the supplementary act of 1908 against monopoly. I will ask that the Clerk read act 469 of 1907.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the act in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

"SECTION 1. No person, firm, corporation, or association shall insert in or make it a condition or provision of any sale or lease of any tool, implement, appliance, or machinery that the purchaser or lessee thereof shall not buy, lease, or use machinery, tools, implements, or appliances or material or merchandise of any person, firm, corporation, or association other than such vendor or lessor; but this provision shall not impair the right, if any, of the vendor or lessor of any tool, implement, appliance, or machinery protected by a lawful patent right vested in such vendor or lessor to require, by virtue of such patent right, the vendee or lessee to purchase or lease from such vendor or lessor such component and constituent parts of said tool, implement, appliance, or machinery as the vendee or lessee may thereafter require during the continuance of such patent right: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the appointment of agents or sole agents to sell or lease machinery, tools, implements, or appliances.

"SEC. 2. Any person, firm, corporation, or association, or the agent of any such person, firm, corporation, or association, that violates the provisions of this act shall be punished for each offense by a fine not exceeding $5,000.

"All leases, sales, or agreements therefor hereafter made in violation of any of the provisions of this act shall be void as to any and all of the terms or conditions thereof in violation of said provisions."

An act relative to monopolies and discriminations in the sale of articles or commodities in common use.

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Every contract, agreement, arrangement, or combination in violation of common law in that whereby a monopoly in the manufacture, production, or sale in this Commonwealth of any article or commodity in common use is or may be created, established, or maintained, or in that thereby competition in this State in the supply or price of any such article or commodity is or may be restrained or prevented, or in that thereby, for the purpose of creating, establishing, or maintaining a monopoly within this State of the manufacture, production, or sale of any such article or commodity, the free pursuit in this State of any lawful business, trade, or occupation is or may be restrained or prevented is hereby declared to be against public policy, illegal, and void.

SEC. 2. The attorney general, or, by his direction, a district attorney, may bring an action in the name of the Commonwealth against any person, trustee, director, manager, or other officer or agent of a corporation, or against a corporation, to restrain the doing in his Commonwealth of any act herein forbidden or declared to be illegal, or any act in, toward, or for the making or consummation of any contract, agreement, arrangement, or combination herein prohibited, wherever the same may have been made. The superior court shall have jurisdiction to restrain and enjoin any act herein forbidden or declared to be illegal.

SEC. 3. In such action no person shall be excused from answering any questions that may be put to him, or from producing any books, papers, or documents, on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him, but no person shall be prosecuted in any criminal action or proceedings, or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter or thing concerning which he may justify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, in any such action.

SEC. 4. Nothing in section 1 of this act shall be construed as impairing, repealing, or superseding any statute of this Commonwealth.

Approved April 28, 1908.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for 10 minutes longer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can only yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. THAYER. I do not know that that will be sufficient, but I will make it do. The discussion of this farmers' free-list bill has already been worn almost to attenuation, but this phase has not been extensively dwelt upon. The gentleman from Indiana has already referred to the fact that at the time my colleague was defending this trust at the Senate end of the Capitol its methods were being pitilessly disclosed. "Thus the whirligig of time brings about its revenges," but not often so quickly. It is more like that incident in the New Testament where, while one disputant was protesting against the facts the feet of those who had borne out the other protestant were already at the door, and in this matter I refer not to the protagonist but to the principal. The conditions of shoe manufacturing in Massachusetts had become so scandalous that in 1907 a movement was started to restrain the abuses which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. has injected into its methods. There were long and acrimonious hearings at the statehouse, in which the most eminent and expensive counsel took part.

The proponents of this act were represented by Hon. Herbert Parker, a former Republican attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Instead of business men of small means having the opportunity to engage in business with leased machinery, the United States Shoe Machinery Co. was but the controlling power in a long line of manufacturers compelling tribute of a greater part of the profits, and owning the body, soul, and brain of the hapless men who have been entangled in its net, a slavery as absolute as that of the Incas of Peru. These acts were passed, after a hard struggle, as a measure of relief to the manufacturers, but subsequent events have shown their futility. Recently an opponent named Plant attempted to start an independent organization and began operations on a great scale and with every prospect of success, but suddenly, almost before the promise of relief had been presented to the manufacturers, the Plant system was absorbed by the United States Shoe Machinery Co. It transpired that in order to finance his factory Mr. Plant had been obliged to borrow largely from the banks which had indeed solicited his custom, but in some mysterious way all of Plant's notes had found their way into the possession of the United States Shoe Machinery Co., and suddenly he was met by the demands for their payment.

There was no option but that which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. offered, and this independent organization was absorbed by the monopoly. This is instructive in itself as showing for what purposes the accumulated deposits of the common people are used, like the pinions of the eagle, to their own destruction. It is unnecessary to ask "upon what meat does this our Cæsar feed that he has grown so great?" There has been competent testimony that a machine which the United States Shoe Machinery Co. leases for $1,200 a year it sells outright to foreign purchasers for $400—a difference of $1,600 computed on a 6 per cent basis, of $2,000 computed on a 5 per cent basis, and $2,600 computed on a 4 per cent basis. And then we are asked not to remove the duty from the product because, perforce, the foreign manufacturer is using American machinery and will undersell our own manufacturers. If there are more elevated heights of impudence it remains for some Peary to discover them or some Cook to assume to. As to the reliefs we are entitled to, there are several. First, the removal of all duties from all products of monopoly, whether machinery or product. Second, the invocation of the United States law. I am inclined to agree with Senator Bailey and the United States Supreme Court, as enunciated in Continental Wall Paper Co. against Lewis Voight & Sons Co. (148 Fed. Rep., 939, 950), as pertinent.

> The consumer, at last, is the only real victim. It is the consumer who makes up the public, which it is the object of the law to protect against undue exaction through illegal combinations in restraint of freedom of commerce and fair play in commercial transactions.

It ill becomes monopolies like the United States Shoe Machinery Co., which is throttling independent manufacturers and become the arbitrary head of a great part of the shoe business, to cry out that we are destroying an American industry when we are reducing the cost of living to that class which works the hardest and receives the least reward for its labor. Conditions will not be bettered until we not only meet their challenge but remove, as above stated, the duties on their products, which are only an extortion on the American people, but further refuse admission to interstate commerce of all products of monopolies of whatever kind or nature.

> He that withholdeth corn—

And by corn I opine Solomon meant not only all cereals but all the necessities of life—

> the people shall curse him, but blessings shall be upon the head of him that selleth it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, as I look around this Hall I am very forcibly reminded of what I think will be the appearance of many an American workshop after the Democratic program is carried out. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There are more people in the galleries than on the floor, and, if I am not much mistaken, if this policy is carried to its legitimate conclusion there will be more American workmen on the streets than in the shops by and by. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Before taking up the bill I want to refer to one other subject, for I shall try to talk about the bill directly and see if I can get an idea from the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee as to what it means. When the present Speaker of this House delivered a most magnificent oration at the closing vote on the Payne tariff bill, after it came back from the Senate with the report of the conference committee, he said that the ad valorem average of all the schedules indicated that it was 1.71 per cent higher than the Dingley law. The newspaper press and the magazines of the country that desired to do harm to the Republican Party accepted that statement and have persisted in it ever since.

I did not believe that it was correct. I did not believe that it was possible to figure the ad valorem on a bill which had not gone into operation, and I asked of Treasury officials that a fair comparison between the two measures should be officially made. Six months after the law went into effect we knew the actual amount of money which had been paid into the Treasury as revenue under the Payne tariff bill, and I asked that those same identical importations, the same values, coming in at the same time, might be refigured on the basis of the Dingley tariff law, and it was done. At the State convention in Connecticut in September, 1910, I gave it authoritatively to my people, showing each schedule, exactly what had been received under the Payne law and what would have been received under the Dingley tariff rates. There could be no mistake in regard to it if the figuring of the Treasury Department was correct. I will not repeat the ad valorems of the various schedules. I will give them to anybody who desires them. The general average showed that there was received by the United States Treasury, and actually paid in, 6.4 per cent less money than would have been paid in if the invoices had all been refigured and reliquidated under the Dingley tariff law. That was made public. I sent it to the press of the country. I sent it, I think, to every Senator and Representative of the Sixty-first Congress, and there has been no excuse for the continued repetition of the statement that the last revision was upward instead of downward.

When the campaign of last fall began the very first thing that I met was the statement made by the Speaker. Now, I do not criticise him for making it. I will show you how it could have been honestly made and yet be an actual mistake.

Let me take an item in any of the schedules. Take the silk schedule, if you please, reading like this:

> Valued at not less than $1 a yard and not exceeding $2 a yard, $1.

Now, if the importation happens to be at $2 a yard, your ad valorem is 50 per cent; if it is $1.50 a yard, your ad valorem is 66⅔ per cent; if it is $1 a yard, your ad valorem is 100 per cent. So you can not make an estimate or a comparison between two tariff laws unless you figure the identical importation in both cases, and, of course, at the same value in both cases. And yet this erroneous statement is still being made, in utter disregard of the actual facts.

It went on all through the winter and in the discussion of the reciprocity bill during this session. Now I want to read a statement made the other day—innocently, of course—by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. He said:

> And when the bill prepared by the Ways and Means Committee of the Sixty-first Congress passed the Republican House it not only did not reduce the taxes, it not only failed to put the items in my bill on the free list, but it increased the taxes from about 45 to about 50 per cent. Hence I repeat again that when the people asked you for bread you gave them a stone.

And these are the kind of assertions faced by Republicans not only here in Congress but during the campaign last fall. I stated in the reciprocity debate that, in my judgment, the result of the election last fall was reached upon a series of mistakes which would in time develop themselves.

But I did not look for the development to come quite so quickly. It is here. A week ago last Saturday as I started for home I put in my pocket a copy of the report of the Ways and Means Committee upon this bill, the so-called farmers' free list. I read it on the cars going home—read it casually. Coming back I had nothing to occupy my time from New York to Washington, and again I casually picked the report out of my pocket and I have it here now. In that report, made by the Committee on Ways and Means officially, they contradict every statement that they have made in this campaign from the beginning to the end and contradict their own report. I ask the Republican Members of the House and such Democratic Members of the House as choose to gratify their curiosity—those who have the report—to take it in their hands for just a moment while I call attention to it.

On page 3 of the report is this language. I do not know who wrote it; I do not care:

REPUDIATED PROMISE OF DOWNWARD REVISION.

In its platform of 1908 the Republican Party announced the modification of its protection theory referred to by the President, and in deference to aroused public opinion against burdens imposed by the Dingley tariff of 1897, promised a downward revision of the tariff. On this promise the party secured from the people a further continuation of power. How this promise was repudiated in the enactment of the higher tariff act of 1909, and how the people, so far as their power extended at the time, in just resentment have driven the Republican Party from control in Congress are matters of history.

I now ask those who have a copy of this report with them to turn to page 11 of the same document. As I read this, getting along down toward Baltimore, my eyes were opened. I now call your attention to Table No. 4 in the Democratic majority report on this bill. The first thing I did when I came to Washington Tuesday morning—arriving at about midnight Monday night—was to try and find the author of these tables. I went to the Treasury Department, and the officials there repudiated them. I sent to the Statistical Bureau of the State Department, and they repudiated them. I sent to the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department, and they repudiated them. I finally found him, located just exactly where I should have expected him to be, in the room of the Ways and Means Committee. He acknowledged the authenticity of this table that I am going to read to you to show whether the Payne tariff bill is lower or higher than the Dingley law, whether the Republican Party did comply with its promises, if it made any, and whether the Democratic committee has not absolutely repudiated their own statements in the identical report in which they made them. Let me read it to you:

Value of imports entered for consumption, duties, and ad valorem rate of duty, with relation to articles carried by bill H. R. 4413, for the years ending June 30, 1905 and 1910.

[From Democratic report.]

Articles.	Years.	Value of dutiable imports entered for consumption.	Duties.	Ad valorem rate of duty.
				Per cent.
Agricultural implements	1910	$79,602	$12,189	15.31
	1905	13,876	2,775	20.00
Cotton bagging, sacks, burlaps, etc	1910	25,605,019	6,877,667	26.86
	1905	16,965,842	4,879,870	28.76
Cotton ties	1910	9,389	1,499	15.96
	1905	7,136	2,576	36.10
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc.	1910	1,319,622	97,325	7.38
	1905	437,347	146,182	33.42
Barbed and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc.	1910	1,825,088	514,410	28.18
	1905	1,041,230	293,913	28.22
Fresh and preserved meats	1910	736,165	159,863	21.71
	1905	477,755	114,476	23.96
Flour, cereals, and bread	1910	1,202,497	273,746	22.76
	1905	664,315	141,370	21.28
Lumber, laths, and shingles	1910	22,398,342	1,918,803	8.57
	1905	12,864,258	1,714,172	13.33
Sewing machines, and parts of	1910	76,964	23,089	30.00
	1905	(1)	(1)	(1)
Salt	1910	295,131	150,398	50.96
	1905	396,202	203,064	51.25

[1] Not separately reported.

Take the first item. The table is headed "Value of imports entered for consumption, duties and ad valorem rates of duty, with relation to articles carried by the bill H. R. 4413"—that is the bill we have under consideration, Mr. Chairman, and it takes up each schedule; I am going to take them up—"for the years ending June 30, 1905 and 1910"; 1905 was under the Dingley law and 1910 is under the Payne law. Take the first item—agricultural implements. Under the Dingley law the duty was 20 per cent, according to the Democratic authority, and it is right. Under the Payne law it is 15.31 per cent, the difference being 4.69 per cent ad valorem in favor of the Payne bill.

Take cotton bagging—the next item—sacks, burlaps, and so forth. The duty under the Dingley law was 28.76, by Democratic authority. Under the Payne law it is 26.86, making a difference of 1.90 in favor of the Payne bill.

Cotton ties, under the Dingley law, were 36.10 by Democratic authority. Under the Payne bill they are 15.96, the difference being 20.14 in favor of the Payne bill.

Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, and so forth, under the Dingley law, were 33.42. Under the Payne bill they are 7.38, the reduction being 26.04 under the Payne bill according to Democratic authority, and that is right.

Barbed wire and other fence wire, 28.22 under the Dingley law, 28.18 under the Payne law, a reduction of 0.04 of 1 per cent.

Fresh and preserved meats—I am taking every one of these schedules in this pending bill and giving you Democratic authority for it—fresh and preserved meats, 23.96 under the Dingley law; 21.71 under the Payne bill—a difference in favor of the Payne bill of 2.25.

Flour, cereals, and bread. Last fall I said in that very speech which I sent out to you, every one of you, that the agricultural schedule was raised under the Payne bill, being one of the four or five that were raised. I find the same thing stated under Democratic authority now; for in this schedule, flour, cereals, and bread, the percentage was 21.28 under the Dingley law and 22.76 under the Payne bill, or 1.48 higher under the Payne bill.

Lumber, laths, and shingles, 13.33 under the Dingley law, 8.57 under the Payne bill, or 4.76 in favor of the Payne bill.

"Sewing machines, and parts of," 45 per cent under the Dingley law, 30 per cent under the Payne bill, or 15 per cent in favor of the Payne bill.

Salt, 51.25 under the Dingley law, 50.96 under the Payne bill, or 0.29 in favor of the Payne bill.

So that every item but one in this bill which you are now putting forward as a reduction has had a previous reduction, and, figuring it all up, you will find that instead of 6.40, as I said six months ago and published to you, you now officially report the average reduction of the Payne bill at 6.38, within 0.02 of 1 per cent, or in almost exact accordance with the facts that you had placed before you a year ago; and yet you continue to repeat these statements and send them out to the people and to the press and the magazines of this country, and continue to discuss this question on the theory that the Republican Party raised the tariff instead of lowering it. Will you not accept your own authority, which you have furnished us in the report on this bill, and cease to make these statements in the future? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there is another feature about this: All through this report the idea is conveyed—and you have always endeavored to impress it upon the country—that a tariff is a tax always added to the cost of the goods. I will not take your time to read all of the statements, because I have much that I want to say to you. I have much that I think ought to be said to you. Let me read one or two of these extracts, and see whether I have drawn a correct inference:

By this measure agricultural tools and implements of every kind are placed on the free list in order to remove or prevent any possible discrimination against our farmers—

I will talk about that later—

in the price of these necessary articles, and to place them on an equal footing with their competitors elsewhere in the world.

Also:

As our population has increased, our exports of foodstuffs and food products have declined and imports increased; under these circumstances, duties on these articles have become a heavier burden on the people.

If that language means anything, it means that every duty that is laid on an article coming into the United States adds an equal amount to the cost of the domestic manufacture or to the price which the domestic buyer pays. So I have followed this proposition a little further, and I have thought I would see how much the Payne bill, in the reductions which you yourselves now acknowledge were made—has saved to the American public—and I have taken Table 2, on page 10, which gives the domestic consumption of each one of these things which you propose to put upon the free list, and have applied to those amounts the percentages by which you admit the Payne bill was reduced, with the following results: Now, understand me, this is the Democratic argument carried to its logical conclu-

sion. If the Democratic contention is good for anything in the report—which I deny—it is good in this showing:

Articles.	Consumption 1905 (Table 2, p. 10).	Reduction in Payne bill (Table 4, p. 11).	Annual saving to people on these 10 schedules by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority.
		Per cent.	
Agricultural implements	$90,637,110	4.69	$4,250,880
Bagging for cotton sacks, burlaps, etc	26,031,044	1.90	494,601
Cotton ties, hoop or band iron	12,639,953	20.14	2,545,686
Leather, boots, shoes, harness, saddles, saddlery, etc	493,005,263	26.04	128,358,568
Barbed wire and other fence wire, wire rods, strands, ropes, etc	113,027,205	.04	45,210
Fresh and preserved meats	614,895,219	2.25	13,835,142
Lumber, laths, and shingles	699,599,293	4.76	33,300,924
Sewing machines, and parts of	8,497,464	15	1,274,619
Salt	9,540,824	.29	27,618
Total	2,067,873,975		184,133,248
Flour and grist, cereals, and bread	665,041,533	[1] 1.48	
Total consumption	2,732,915,508		

[1] Increase in Payne bill (Table 4, p. 11).

Annual saving to the people on these 10 schedules by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority	$184,133,248
Annual increase of cost to the people on flour and grist, cereals, and bread by the Payne bill, on Democratic authority	9,842,614
Total saving	174,290,634

Or a reduction of 6.38 per cent ad valorem.

This is the Democratic showing now for the Payne bill.

Are we as Republicans not entitled to a retraction of all statements heretofore made about upward revision and repudiated pledges?

The Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee are now meeting by themselves in a locked room, safely guarded by watchmen at the doors and in the corridors, refusing not only public hearings, but declining even to talk in confidence to the members of the press, and doing precisely as their Republican predecessors have been charged with doing in every respect. I do not find any fault with it, but it was thrown at the Republican candidates for Congress in Connecticut by our governor and other speakers on the stump that we made the Payne bill in secrecy. What are you doing? Let it go out to the country that you are making your free-trade bill precisely as the Republican Ways and Means Committee made the Payne tariff bill, in secrecy in guarded rooms.

Mr. MANN. And without a hearing.

Mr. HILL. And without hearings that were asked for by us.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman concede that there are about 10,000 printed pages of hearings taken only two years ago?

Mr. HILL. Taken by the Republican Ways and Means Committee; and for the last two years they have been denounced on every stump in the country as prejudiced and unfair. You now confirm the Republican position in that respect as you have confirmed it by your statement in regard to the upward revision. You acknowledge the hearings were fair and impartial. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman from Connecticut admit that the basis of the secret conclave of the Republican predecessors was leveled at the idea that the protected interests conspired in secret with them to produce the rate they gave us? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I admit nothing of the kind, and the gentleman will not charge it. Every hearing was public, and I admit you are just as fair as we were and no fairer, but we were denounced for it through the whole campaign. The only difference is that we gave open public hearings for two and a half months and you gave none whatever. That is another mistake that was made during the campaign. In view of these facts and as the Ways and Means Committee are now desperately struggling to make a tariff on wool which will not be reflected in the necessarily high rates on the finished fabric and so be distasteful to the American people, I will temporarily withhold a statement I prepared for publication to be signed by the members of that committee at their convenience. Let me read it:

To the people of the United States:

We the undersigned, OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama; CHOICE B. RANDELL, of Texas; FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON, of New York; WILLIAM G. BRANTLEY, of Georgia; DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri; CLAUDE KITCHIN, of North Carolina; OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky; HENRY T. RAINEY, of Illinois; LINCOLN DIXON, of Indiana; WILLIAM HUGHES, of New Jersey; CORDELL HULL, of Tennessee; W. S. HAMMOND, of Minnesota; ANDREW J. PETERS, of Massachusetts; and A. MITCHELL PALMER, of Pennsylvania, having joined in a unanimous report in favor of H. R. 4413, and having with that report submitted Table No. 4, showing the respective ad valorem rate of duties with relation to articles carried by that bill for the year ending June 30, 1905, and the year ending June 30, 1910, and finding that such ad valorems show a reduction from the law of 1897 to the law of 1909, known as the Payne bill, on agricultural implements of 4.69 per cent, on bagging, etc., of 1.9 per cent, on cotton ties of 20.14 per cent, on leather, etc., of 26.04 per cent, on wire of 0.04 per cent, on fresh meat of 2.25 per cent, on lumber of 4.76 per cent, on sewing machines of 15 per cent, and on salt of 0.29 per cent, and an increase on flour, cereals, and bread of 1.48 per cent, making a net reduction under the Payne bill on these items of 6.38 per cent, hereby acknowledge that we have been mistaken in our estimate of the Payne bill from the time that it was passed by Congress until now, including the statements made on page 3 of said report, and admit to the people of this country that the campaign of last fall was made under this mistaken impression, and that we now are compelled by the document submitted by ourselves and approved by all of us, to admit our error, and will hereafter give due credit to the statements of the Republican Party of this country that the Payne bill as a whole was a substantial revision downward.

Do you not think they ought to do it? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will not the gentleman admit that many of the so-called reductions of the Payne-Aldrich bill were reductions only in name, and not in fact, because they left the rate still prohibitive?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; I do not admit anything. [Laughter.] I am making statements of my own and in my own way. Meanwhile, while the members of the committee are engaged in their arduous labors, I will hold this document for them to sign, and if there are any other repentant sinners on that side, who wish to get in early, an opportunity will be given now. Copies will be sent for their signatures to Gov. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Gov. Wilson, of New Jersey; Gov. Harmon, of Ohio; William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska; and Herman Ridder, of New York; and to the chairmen of both congressional committees, for publication in the next campaign textbooks of the two parties. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not mean by anything that I have said to claim that the Payne bill or the law as it now stands on the statute books has no mistakes in it. I do not mean even to claim that the reductions in rates of duty were made to the extent which I think the country expected, and such as I personally felt that the situation then justified. As the bill left the House of Representatives it was a most excellent measure, and if the conference report had come back to us for final adoption substantially on the lines of the original bill, I think the country would have accepted it with equanimity and a considerable degree of satisfaction, and, in my judgment, we would have carried the congressional elections last fall and the present tariff agitation would not have existed. But that is ancient history now. The question is, What is our present duty? Believing, as I sincerely do, that the Nation at large is in favor of a protective-tariff system fairly and equitably applied, I am in hearty sympathy with the President of the United States and the national platform of the Republican Party in the declaration, "that the true measure of protection is the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad," and I would subject every item and every schedule of the present tariff law to such a test at the hands of an impartial bipartisan——

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman pursues that rule to its logical conclusion, what is there that is going to induce the importation of anything into this country?

Mr. HILL. What is going to give you any revenue from the course that you are pursuing.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. HILL. And the gentleman has not answered mine [laughter]; and I would subject every item and every schedule of the present tariff law to such a test at the hands of an impartial bipartisan board of experts, and with such a report and after such a thorough and patient investigation, with the facts before us, I would correct any inaccuracies or injustice either to the producer—and there are some to the producers in the Payne bill—or to the consumer, that such an investigation might show.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had his attention called to the fact that the Tariff Board now in existence has made a report upon the amount of farm wages paid in Canada?

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; I have read the report thoroughly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. And that the Canadian board has made a similar report, and that they vary about 50 per cent.

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have read it thoroughly, and I have studied the Canadian Yearbook. But, using a slang phrase, "my eyes are fixed" on the reciprocity question, and there is no use of the gentleman saying anything about it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I am not talking about reciprocity. I am talking about a Tariff Board that is 50 per cent away from the truth.

Mr. HILL. This is the policy, I will say to my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, pursued by our great commercial rivals in Europe——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not answer my question. I asked him if he thinks that a Tariff Board which has already made one report that is 50 per cent away from the truth could be of very much value to anybody in any other report it might make.

Mr. HILL. The logical inference of the gentleman's question is that there can be no basis on which a tariff is laid except guesswork, and I do not believe——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Then what good will a Tariff Board do you?

Mr. HILL. I want them to do the work and ascertain the facts. This is the policy pursued by our great commerical rivals, and in my judgment it is one which we might well follow, and thus save ourselves from recurring periods of industrial stagnation such as we are now experiencing, alternating with prosperity or panic. So much for that.

I propose now, Mr. Chairman, to take up the bill itself and try to analyze it and discuss it as well as I can. It is a bill to place on the free list certain agricultural implements, cotton bagging, and so forth. There are in the world to-day three kinds of revenue systems—one English free trade, one a tariff for revenue, and one a protective system. English free trade means high duties on luxuries, but everything else free. A tariff for revenue only means high duties on luxuries and everything else taxed at the lowest possible point which will give sufficient revenue to maintain the Government. A protective tariff, like both of the other systems, means a high tax on luxuries, a duty on imported competing articles equaling the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, and everything else free.

I think in the last session of Congress the gentleman who now honors the House of Representatives and the American people by occupying the Speaker's chair made a speech on this floor in which he said that the Democratic policy would be to have a tariff on everything, and then in a low voice added, "There will be no free list, or a very small one, if any." Am I right about that? "No free list, or a very small one, if any." And yet the Democratic Party starts out with a policy which puts $2,700,000,000 of the annual consumption of the American people on the free list in one bill. "No free list, but a very small one, if any."

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. That is the prelude to the play.

Mr. HILL. I want to know in which classification this bill comes, whether in English free trade, tariff for revenue, or under the protective-tariff system? It is a hybrid. It does not bear classification with any existing system in the world. This bill has none of these policies, and it is distinctly announced on this floor—oh, I regret it, and I think the American people will regret it—it is distinctly announced on this floor as the exercise of the taxing power of the Government in the interest of a class. It puts finished products on the free list and leaves duties on the raw materials from which they are made. Some of the manufacturers of Connecticut, as I happen to know, voted the Democratic ticket last fall under the assurance, freely given by the Democratic speakers throughout that State, that if the Democratic ticket was elected, and the Democrats were put in control of the House of Representatives, they would have free raw materials and the duties maintained on their finished products. I think they will wake up in surprise some fine morning, if this bill ever passes, when they find they have dutiable raw materials and free finished products. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But I stand here for the men and women who work in the factories of Connecticut as well as for the men who own them. [Applause on the Republican side.] This bill puts finished products on the free list and leaves the duty on the raw materials from which they are made. It is intended to hit the trusts, and it is openly announced so here, and the names of the various trusts are detailed. Gentlemen will wake up to the fact that this bill helps the trusts instead of hurting them.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Which one?

Mr. HILL. I will show you before I get through. You will not have any occasion to plead ignorance on that subject. It is intended to hit the trusts and helps them by giving them free finished or unfinished parts of their finished products, a thing that was never done before in the history of American tariff legislation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Specify one of the things you are talking about.

Mr. HILL. I will when I get to it. I am making this speech in my own way.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. All right.

Mr. HILL. In one case it will be destructive of revenue and in the other will change our factories to mere shops for the assembling of the products of foreign factories. If I had my way, I would offer an amendment immediately after the opening clause of the bill.

Where is the man on this floor or elsewhere that can say that this amendment is not fair and right and just to the American people? Yet you will vote it down. You have already announced your intention to vote down every amendment. It would be this:

On page 1, at the end of line 5, insert:

"*Provided*, That all articles mentioned in this act, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act."

Now, is not that fair? Is not that right? If we are going to surrender to Europe a market of 90,000,000 people with an annual consumption of twenty-seven hundred million dollars on the things named in this bill, is it not fair that Europe should give us a corresponding privilege there, or that we should have some consideration for it?

What about revenues under this bill? Well, at the Treasury a few days ago I was handed a copy of a statement prepared for the press, in which it showed that there would be a loss of revenue by this bill of $10,052,942.35, about 18 per cent on the entire volume of importations covered by this bill that we are going to throw away. Is that right?

Our Democratic friends have tried to whittle that down before the country. They started in with the idea that we were going to lose only a million dollars revenue by it. Then they got up to $10,000,000. Then they subtracted one and one-half million dollars, which would be covered by the Canadian reciprocity. Gentlemen, I tell you that forty or fifty or sixty million dollars will not cover the loss of revenue to the Government if you pass this bill.

If your theory is correct that large importations of these articles are coming in, what about the duties paid on the raw materials used in the manufacture of like articles which are now being made here? Will not those duties also go glimmering if you pass this bill? And how about finished and unfinished parts and repair parts, which are to be free? The Treasury Department, in making this statement, very wisely and very prudently and very cautiously submitted this observation:

While there are certain approximations and certain figures that can not definitely be obtained, the tables indicate the following.

Why did they say that? Because they do not know what is coming in under your bill, and nobody knows. There is not a man on this floor can answer the question, What will come in under this first item? And I am going to ask you very soon. If free, more will be imported, and duties will be lost on the materials entering into those articles formerly made here. No man can tell what the loss of revenue will be by this bill.

Now, let us take up the first item of the bill—

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers—

That is a new word not found in the old law—

Harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines, and cotton gins.

The Dingley law stopped there, and the Wilson law stopped there, and the McKinley law stopped there. In fact, in the McKinley law agricultural implements were not mentioned at all. They came in under the blanket clause, I believe, at 45 per cent.

What did Mr. Wilson, chairman of the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means at that time, do? That committee was composed of good men. I will read you their names. You may have forgotten them. I want to tell you who they were and what they did on this particular question. The Committee on Ways and Means of that Congress consisted of William L. Wilson, of West Virginia; Benton McMillin, of Tennessee; Henry G. Turner, of Georgia, a splendid man and a great lawyer; Alexander B. Montgomery, of Kentucky; Justin R. Whit-

ing, of Michigan; W. Bourke Cockran, of New York; Moses T. Stevens, of Massachusetts; William J. Bryan, of Nebraska; William D. Bynum, of Indiana; Clifton R. Breckinridge, of Arkansas; John C. Tarsney, of Missouri; Thomas B. Reed, of Maine; SERENO E. PAYNE, of New York; Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan; JOHN DALZELL, of Pennsylvania; Albert J. Hopkins, of Illinois; and John H. Gear, of Iowa. What did they do? They stopped there, and then they added this clause:

Provided, That all articles mentioned in this paragraph, if imported from a country which lays an import duty on like articles imported from the United States, shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act.

That duty was 45 per cent. A Democratic Congress did that. A Democratic Ways and Means Committee did that under the leadership of William L. Wilson and during the administration of your patron saint and greatest President, Grover Cleveland. They provided that those articles "shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of this act."

What happened then? Then came on the Dingley law, and in that law Mr. Dingley made a provision that reduced the duties on agricultural machinery from 45 per cent, with a possible free list, down to 20 per cent. What did the gentleman from New York, the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, and his associates on the committee do? They cut that duty from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, and provided that agricultural implements should be free, specifying what they were, coming from any country which would admit our agricultural implements free. It was done at the request of the manufacturers of agricultural implements. You propose to give the market away without any consideration and without knowing what, under the terms of this section, you are giving away. I do not say it disrespectfully, but no man can possibly know. You are giving it away for nothing. Now, let us see what it is:

Farm wagons and farm carts.

What are they? An oxcart in Maine; a prairie schooner covered with canvas duck, drawn by a six-mule team, out in Arizona. There are on the farms to-day in Kansas, and I am glad of it, auto trucks. Every conceivable thing in the way of a wheeled vehicle can come in under that provision. That is not all. That is trivial compared to the language which follows:

And all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not.

That is broad enough, is it not? It sweeps every schedule. It does away with the provision of the law that a general clause is not effective where an article is specifically named, and it says here that everything in the whole range of tariff duties, among 4,000 items, that can be construed as an agricultural implement, is included; and your committee, in making their report, add the words "agricultural tools," so that they get them all in—tools and implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Could it be made broader? This bill ought to be recommitted to the committee for further enlightenment on that section alone, without reference to anything else in it, in justice to the American people. Why should we not have reciprocal free trade if we are going to have free trade at all?

We passed a tariff bill two years ago, and one of the principal features of it was a maximum and minimum rate. Why did not you fix the free list as the minimum and let the President negotiate with the other countries of the world for special advantages to American commerce in consideration of it? But no, you could not do that. In the eagerness to get to an absolutely free basis you used language in the first three lines which absolutely sweeps out of existence, so far as these items are concerned, the maximum system adopted in the Payne tariff bill. You say no duties shall be charged on these things. Could you not trust the present administration? Could you not trust the administration which you hope to have two years from now, but which you will never get with this policy, gentlemen? Make no mistake about that. [Applause on the Republican side.] Could not you trust such an administration to negotiate for the best interests of the American people and offer to make your free list the minimum, with the possibilities of negotiation by the administration for privileges and for trade relations which now they are wholly unable to get?

Finished and unfinished parts. A little while ago a gentleman asked me about the question of finished parts. A day or two ago I went down town to an agricultural machinery store. I wanted to know what this bill covered. I had repeatedly asked Members of the House on both sides what this language included, and no one seemed to know.

Agricultural implements of every kind and description, finished or unfinished, whether specifically mentioned herein or not.

I went into one store and asked for the International Harvester Co.'s catalogue. They said they had not got it; but they handed me out one after another these nine different pamphlets which I have here, and they had a lot more. I said I had as many as I wanted to carry. I have here the catalogue of the Bucher & Gibbs Plow Co. Look at it, gentlemen. Look at the different forms of manufacture of every kind and character. If I was a plow manufacturer and there was a duty of $2.50 a ton on pig iron, as there is now, and I wanted to escape that duty, I would send to Belgium or to England or to Germany and make a contract to have iron run directly from the blast furnace into the form of plowshares instead of pig iron, and import 10,000 tons of plowshares free of duty, under that clause "agricultural implements or parts thereof," and use them for what I saw fit when I got them here.

There would be no way to stop it, and nobody in the United States could stop its being done. [Applause on the Republican side.] "Parts of implements." Here are plows, a whole book full of cuts, and springs and wires and everything entering into the construction of plows and harrows. Here are corn planters, buggy planters. You can buy the wheels in Europe and put them together here. I say to the gentleman, the Speaker of this House, that with this bill in operation the zinc industry in Missouri will go a glimmering under the provisions for free finished and unfinished parts. There is not a mowing machine, a harvesting machine, there is not an auto cart, but that has steel antifriction ball bearings or antifriction journal boxes, the metallic parts of which are made of zinc, antimony, or lead. I can take the cast-iron journal boxes in the rough, made in Europe, run Babbitt metal into them, and the duties which I would escape under this bill of $42.50 a ton on lead, $27.50 a ton on zinc, $30 per ton on antimony, and $16 per ton on iron castings would more than pay for the cost of the work and the freight besides for getting them over here. This is only a single illustration of countless other things which can be done under that clause of the bill. Go and tell that, you men of Missouri, to your constituents who produce lead, zinc, and antimony.

And so I might go through with all these various items.

Now, there are gentlemen on the floor from Texas. All through these items are wool parts; take the linings to saddles and harness, white serge and the wool parts, dutiable at 142 per cent. These can be imported free of duty under the provisions of this bill. Where are your Texas men who want high duties on wool under the new Democratic program? Are you going to vote for it? Not only that, but your harnesses and horse blankets, and so on. Here is spraying machinery. I said to an official in the Treasury Department this morning, "Is that admitted as an agricultural implement under the bill?" He said, "It is a matter of doubt." I said, "You can not raise potatoes without it." He said, "It might be construed as a special instrument." I said, "You could not raise fruit without it; we are spraying all the old apple trees in New England, and we have to have the spraying machine in order to bring them back to life again." California fruit farms must have spraying machines. You have got to admit every one of them under the terms of this bill.

Now, here is the McCormick reaper. There is not a schedule in the tariff bill, not one, but that will be absolutely smashed to pieces under this privilege of admitting free finished and unfinished parts of these and like articles.

And so I might go on. And then we come to the International Harvester Co. Now, I am not in sympathy with the International Harvester Co. or any other trust. I do not believe that J. P. Morgan wants any sympathy from me. I did not have the committee report to read last Monday night, but I read the newspaper coming down from Connecticut, and in it I found the annual report of the International Harvester Co. for 1910. Their preferred capital stock is $80,000,000, common stock $60,000,000. They earned last year $21,000,000 net income. They paid a dividend on the common stock of $3,200,000; on the preferred stock of $4,200,000. They had a surplus of $7,300,000 and undivided profits this year, after paying dividends, of $8,684,000. Total surplus was $16,000,000. They are not objects of sympathy. They do not ask it. They came before us, all these manufacturers two years ago, and they said frankly, "We are perfectly willing that you should put these specified articles on the free list and we will take our chances with the rest of the world—that will give us an equal chance."

Now, you will not tell that to your farmers in the South and West; you will not tell them that the Payne bill already does this, but it does do it. You want them to think this is a new proposition, a new discovery which you have made. You are two years behind the times and you always are. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, the International Co. did

$100,000,000 worth of trade last year. How was that trade divided up?

It was divided up in this way. On harvesting machinery, tillage implements, and so forth, United States trade, $37,000,000; foreign trade, $25,000,000; total, $62,000,000. Wagons, spreaders, gasoline engines, and so forth—notice what you are getting into, gasoline engines and parts thereof free as agricultural implements—United States, eighteen millions; foreign trade, eight millions; miscellaneous goods, fibers, and so forth, ten millions. Now, gentlemen, do you know what you have done? Under that provision of finished or unfinished parts you have given them at least $10,000,000 a year—at least that. Take agricultural implements. How many reapers and binders in the whole, as a complete machine, are going to be imported into the United States, if they are absolutely free? Not one. The freight would stop it. What have you done? They have got their factories on the other side, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] told us the other day, in three or four European countries. Will they move over there and send the finished machines here? No; because they are largely made of lumber, which they can get cheaper here than they can in Europe.

But they will get the finished metallic parts over there from their own factories on the other side and make an assembling shop here, and get every penny of duty on those things remitted under the terms of your bill. You talk about helping the farmer! Do you suppose you will get those agricultural implements one single cent cheaper because of this? Do you not know they can make those implements cheaper by getting the parts made on the other side and using the lumber here? It is not only so with agricultural implements. Any manufacturer would select and make up the things at home from material which he could get at the best advantage at home, and he would import the finished parts made from materials which he could get at the best advantage abroad, and so make simply an assembling shop of the United States. The remark that I made when I came in, that the room as it then looked reminded me of the way an American workshop would appear by and by, was justified by the fact that under this policy experienced machinists and mechanics will be looking in vain for work, while men who are simply assemblers will be left in the almost deserted shops under your policy. You can not get away from that proposition. It is human nature to do it, and, of course, they will do it.

Now, take up patented articles. Do you expect the farmer is going to buy any patented agricultural machinery any cheaper? But the manufacturer can make it cheaper, and he will take the profit. So that instead of contributing to the benefit of the farmer by your proposition, you are directly and absolutely putting from 10 to 15 per cent of the cost of production of these articles right into the pockets of the trusts, and they do not need it. It is a work of supererogation in most cases. They are getting along pretty well as they are. Why should a Democratic majority come in here and build up their business and make additional profits for them under these circumstances, under the plea that they are going to help the farmer? On all patented articles this means reduced cost to the producer, less revenue to the Government, and the same price to the consumer. I think the time is coming, and it may be somewhat radical for me to say it, but I think the time is coming in this country when the United States in granting a monopoly under a patent will reserve to itself in some way the right to determine at any time whether the price at which the product is sold is reasonable or not.

Now, under this first schedule how much do we consume? In all these figures I give you Democratic authority, as I have from the beginning. We consume $90,000,000 worth annually. What are we giving away? England, Germany, and France are our only competitors. We have free trade with England now in plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horserakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, and cotton gins. But this bill opens our market to the whole world, not only on these things, but on every conceivable kind of agricultural tools and implements, such as scythes, hoes, shovels, axes, pruning knives, traction engines, and all kinds of farm machinery. The market of Great Britain is open and free to-day to us on all of these things. Not so with Germany and France. What do they charge us? To get into Germany our manufacturers pay on cultivators, potato diggers and harrows, 12 per cent duty; on plows, 9 per cent; on forks for hay and manure, and so forth, 4 per cent; on motor-driven plows and reaper machinery, 6 per cent; on thrashing machines, 7 per cent; on other agricultural machines, 12 per cent; on wagons and carts, 6 per cent; and on all of them alike, 11 per cent to get into France, and you say come over and take this magnificent market of 92,000,000 of people and keep your doors closed to us. That is your Democratic policy.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman's whole argument seems to be directed in the interest of the American manufacturer. He pays no attention to the consumer. Our bill is designed for the relief of the American consumer.

Mr. HILL. Not at all; it is the other way. I am complaining that by your legislation your are benefiting the trusts and not helping the consumer. You will not benefit the farmer, and I am complaining that you will deprive the United States Government of needed revenues, and I regret that the gentleman has not yet succeeded—I regret on my own part—in getting hold of the drift and tendency of my argument. [Applause on the Republican side.] So much for the market of the world given free on agricultural implements. Let us take up the next proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may wish to use.

Mr. HILL. I will take but little time; I am going through it hurriedly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit a question here?

Mr. HILL. At any time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. How will it help any trust to give free the American market for the machinery of which you speak?

Mr. HILL. It is helping the trusts——

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Which trust?

Mr. HILL. We give them the privilege of importing finished or unfinished parts made by the cheaper labor of Europe, and I have seen it, and will tell you of it if I have the time, not from statistics, not from consular tables, but from my own personal observation and experience. You allow them to bring them in here free, and so lessen the revenues, and yet have no possible way by which the price to the consumer is to be lessened, especially on patented articles. [Applause on the Republican side.] My friends, you have a good deal to think about when you tackle 4,000 items in a tariff bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Ask him another question.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] suggests that I ask you one more question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I asked the gentleman a while ago how permitting the American consumer to have a free market in machinery will help any trust, and you have not explained that to me; but I will ask the gentleman what particular trust will be benefited by allowing——

Mr. HILL. And I have said already, the International Harvester Co., which makes their machines on the other side. They can import them, if profitable, complete; that is, made up. You give them the privilege of importing such parts as they can make cheaper over there, such parts as cost them more here, put them together, and you have no way in the world of compelling them to sell their product cheaper to the American farmer. Now, will you help or hurt them?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say the International Harvester Co. has a factory on the other side?

Mr. HILL. I stated that the gentleman from Illinois the other day named three or four countries in which they had their factories.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why have they taken their money and labor from this country when they can do better here, or——

Mr. HILL. They use their factories there now to supply the foreign markets. You want them to use them to bring their finished and unfinished products over here. We want the work done in American workshops.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why do not they stay here and make their machinery——

Mr. HILL. I do not care to discuss the question with the gentleman any further, as I do not seem to be able to make it clear to him; but I want to say this to the gentleman, that there is a vast difference between criticizing, as you have been doing for 16 years, and assuming the responsibility, as you have got to do now. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, the grave error that the gentleman assumes does not still answer the question I put

to him, and that is, why it is that an American monopoly finds it more profitable to go abroad and to take labor abroad than to stay here?

Mr. HILL. If I have not answered the question, I can not answer, and I shall have to ask the gentleman not to interrupt me further on that point.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Tell it over to him. Tell him it is labor, among other things. Tell it to him, so that he will understand that.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the gentleman does not want to be interrupted, I beg his pardon.

Mr. HILL. I do not mind being interrupted, but I do not like to be asked the same question two or three times.

The next schedule is:

Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed, in whole or in part, of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares—

If they had stopped there it would have been all right and the articles to be imported would have been fairly well defined and restricted. But the whole world is thrown open, for it says further:

Or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products.

What are they? There is not a fiber, there is not a fabric, there is not a material made on earth but that can be brought into the ports of the United States under that language free of duty. It is absolutely all-embracing, as the language is in the first section under the agricultural-implement bill. Now, there was not any necessity for your doing that, not the slightest.

There is a man in this House on the Democratic side who has made a study of this bagging question, and I am sorry he is not here, for he could have given you an intelligent proposition to refer to this House. I refer to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], who is entitled to great credit on the Democratic side, and ought to receive it from his constituents, for his earnest, faithful, intelligent effort to get free cotton bagging for them. [Applause.] But he has done it in a straightforward way. He has not put in a proposition that takes in the whole world. This is the amendment he offered to the Payne tariff bill a few years ago:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, to and including line 9, strike out the whole paragraph and insert.

"Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and similar fabrics, suitable for covering cotton, composed of single yarns made of jute or jute butts or hemp, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, not exceeding 16 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, and weighing not less than 15 ounces per square yard."

Any man knows what that means. No man knows what this means in this bill. Why do you not follow the intelligent advice of men on your side who have given study to these questions in the years gone by? You put an all-embracing proviso in there that will take in every foundation fabric for every piece of oilcloth that is made in the United States and allow the trust to bring it in.

You will allow every Fertilizer Trust to bring in bags under that provision free. Do you believe the farmers of the South will get fertilizer one cent cheaper because of the little bit of duty that is taken off those bags? Do you suppose the United States Steel Trust, the largest producer of cement in the United States, will concede a fraction of a cent because of the duty being taken off bagging in which they sell the cement? The farmer does not buy the bag at all. He sends the bag back again, and every cent of rebate of duty will go into the cash boxes of these trusts.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Always.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman says "Always." The custom of trade enters into and controls these things. You have taken these duties off, and in every single case there the trust will get the benefit of it and the farmers not a single cent.

This thing goes further than you seem to have foreseen. The United States Steel Co. does not need any sympathy from the Democratic Party. The Fertilizer Trust does not need any sympathy from the Democratic Party. And yet you are forcing upon them a cheaper article for them to use—no, not a cheaper article, but the same article at a less cost—under the plea that you are giving it to the farmer, when the farmer will never know it. Now, there are three trusts that I have told you are going to be benefited by this proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, you have brought in free bagging that covers the oriental rugs that cost hundreds and hundreds of dollars apiece. Is this for the benefit of the farmers? Every yard of carpet that comes into the United States will come in with its covering free, and I do not know but that you have repealed section 18 of the administrative act, which provides that the covering on any article coming into the United States on an ad valorem basis, or on any article on which the duty is fixed by reason of value in any way, shall be dutiable. Have you thought about it? If you are going to make bags free to the farmer, why do you not make free cartons, bottles, crates, boxes, casks, barrels, hogsheads, jars, and containers of every kind which are referred to in section 18? That section provides that they shall be dutiable on ad valorem importations. Does your provision here repeal that, or does it not? If it does, you have swept millions out of the Treasury of the United States in the loss of revenue in order to get $700,000 to give to the southern cotton growers free cotton bagging. Nobody can tell what is lost.

You have gone at this thing apparently in a hurry to get this bill in here. I can not account for it in any other way. Why, the Wilson bill had this provision in regard to cotton bagging—not as clear as the amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT, but still clear enough so that you could determine what it was that was to be free under the law—"bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar materials suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, flax, jute, or jute butts," limited by the restriction of the material. But you say, "any material suitable for covering"; not only cotton, but any other agricultural product of any kind or character—potatoes, apples, grapes, or anything; anything that you see fit to put in a bag.

Now, gentlemen, I submit to you, in view of the necessities of the Treasury of the United States, that the language of neither of these schedules is wise legislation, and on either proposition the bill ought to be recommitted to the committee for further consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The consumption of the United States of the articles named in this clause is $26,000,000. Germany charges us 18 per cent on these things for taking them in there. France charges us 21 per cent. You propose to let them in here for nothing. Marvelous generosity!

Let us take the next item:

Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products.

Is a rose an agricultural product? Are violets agricultural products? Is the wire that surrounds your buttonhole bouquet to come in free? Who is going to draw the line? Men get their living in my country by raising those things, just as they do in the West by raising wheat and corn. Who is going to draw the line? This paragraph takes in every form of wire. I appeal to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] if this and the next succeeding section do not take in every form of wire, even wire rope, under the provisions of this bill, and every dollar of duties on those things the Treasury will lose.

Now, I will admit—I suppose all my colleagues will not agree with me in what I am going to say now—that the southern farmer has just as good a right to a free cotton tie as the northern farmer has to free binding twine. I will admit that neither ought to be free. We ought not to apply tariff rates by favoritism. I hope the time for that sort of thing has gone by and that it will never be done again; and as I said before, I regret from the bottom of my heart that the Democratic Party, in view of its criticisms of our action with regard to binding twine in the past, has now fallen from its high estate and got down to administering tariffs as a matter of privilege. It ought not to be done by anybody.

On this item the home consumption is $12,639,953, and Germany charges us on wire 14 per cent to get into her ports and on barbed wire [illegible] per cent, and we are to give our market to them for nothing.

Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight, of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather.

Does that last clause refer to the sets or does it refer to the parts? Are saddlery hardware, buckles, trace chains, and all of those things to come in free? No man can say. No man in the Treasury Department will construe that language.

Harness is to be brought in whole. It can be brought in in sets or in parts, composed wholly or in chief value of leather. Is the part to be in chief value of leather, or the whole harness? Is saddlery hardware to come in free also?

And leather—

Now, gentlemen, pay attention to this—

And leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Now, every hat manufacturer in my district will hold up his hands in glee at that proposition. Why? Because he can take

the sweat leather that goes into the hat and bring it in free. But there are men in my district who buy the skins, who finish them, or pay a duty of 15 per cent on the dressed skin, and who cut them up into sweat leathers and bag linings for the bags that the ladies carry in their hands. They do that work and that only, and this proposition will absolutely exterminate every one of them in the United States, and you know it. A leather duty of 15 per cent and the finished article coming in free. Why, there is not a rubber belt on an agricultural machine or engine but what will come in free as a finished part. There is not a leather belt, there is not a single item of the metal schedule from one end to the other but what will come in free as finished or unfinished parts.

Calfskin shoes.

Finished calfskins are dutiable at 15 per cent, shoes are to be free. Is that wise legislation? Now, stop and think of it just a minute. Just think of the consideration that must have been given to this bill to bring about this result. I am not saying that the consideration was unintelligent. I am simply saying that these gentlemen, able, skillful, wise, and good legislators, have not taken time enough to perfect this bill and put it before Congress for the considerate action of Congress, and it ought to go back to the committee, and every single schedule that I have mentioned ought to be reconstructed and rewritten.

Take a saddle. Do you stop to think that I can bring in a saddle here free, and yet the lining is dutiable at 142 per cent. You think it is made of leather. Most of them are made of pigskin. Pigskin is dutiable at 15 per cent. Saddle trees are dutiable at 35 per cent. The Payne bill cut saddlery down to 20 per cent, all the manufacturers could possibly stand. They said they could not go lower without going out of business. It went from 45 per cent down to 20 per cent in the Payne bill. You now say practically that we will wipe out the industry and turn it over to England.

Saddle trees, 35 per cent duty, and the finished product to be free. Where do you suppose the American industry is coming out under these circumstances? Two and three-quarter billion dollars of production annually affected by such legislation as that. We had a consumption in the United States on this schedule alone last year, or in 1905, according to the Democratic authority, of $493,000,000. What do you suppose it costs us to get into foreign markets? Oh, but you say we can make shoes and saddles and harnesses and sell them all over the world. Yes; I have seen them all over the world. The last time I saw them was in Belgrade and in Cologne. I have seen American shoes in foreign shop windows, and right alongside, shoes of American pattern of foreign make, and alongside of both other shoes of foreign style and manufacture, and the American shoe has sold in every case for 50 cents more a pair than any other. They were worth it. They are works of art compared with shoes made anywhere else in the wide world. They bring the money. You say it is because of the activity, because of the energy, because of the determination of the American manufacturers to carry their products to the ends of the earth, that they can do it cheaper. They do not; they get a higher price almost invariably. You do not see any cheap shoes exported. They are high-class, first-class shoes, works of art as compared with those of England, Germany, or France.

Now, what do our shoe manufacturers pay to get in there? You say they will go in for nothing. Oh, no; for Germany says that you shall pay 2 per cent on cut uppers, 12 per cent on shoes, 6 per cent on sole leather, 3 per cent on bovine leather, 5 per cent on harness, and 5 per cent on saddlery leather.

What about France? France says you shall pay 8 per cent to get in on uppers. You will not get in your soles; they will be worn out. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLMSTED. They will be walking on their uppers. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Saddlery and harness, 11 per cent, and yet you propose to give to the foreigner our market of 90,000,000 of people for nothing.

Now, I think I can safely speak about some of these industries. The shoe industry is an industry of New England. It is almost a crime for a man to be from New England on this floor, judging by the denunciation I have heard of the New England manufacturers. But the shoe industry is not a Connecticut industry. There are about nine shoe shops manufacturing shoes in Connecticut, with a half a million dollars invested. Nine shops out of 1,316 in the whole country, but I speak for an American industry anywhere [applause on the Republican side], just as much for the International Harvester Co. in Illinois as I would for an industry in my own congressional district. I stand for the protection of American labor and the equalization of cost between this and competing countries.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. What about reasonable profits?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have answered that 50 times within the last 18 months. The gentleman from New York knows the answer just as well and probably better than I do myself, and what is the use in taking up time by answering it again?

Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fences, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples.

Dutiable raw materials, free finished products, imports not governed by styles or fashion, but a world-wide product.

Our consumption for last year, or 1905, according to the Democratic figures, was $113,000,000. What are the duties on these articles which the American manufacturer will have to pay to get into the other countries? It is well to figure the cost of this change as we go along. This is a great revolution that is impending. Wire, 14 per cent, and barbed wire, 22 per cent; that is what it costs us to get into Germany.

Now, take the next schedule—beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds. If it stopped there, I would like to vote with you.

I have been in favor of free meats for years. I am in favor of free fresh meat now. You will not let me vote on a separate schedule in this bill. You say I have got to take all these things, which will demoralize the revenue system of the United States, in order to get a desirable thing; but this schedule is just as unfortunate as any of it, taking it altogether. Let me read the rest of it:

Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats.

Do you know how much good that is going to do the farmer? Why, I see my friend from Texas here. A few days ago I got a circular from the Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, and their bitterest complaint is that the United States Government will not enforce the entry of our cattle and meats under any terms—not free—into the countries of Europe. Do you know, gentlemen, you can not take cattle from this country and send them to Europe? The only country that will receive them is England. I am speaking now of France and Germany, and perhaps I ought not to say that England is the only country in Europe; but England will receive them on condition that they are slaughtered at the port of entry. France and Germany will not let them in at all. What do you gain for your farmers in giving them free meats, pickled and preserved in any manner, as well as free fresh meat? Why did you not let the President use this clause to make negotiations with Germany and France and let our meats in there? Why did you not? You can not take canned meat into Germany under any conditions, as I understand it. I did not know but there might be some doubt about that, and so I went down to the Treasury Department and consulted them, and I will tell you what they told me.

First, no cattle, except into England. In the case of Germany, as in the case of France, there is a peculiar prohibition of fresh meat. You can not take fresh meat from the United States into France and Germany unless the viscera accompanies the carcass, and you know that is impossible, going from this country. It can not be done. Why do you not let the farmer get a market for his products in consideration for the one thrown open here?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to know how in the world the gentleman expects keeping meat on the free list or canned meat off the free list to help Germany. Does Germany ever import any meat into this country?

Mr. HILL. Oh, if the gentleman had studied the question of preferential tariffs between Great Britain and her colonies, he would have found this, that she could not get from some of her colonies preferential rates, because she had nothing to give in exchange for that, being on a free-trade basis. We put ourselves on a free-trade basis, and what have we to give?

Mr. HARDY. Does putting meat on a free-trade basis affect Germany?

Mr. HILL. Why, certainly, Germany will not admit our canned meat under any circumstances, and we admit hers under this proposition free. But Germany has many other things which she desires to send here.

Mr. HARDY. Has Germany got meat enough to export?

Mr. HILL. Oh, Germany buys meat and preserves it and cans it and sends it away, just as I saw Denmark doing, buying butter from all the world and sending it back again to all the world; just as I know prunes are shipped from California to France, prepared and bottled and sent back here and sold

as French prunes. That thing is going on all of the time. Why should not we have a fair chance? Why should we surrender everything to them and demand nothing from them? The home consumption under this schedule is $614,895,219, according to Democratic authority. As my time is running out, I will publish with my remarks the duties of Germany and France on all of the items referred to in the bill specifically. Let us go now to the next schedule. If I am not much mistaken, you gentlemen from the Northwest raise durum wheat up there, especially adapted to the making of vermicelli and macaroni, and we ship both the wheat and flour to Italy and Italy ships back to us about 80,000,000 pounds of the manufactured product a year. Why should we not make that macaroni and vermicelli and send it out to all the world? This bill proposes to take all prepared cereal foods and admit them free.

Now, then, does Italy and Germany do that in fair competition? Not at all. Those Governments say to their manufacturers, "We will rebate all your duties that you pay on this American wheat coming in here when it is exported again." Is that all? No; they rebate to an extent and in such a way as to practically offer a bounty besides to get it exported into American markets, and the Democratic Party of the United States proposes to join hands with Germany and Italy in that sort of business, and by giving them a free market here help them to pay a bounty to have American farmers' products prepared and made into cereal foods on the other side of the ocean and shipped back here and sold to our own people. I want that work done here, or I want the markets open and free to both alike. I can not vote for this kind of legislation, gentlemen.

"Prepared cereal foods." What does that mean? What are prepared cereal foods? They are dutiable at 26 per cent in Germany, 45 per cent in France, and to be free in the United States. Ninety millions of people giving away their market without any equivalent concession. Our annual consumption under this schedule is $665,041,533. Take the next item, of lumber. I am in favor of free lumber. Why do not you give it to us in this bill? You have not. Let me read it:

Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed—

Now, that is the language of the old law practically—

except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods.

Why do you include shingles and laths? Because they are not in the general language of the present law, and you wanted to bring them in. Why did you not put in clapboards, which the farmer has to have on his house? The American farmer is able to have clapboards on his house. Why did you leave that off? Why did you not put in pickets and palings? The American farmer and workman is able to put pickets and palings around his home and the mechanic to fence in his little cottage. Why did you gentlemen not put those in there? You say you have given them free lumber, but you have not in this bill, not by any manner of means. Do you know it costs more to retie a railroad than to rerail it, taking one year after another? Why did you not give the railroads of this country that if you are in favor of cheaper transportation for the farmer? You said you were going to give them free lumber. You have not done it. This bill ought to go back to the Committee on Ways and Means for reconsideration on every single schedule. [Applause on the Republican side.] We consume $600,000,000 worth of that material in a single year. Now, I do not expect we are going to get much imported from France or Germany.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is not siding lumber and flooring about the most expensive lumber that goes into the ordinary farmer's house?

Mr. HILL. Except inside trimming. It is more of an item than shingles and more than laths, and ties are more of an item to railroads than the steel rails are.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In an ordinary house the trimming is not so expensive.

Mr. HILL. I had heard that statement made in regard to railroad ties, and in order to ascertain positively about it I called up the Southern Railway Co. down here and asked that question, and it is just the same down South as it is up North. Why did you not put them on the free list so as to help out with cheaper transportation?

Now, as to sewing machines. The Singer Sewing Machine Co. does not need any sympathy from Congress. They have a factory in Glasgow, employing 12,000 people there, making sewing machines to-day. They also have factories in the United States. I fancy that they can make the ordinary family sewing machine, with the cabinet case and all, cheaper than anybody else in the world, but I do not know positively.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] knows that we discussed making sewing machines free two years ago, and we did not do it because we thought they would make them over there and ship them over here. It would take away the work from American workmen. You can do it, and it will not hurt the company one particle. They can do as the International Harvester people can and probably would do. They can have the cabinet cases—and I am speaking about what I know of their methods—made here and the metallic work on the other side, ship it over here by the ton in finished and unfinished parts, and our men will lose the work and the company will make more money than they did before. And you are putting them on the free list with the hope of helping the farmer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You are overlooking the theory on which this bill is written. We have not written it from the gentleman's standpoint of the manufacturer. What we have written here is an endeavor to reduce the cost of living to the people, and when a great industry exports a very large percentage of its manufactures to a foreign country to-day, has factories abroad, it hardly seems to me it carries out the gentleman's argument that if these sewing machines go on the free list they will transfer their factories abroad and ship them back here.

Mr. HILL. Finished parts. They can not afford to ship the finished products, but the parts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But more than that. I can state—and the gentleman is on the floor, or was a few moments ago, from whom I got the information—that this very company ships sewing machines to the Orient, and lays them down, freight paid, at the wholesale price of $8.25.

Mr. HILL. I do not know about that. I will tell you what I have seen——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let me finish. They are selling them to the American people to-day from $20 to $30.

Mr. HILL. Yes; at retail, and each sale to a new customer. They are sold on time, on the installment plan, through agencies all over the country. When sold to go abroad they are shipped by the carload, and almost by the shipload. I will say to the gentleman that I have seen them by the cartload, piled up as you would pile hay on a southern farm wagon, carried up the streets of Vladivostock, in eastern Siberia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. If the gentleman will allow me to finish.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When a great monopoly in this country ships its machines, not the surplus product, but great quantities, as the gentleman testifies himself, abroad, and yet lays tribute on the American people of three or four times their value, I am in favor of putting them on the free list. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. So am I; but I am not in favor of giving those people privileges by which they can make them cheaper here by simply assembling them and taking away the work of American mechanics and having the principal part of it done on the other side. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is my doctrine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know how the gentleman will put them on the free list, according to his doctrine.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is just about as cheap to ship foreign pauper labor over here and have them do the work as to ship pauper goods over here?

Mr. HILL. Oh, I have heard that for many years. The hardest thing to move is a man. You can take merchandise and pack it up and ship it with a c. o. d. label, and the freight will be paid at the other end. When a man is shipped the freight must be paid in advance.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HILL. To emigrate means to leave the home, to break the home ties, to separate the family, to go out into the world alone. It takes nerve and courage and resolution to do that. It is infinitely easier to ship the products of a man's toil from Europe than it is to ship the man himself, and you know it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. But they ship them in all the same, and the gentleman knows it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I will pass the next item, for it is getting late. The gentleman talks about free labor. Let me tell you something of what I have seen. I was riding through the city of Oxford, in England, one day, and the driver

sat on the seat in front of me. I said to him as we were driving along, "Do you own this carriage?" "No," said he; "I hire it." I asked him, "What are your working hours?"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. There seems to be some confusion in one part of the Hall. The House will be in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to tire the House, but I want to refer to some incidents relating to the cheap labor that the gentleman suggested could be imported.

I was riding in the streets of Oxford one day in a cab, with the driver sitting in front of me, and I said to him as we went down the street, "How much do you get for driving this carriage, or do you own it?" He said, "No; I do not own it. I drive it by the week." "What are your hours? When do you begin?" He said, "From 9 o'clock in the morning." "How long do you work?" said I. "From 9 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, and if I have a fare I stay with it until it leaves me."

I asked him, "How much do you get?" He said, "I get $2.50 a week." "How old are you?" said I. He said, "I am 55 years old." "Have you a family?" He answered, "Yes; I have a family of five." I asked him, "How in the world do you manage to live?" "Of course, I can not," he said, "but I have a son and daughter at work. The daughter is at work in a linen mill and she gets $2.25 a week, and my son is a printer and gets $2.50 a week, and we manage to get along." There were three people at work, with an aggregate income of $7.25 a week.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I will ask the gentleman to wait until I finish, and then I will answer his question. I said to this driver, "You are 55 years old. You can not save anything. What will you do when you are unable to work?" He said, without cracking a smile, "Do? Why, I expect to go to the poorhouse. What else do you suppose I have been paying poor rates for all these years?" [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALLEN. Does the gentleman mind telling the House what tip he paid the driver? [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Oh, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman let me ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I will yield for any intelligent question, and you would ask none but an intelligent one.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I was very much interested in the story the gentleman was telling, and I accept it as absolutely true, coming as it does from the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. It was true.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. May I ask the gentleman, Did the driver tell him how he managed to eke out a living before that daughter and son grew to an age to be a help to him?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman must answer that for himself. I was riding through the Isle of Wight one day and I stopped to visit a little chapel near the entrance to the Queen's estate, known as Osborne. As I came out of the chapel I saw a man at work in a garden across the street, and I went over and spoke to him. I said, "I am a Yankee, and a tourist, and full of curiosity. Would you think it impertinent on my part if I were to ask you a question?" He said he would not. We were standing in front of a little one-and-a-half-story brick cottage. I said, "Do you own this house?" He said, "No, sir; I am the Queen's farmer." I said, "What do you receive as compensation?" He said, "$5 a week and house rent." Said I, "Is that the usual price here?" Now, I am stating these things in order that you may get the drift of the situation. He said, "No; the usual price is 2.75 to $3 a week in this country."

Do you know what I thought of at once? I thought of a novel called Marcella that I read once, written by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, describing the agricultural population of England under free trade:

> Men of 60 years of age and upward, gray and furrowed, like the chalk soil into which they had worked their lives; not old as age goes, but already the refuse of their generation, and paid for at the rate of refuse, with no prospect but the workhouse if the grave should be delayed.

I do not want any English free trade in the United States. Do you?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Just excuse me a moment. I have already taken more time than I should.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to ask one question?

Mr. HILL. I said this carriage driver in Oxford told me that his daughter worked in a linen mill. I had just come from the largest linen mill in the world—the York Street Mills, in Belfast.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HILL. I will, and then I will finish my story afterwards.

Mr. HARDY. They have a high tariff in Germany. Are the laboring people any better off in high-tariff Germany than they are in free-trade England?

Mr. HILL. Now, really, I do not want to stop in my line of thought to argue out a question of that kind. If you can not draw your own conclusion from the things that I am going to tell you, from what I have seen, no argument that I could make would satisfy you.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman just answer that in one word? He can answer it yes or no, Whether the laboring man is better off in high-tariff Germany than he is in free-trade England?

Mr. HILL. All men are better off that have work to do than men who do not have it.

Mr. HARDY. Well, the gentleman can answer that——

Mr. HILL. I said I did not propose to argue this question out with the gentleman. I propose to go ahead with my statement. I visited the York Street Linen Mill, in Belfast, Ireland. I went through that mill, the largest in the world, and I saw men and women at work there. I will not trust to my memory. I have taken these figures from my diary, as they were taken down by me in the various trips I have made in different countries in the world. I saw women working at wet linen looms, a stream of water pouring on the fabric as they wove it, and their clothing wet from their hips to their feet, and standing with bare feet on the wet floors, working for $2.50 a week.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. No; I will not yield now. I will by and by.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I was going to say that I had seen that same thing in this country.

Mr. HILL. I know you do not like these things. I am not giving them to you to like. I am making this speech for the country, and not for you.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I simply wanted to tell you that I saw that very condition in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. HILL. I went into every department of that establishment. I saw them hackling flax. They took the fiber and threw it over great iron hooks and drew it out and straightened it, breathing the dust constantly into the nostrils and lungs. It is a dangerous occupation. It is a tremendously fatiguing occupation. How much do you suppose those men got for that kind of work? Three and a half dollars a week. You say this was rough, cheap work of which I have spoken. One day I stopped at Brussels and went to the Royal Lace Factory. At this lace factory there were two women clerks. It was early in the morning and the manager had not come. I tried to buy a lace collar for friends at home. I looked first at one and then at another, and finally I found one that I wanted. It had taken the first prize at the Paris Exposition. I bought it and paid for it, and I paid the duty on it when I got here, too. [Laughter.]

As I came down to the door one of the clerks followed me, and just then the lady manager of the establishment came in. The clerk told her what I had bought. The manager turned to me and said, "Sir, you need not be afraid of that piece of lace ever being duplicated." I said, "Why not?" She said, "The woman that made that lace worked on it for two years, went blind, and has since died." I said, "How much did you pay her?" She turned to me and said, "Twenty cents a day." I was sorry that I had bought it. I have bought lace in factories in Venice where they told me that 5,000 girls were working for 12 and 18 cents a day. You can not find that in New England; but you may find it if you pass this bill and pursue to the end this policy on which you have started. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Talking about iron and steel, I have seen mechanics in Japan, in Yokohama, in foundries making corework, first-class molders. What do we pay them here? Three or four dollars a day.

A MEMBER. Five dollars a day.

Mr. HILL. I have seen first-class corework castings being made in Japan from Japanese or Chinese iron, and the men got 40 cents a day. When I was in Osaka I was told that there

were 40 cotton mills running there day and night with a double shift, and the girls were earning 8 cents and the men 15 cents a day. You propose to open the markets of the United States to products of that kind of labor. [Applause on the Republican side.] The American people will not sustain you in it.

I have seen that sort of thing all over the world. Even the free traders of England would not sustain a policy of that kind. Three years ago I was going through a large factory in England, and the manager said to me: "I suppose, coming from America, you are a protectionist?" I said: "I am. Are you?" He said: "No; but I should be if I lived in the United States." [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what England thinks of you.

I will not go on with this. I have statistics made up by myself in the last 16 years. Almost every long vacation I have visited some country in the world. In 1896 I started from the north of Ireland and went through to Italy, visiting factories. I have seen men in the porcelain works at Sevres, France, working for from 60 cents to $1.40 a day. I have seen men in the Gobelin tapestry works making fabrics fit for a king's ransom, with a picture on the wall behind them and the hand loom in front of them. Occasionally the man would look behind him, but he would reproduce in the fabric in the loom every line and color in that magnificent picture. There is no work in the world that will compare with it; and they were getting from $7.50 to $15 a week. Think of it! You can see such things as these in most of the Old World countries. I have seen them in Palestine, Egypt, Servia, Turkey, China, Japan, and all over the world. I can hire a man in Siberia at $50 a year and in Japan for $10 a year.

I will not go into this any further. I want to give you my parting thought. Whatever you do, do quickly. It may not seem of consequence to you, but it is of immense consequence to 90,000,000 people. The business of the country is stagnant awaiting your action. The pending measure, crudely drawn, uncertain in its phraseology, destructive of revenue, transferring whole industries to foreign countries, tending inevitably to idle mills, unemployed workmen, and general reductions of wages, has not thus far met any enthusiastic response, even from the men who placed you in power last fall, to say nothing of those who, believing in the protective principle wisely administered, prophesied that you would attempt to destroy it. Day after day the country is warned by the advocates of this measure that this is but the beginning. And it is unblushingly admitted to be a piece of favoritism to a particular class. Where is it to end? And what becomes of the fundamental principle of the Democratic platform declarations for a tariff for revenue only and the Jeffersonian doctrine of "equal rights to all and special privilege to none"—not even the farmers?

Have you abandoned your principles at the very outset, and is the power of taxation to be exercised by you in the future as a system of political rewards and punishments? If so, you should not forget that the same people who judged us will in the future judge you, and that the condemnation which will come to you from your betrayal of their confidence will be swift and certain. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

Ad valorem equivalent of duty paid on certain articles in Germany and France.

Articles.	Germany.	France.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Plows	9	
Cultivators, extirpators, potato diggers, harrows, rakes, etc.	12	
Forks for hay, manure, etc	11	
Scythes and sickles	4	11
Motor-driven plows and reaping machinery	6	
Threshing machines	7	
Other agricultural machines	12	
Wagons and carts	6	.....
Hoop and band iron and steel	13	36
Jute bags	18	21
Jute bagging	7	19
Uppers	2	8
Shoes	12	9
Sole leather	6	.....
Bovine leather	3	.....
Pigskins	.....	4
Harness	5	11
Saddlery	5	11
Saddle leather	5	.....
Wire	14	.....
Barbed wire	22	.....
Fresh beef	24	23
Prepared beef	23	.....
Pork	14	16
Ham and smoked pork	15	.....

Ad valorem equivalent of duty paid on certain articles in Germany and France—Continued.

Articles.	Germany.	France.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Lamb	3	.....
Mutton	.....	11
Bacon	10	.....
Sausage	4	.....
Lard	8	.....
Salted meats	.....	18
Prepared meats	.....	15
Rye flour	5	22
Wheat flour	26	41
Oatmeal	46	11
Corn meal	.....	23
Prepared cereal foods	26	45
Biscuits	2	4
Sawed wood	8	14
Sewing machines	14	7
Salt	21	25

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STONE].

Mr. STONE. Mr. Chairman, there is a story of a boy who visited a circus with his father. In the course of the program a man was shot from a cannon. He landed some distance away and was immediately pounced upon by several clowns, who began to strike him on the head with clubs. Turning to his father the boy asked why, if the man was dead, it was necessary to knock him on the head. The reply was, "That is to make him deader."

This measure has been advocated with rare eloquence and force during the past 10 days by the able leaders on this side, and in rising now to address the committee on some general phases of this tariff measure I can not hope to do more than kill the opposition "deader."

Even if the opposition has not all been killed, we have the consolation of the words found in II Kings, vi, 16:

> Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they that be with them.

It might seem presumptuous in me, one of the youngest Members of this body, to join in this debate were it not for the fact that there is no American citizen whose influence is not as a member of the body politic necessary to its well-being. In this Republic no one need imagine himself too weak, too poor, or too insignificant to do a part.

The humblest citizen in this great Republic may rejoice as being a coworker with him who is the highest, assured that without fidelity on his part the efforts of others will lose something of their value, and sure that he equally with them is a part of this Nation and a maker of its destiny.

Mindful of the great responsibility that devolves upon me as one of the number who are charged with the important duty of legislating for 92,000,000 people, I rise to urge the passage of this bill.

There are those who profess to view its enactment into law with forebodings of disaster. I have been amused rather than worried by the suggestions of those who view with alarm this effort at reform. Their attacks have been most unfair in what they concealed, and entirely false as to much that they asserted. This bill may produce fear in the hearts of the few who oppress, but it will give hope to the many who are oppressed.

The people have been aroused to the need of tariff reform, and they will not yield in their demands because of dire prophecies on the part of some gentlemen of stand-pat tendencies of calamitous projects concealed beneath the harmless surface of this bill.

Under the awakened conscience and intelligent attention of the people, the person or the party will be sustained that undertakes to check this slavery of the many to the avarice of the few.

It is almost beyond belief that the people of the United States, in the very center of the most productive region of the globe and in the midst of splendid harvests, amply furnished with transportation facilities, free from pestilence, and full of energy and vigor are held up daily by trade combinations fostered by a monstrous tariff law which forces them to pay unprecedented prices for the necessaries of life. Yet the household bills of every family in the Union give full and direct testimony that this is the case. It is high time that the food supplies of our people be freed from the control of these combinations, which are paralyzing the industrial population of the country and threatening the peace and prosperity of all classes through their avaricious exactions.

Any proposition to remedy this condition is met with the charge that it is fraught with disaster to the business interests of the country, and is to be prevented by all means. The beneficiaries of high protective duties wish the people to believe that prosperity is not the result of laws operating naturally; that it does not come from the application of intelligence and industry to the resources of the earth, but that it is the artificial creation of a taxing device. They would argue that the United States has not achieved its great growth by virtue of its inheritance of fertile lands, rich mines, and noble forests, and by the industry and integrity of its people, but because the Government permits a monopoly tariff that takes from one class and gives to another class. Any talk of change in the slightest detail of this magic device for the production of prosperity is branded as sacrilegious and sure to bring down punishment upon both the just and the unjust. The friends of the system contend that any fluctuation in prices is not due to economic causes like overproduction, speculation, undue expansion, and the natural operation of supply and demand, but to a profane questioning of the infallibility of this high-protective tariff idol which has provoked his anger and brought down his wrath.

The fact that this system enables the privileged few to accumulate vast wealth is considered by its friends as sufficient justification for its establishment and as sufficient reason for its continuance. This conclusion can be based only on the assumption that a great fortune justifies itself, no matter how it is made. These persons seemingly fail to see that those who buy—the consumers—have anything to do with the question. If a certain business is making money and the workmen have labor throughout the year, all should be well with the world. When these workmen rise against the conditions which the avarice of their employers has imposed, we form organizations of relief, but we allow the system which produced the unjust conditions to continue unabated.

The world has moved, but it is a regrettable confession that in a legislative way we are still acting under the old belief that to be prosperous we must in some way rob our neighbors.

No sensible person fights wealth as such, but everyone should oppose the privileges that produce swollen fortunes on the one hand and undeserved poverty on the other. Surely the prosperity of one should be consistent with the welfare of all, and one man can not be allowed to have more than he should have without forcing some other man to accept less than he should have. We may dazzle the world by our trade statistics and bewilder the nations with our marvelous prosperity, but we must do something finer and nobler than this to justify our large claims to leadership among the nations of the world. We must stand for honesty and justice. No amount of argument will prove that many of the schedules of the present tariff law are honest and just. It enables the trusts and monopolies to exact extortionate profits and to thus increase the cost of living beyond all reasonable bounds. No reduction in tariff rates is contemplated that will injure American labor or cripple American industry. An honest and just revision is all that the people demand, but they will be satisfied with nothing less. The important fact about the present tariff as the people see it is that it is unjust and dishonest, written by the servants of special privileges for the benefit of their masters, and intended not to help the small man make a living but to help the big man make an exorbitant profit. It is no justification of such a tariff to refer to its alleged virtues as a revenue producer. This Government is not reduced to the necessity of raising its revenues by schedules which rob the people. The present tariff pays the Government about $330,000,000 a year, but it enables the trusts and monopolies to increase their profits to the extent of $4,000,000,000 a year.

The 1910 Illinois State Democratic platform contains this plank, and it expresses my sentiments and voices my policy:

> We denounce the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act as an indefensible masterpiece of injustice, legally authorizing remorseless extortions from the many to enrich the few through the operations of trusts and monopolies, which it fosters. Tariff taxation, like other taxation, should be so levied as not to discriminate against nor in favor of any section, class, industry, or corporation, and should be limited to the actual necessities of government honestly and economically administered.
>
> We insist that any law enacted with the intention of enabling individuals or corporations to levy tribute upon the American people, or to guarantee a "reasonable profit" to any class, is in violation of the Constitution of the United States and is indefensible from either a legal or a moral standpoint.

Not only does a high protective tariff bear down upon the masses of our people with a cruel and uneven hand, but it is a fruitful source of corruption. The widespread corruption which has caused the defilement of our politics did not have its origin in politics, although it finds expression and quakes publicity there. Its source is in the greed of men who, to secure tariff legislation that would give them personal advantage and add to their wealth, have stooped to bribery and the corrupt manipulation of public functionaries. The hideous power of privilege not only permeates and taints politics, but its impure hands soil the very fountains of justice. The astonishing feature of the situation is that an intelligent people have so long viewed with indifference, and in some cases even openly applauded, the men who are shrewd enough to manipulate politics to their own gain. The people have so long permitted our Government to be used for the speculative purposes of men who shamelessly debauch our public representatives that all the foreign critics dwell upon our civic degradation. Our robes must again be washed pure and white and no longer allowed to trail in the dust of this dishonor and infamy. The evil of corruption can be eradicated just as surely as wrong can be overcome by right. A redemptive war is necessary to our national existence and is sure to be won, but it will require the same high quality of patriotism as when the war drums beat and the bugles play and men go forth to battle. The honor and dignity of our great legislative bodies must be restored and the present views of foreign critics as to the sordidness of our civilization must be removed. No hypercritical obstacles should prevent this reformation, which, it must be conceded, is a consummation devoutly to be wished. The enlightened sentiment of the American people will no longer tolerate a tariff law that, by reason of the special favors it grants, leads the recipients of those special favors to debauch our electorate in order to procure its continuance.

This objectionable tariff system has heretofore been shielded behind the cloak of partisan politics, and there are those who now seek to frustrate this step toward reform by attempting to brand it as a purely partisan affair. Simple justice should never bear the stamp of partisanship.

It has been very gratifying to me to observe the scant regard for party lines in the votes upon the several measures that have already passed this House. I trust that the vote on this measure will be a further indication of the same wholesome spirit. There is an independent spirit now in evidence over the country, and it is not allied with the reactionary forces but with the forces that upbuild and uplift. Each Representative must measure up to his opportunities and convince the people of what he can do for them or he can not expect their continued confidence nor their future support. Their allegiance is to the truth and not to the man nor the party who assumes to represent the truth, but who does little to promote progress in the way of better things.

A genuine interest in popular government and the spread of progressive ideas have brought about a weakening of party ties. Hereafter political success will depend more upon merit and less upon traditional prejudices. The time of slavish adherence to party names has passed into history. Corruption never has paid any attention to party lines; honesty and decency have ceased to pay attention to party lines in order that they might triumph. With the people it is no longer a question of what is regular, but of what is right.

In order to enhance its chances of favorable consideration by the other branch of Congress and to insure its approval by the President, I should like to see this bill get a large independent vote here. I would not deny to any Republican of whatever variety the privilege to vote for this measure, and I would gladly share with all such persons the credit that is rightly due to those who secure its passage. The interests of the people transcend all questions of personal or party advantage. This should not be a party measure as party lines are now drawn. It is the people's question, and the people are sure to visit their resentment upon the person or the party who fails or refuses to apply the remedy. Tariff reduction has been demanded by the people in tones loud enough to be heard throughout the land, and the demand will not cease until it is accomplished. This demand is not only loud and deep and universal, but it is right and just and must prevail.

The fact that this particular bill is planned primarily to relieve the farmers of unjust burdens does not justify its classification by its opponents as class legislation. The blood and the brains of every vocation of life are perennially supplied by drafts upon the farming population of the country. Most of the greatest men and women of our history were born and reared on the farm. The farm has developed the potential energy and inspired the latent genius of those who are now our leaders in practically all the professions of life. We may confidently expect that in the future it will furnish the majority of those who are destined by native force of character to create the great fortunes and to wield the mighty influences of the country. We can not benefit the farmer without indirectly benefiting all classes, for upon his welfare rests the welfare of all our people.

Again, there are those who claim this bill is sectional in its character and appeal to an ancient prejudice in their efforts to encompass its defeat. No longer will that Circe's voice enable them to keep fastened upon us a system that is opposed in purpose and spirit to every principle of independence and liberty upheld by the general sentiment of the people of this country.

There is a North of waving fields and blossoming meadows and verdant pastures, with untold wealth of mine and orchard and field.

There is a great awakening South covered with billowy waves of snowy cotton, whose annual crop would buy a kingdom.

There is an East with its ambitions and its wonderful factories.

There is a West with its vast prairies and inexhaustible mines.

But these sections have all been fused as in the furnace of some great Vulcan and welded with an Odin's mighty hammer of patriotism until there is neither seam nor flaw.

There is a North, a South, an East, and a West, but they are all parts of a united and stupendous whole. The men of the North and the men of the South cherish the same sentiments of liberty, glory in the same common memories, and love the same old striped and starry banner which is the scarred and priceless legacy of a thousand battle fields.

On a hillside in Kentucky in a section of country far removed from railroads and telegraphs and the quickening touch of commerce is a vine-covered mound in a little churchyard. Within it lies the remains of a man wrapped in the Stars and Stripes, whose body was riddled with bullets at El Caney. His neighbors called him a hero, and on his tomb they have written: "Here lies the son of a Confederate soldier. He died for his country." And there is to-day no one to say nay. Forty years ago that inscription would have been erased by a million hands in contempt, but to-day no hand would be so vandal and blasphemous as to chisel out one letter. A mighty change has swept over this country of ours in four decades, a change that has betrayed itself not only in the face of nature but in the lives of the people. A new people has sprung up, a new set of conditions, a new civilization, a new patriotism, new in that it is one, from ocean to ocean, north to south; a united people, united in a common bond of commercial interest, of national ambition, and of brotherly sympathy.

The great army commanded by the Duke of Wellington was made up of regiments from all parts of the British Empire. When in camp, as with most armies, the evenings were frequently spent in singing.

Beginning with the Scottish regiments, they would sing:

Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled,
Scots, wham Bruce has often led,
Welcome to your gory bed,
Or to glorious victorie.

Then the Irish or the Welsh regiments would follow each with their favorite song, and so on until the English squares were reached when they would start "God Save the King." At once the soldiers from all parts of the United Kingdom would join in until the whole great army as with one mighty voice was singing "God Save the King."

As representatives of the various districts and States of this Union, we will each have our heritage of local traditions and local problems, but we should stand here as Americans to glory in the triumphs and be happy in the accomplishments of one great inseparable country. We should be animated by a spirit of lofty patriotism which knows no section, no race, no sect, nor creed, and which is filled with a holy enthusiasm for the welfare of all the people, so that America may continue to draw the world unto her until her ideals shall everywhere prevail.

The words of Patrick Henry to the First Continental Congress are in a larger sense than then true to-day:

The distinction between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, and New Yorkers is no more. I am not a Virginian but an American.

Despite the efforts of the few who express and appeal to a contrary sentiment, a united America calmly and hopefully looks forth upon the world. This bill is a manifestation of that spirit of fraternity which blesses our land and treats each and every section with equal favor.

We have adopted rules that allow the maximum freedom of debate, and by making the committees elective instead of appointive the Speaker can no longer pack committees in order to block the will of the Nation and then enforce his decrees with the political death of those of his own party who oppose him.

We have voted in favor of a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct election of Senators which is calculated to make the other body of Congress more responsive to the will of the people. We have passed a bill that requires the publication of campaign funds before as well as after the election for the purpose of making every election an expression of the virtue and intelligence of the people. We have passed the measure to provide reciprocal trade relations with Canada, thereby cementing together the two great English-speaking nations in the bonds of peace, friendship, and commerce. All these things will meet the approval of the manhood and conscience of the citizenship of this Nation. Let us now pass this farmers' free-list bill and still further deserve the approval and commendation of the people.

Upon each of us rests a responsible duty to perform, which we must not shirk or give only a half-hearted attention.

The forces of the people and the forces of privilege are lined up in battle form to-day. Our integrity and destiny as a nation depend on the outcome. The people of the United States expect every Representative to do his duty to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4413, the free-list bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. REDFIELD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JAMES MORAN.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. JACKSON to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James Moran, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriations for mileage of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

CLOSING GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill H. R. 4413—the free-list bill—be closed when the House adjourn on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill be closed when the House adjourns on Saturday next. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he also ask that the House meet at 12 o'clock on Monday instead of at 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will ask that after this request is granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, the present order of the House is that it shall meet at 11 o'clock until this bill is disposed of. I ask unanimous consent that the hour for meeting on Monday next and thereafter shall be at 12 o'clock instead of 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned to meet on Friday, May 5, 1911, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HENRY of Texas, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 148) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890 and other acts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 17), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8602) granting pensions to widows and minor children of United States marshals and deputy marshals whose husbands and fathers were killed while in the discharge of their official duties; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8603) to appropriate $500,000 to deepen the channel and remove the obstructions in the Arkansas River, in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8604) to provide for the construction of a military road at the United States cemetery at Fort Gibson, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8605) granting a pension to soldiers, sailors, and marines who served during the Civil War between April 1, 1861, and November 1, 1865, for the time intervening between the date of discharge and the date they commenced drawing a pension from the Government of the United States at the rate per month they are now paid by the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8606) to provide for the erection of a public building at Vinita, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8607) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wagoner, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8608) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bartlesville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8609) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sapulpa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8610) providing for the erection of a public building at Tulsa, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 8611) to regulate the importation and interstate transportation of nursery stock, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 8612) to amend an act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia, approved June 18, 1898; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8613) making drunkenness in the District of Columbia a misdemeanor and to provide a hospital for inebriates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8614) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to suspend and revoke certain licenses and permits; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8615) to require the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. to build and maintain bridges, etc., over the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8616) to amend paragraph 43 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8617) for universal transfers over the street railway lines in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8618) providing for guides in the District of Columbia and defining their duties; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8619) to amend "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8620) to amend an act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, approved May 7, 1906, by prohibiting the sale of poisonous hair dressing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8621) providing for the regulation and suspension of traffic and processions on highways in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8622) to amend section 4 of "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as to kiteflying; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8623) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1898"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8625) to protect public health in the District of Columbia by regulating the production and sale of milk, cream, and ice cream in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8626) to amend an act entitled "An act to distinctively designate parcels of land in the District of Columbia for the purposes of assessment and taxation, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8627) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8628) to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8629) to receive arrearages of taxes due to the District of Columbia to July 1, 1908, at 6 per cent interest per annum, in lieu of penalties and costs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8630) to amend the act of Congress approved April 22, 1904, authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8631) to provide an additional method for enforcing and foreclosing tax sales and tax deeds in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8632) to amend sections 680 and 686 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8633) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8634) to amend the laws for the protection of birds, game, and fish in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8635) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District," approved May 13, 1908; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8636) to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8637) for the creation of the police and firemen's relief and retirement fund, to provide for the relief and retirement of members of the police and fire departments, to establish a method of procedure for such relief and retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8638) authorizing the extension of Barry Place NW., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8639) for the widening of Sixteenth Street NW. at Piney Branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8640) to provide for the extension of Kenyon Street from Seventeenth Street to Mount Pleasant Street, and for the extension of Seventeenth Street from Kenyon Street to Irving Street, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8641) to authorize the widening and extension of Minnesota Avenue from Pennsylvania Avenue SE. to its present terminus near Eastern Avenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8642) authorizing the extension of First Street east, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8643) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of Newton Place NW. from New Hampshire Avenue to Georgia Avenue, and to connect Newton Place in Gass's subdivision with Newton Place in Whitney Close subdivision," approved February 21, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8644) to provide for the extension of Buchanan Street NW., between Piney Branch Road and Sixteenth Street, and the abandonment of Piney Branch Road, between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8645) to authorize the construction of a municipal asphalt plant in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8646) to provide for the payment of the debt of the District of Columbia and to provide for permanent improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8647) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8648) to regulate the construction of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8649) to authorize the extension and widening of Colorado Avenue NW. from Longfellow Street to Sixteenth Street and of Kennedy Street NW. through lot No. 800, square No. 2718; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8650) to provide for plans and specifications for two high schools in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8651) providing for the appointment of two cadets from the District of Columbia to the United States Military Academy at West Point; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8652) to license operators of cinematographs, moving-picture machines, and similar apparatus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia), a bill (H. R. 8653) to give the District of Columbia a right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States in patent cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 8654) to provide a system of compensation for accidents in dangerous occupations thereunder, and also in jurisdictions subject to the legislative power of Congress, with a view to prevention of accident; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 8655) providing for the sale to actual settlers only of all lands heretofore granted by the United States to aid in the construction of railroad and telegraph lines in Oregon, by the acts of April 10, 1869, and May 4, 1870, that may be or become forfeited to the United States by virtue of any legal proceedings now pending; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 8656) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Media, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8657) to prohibit the importation into the United States of adulterated seed and seed unfit for planting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8658) to regulate the transportation of habit-forming drugs in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 8659) incorporating the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8660) incorporating the American Academy of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 8661) prohibiting an owner or beneficiary of any letters patent of the United States making it a condition that the purchaser, lessee, or licensee thereof shall not buy or lease or use machinery, implements, appliances, or merchandise of any person, firm, corporation, or association other than such vendor, lessor or licensor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 8662) to change the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service to the Public Health Service, to increase the pay of officers of said service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8663) to provide for the government of the Canal Zone, the construction and occupation of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8664) to provide for the operation of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8665) to amend sections 4488 and 4489 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended in 1889, relating to the regulation of steam vessels; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 8666) to apply a portion of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the endowment of schools or departments of mines and mining, and to regulate the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8667) to provide for the construction, maintenance, and improvement of post roads and rural delivery routes through the cooperation and joint action of the National Government and the several States in which such post roads or rural-delivery routes may be established; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8668) giving rural mail carriers holiday on the 25th day of December of each year; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8669) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8670) to amend sections 2304 and 2305 of the Revised Statutes of 1878, of an act providing for soldiers and sailors acquiring homesteads in public lands of the United States and deductions of military and naval service from the time required generally to perfect title; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Memorial of the Legislature of New York, favoring the election of United States Senators by the direct vote of the people; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8671) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Worley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8672) granting an increase of pension to John Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8673) granting an increase of pension to William I. Goodin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8674)) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8675) granting an increase of pension to John K. McKeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8676) granting an increase of pension to Simel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8677) granting an increase of pension to Fred. J. Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8678) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Swander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8679) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kisling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8680) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. Noneman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8681) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Amhalt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to Albert Ferren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8683) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ribar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8684) granting an increase of pension to Ira Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8685) granting an increase of pension to Rufus H. Slaymaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8686) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. L. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8687) granting an increase of pension to William H. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8688) granting an increase of pension to George Blanden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8689) granting an increase of pension to George Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8690) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8691) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Henry Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8692) granting an increase of pension to William A. Flora; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8693) granting an increase of pension to James Harruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8694) granting an increase of pension to Amos Nye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8695) granting a pension to Andrew Brandeberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8696) granting an increase of pension to Patrick W. Foley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 8697) granting an increase of pension to Isaac McClelland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to John A. Shannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 8699) granting a pension to Stephen White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8700) granting a pension to George W. Finlay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8701) granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Barton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8702) granting an increase of pension to Truman Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8703) granting an increase of pension to Byron M. Standish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8704) granting an increase of pension to Peter L. Metz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8705) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Haven; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8706) granting an increase of pension to Martin Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8707) granting an increase of pension to Charles Colp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 8708) for the relief of Isaac F. Norman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8709) for the relief of the heirs of Job Thomas, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8710) to refer the war claim of the estate of John Sullivan, deceased, late of Stafford County, Va., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8711) to refer the war claim of John C. Newton, of Stafford County, Va., to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8712) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of R. G. Johnson, administrator of Lewis W. Mann, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8713) granting a pension to Thomas Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 8714) for the relief of the estate of John Frazer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8715) for relief of the estate of Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8716) for the relief of Thomas Kizer, administrator of the estate of Henry Kizer, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 8717) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hosack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 8718) granting a pension to James E. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8719) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Meehan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8720) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Moulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8721) granting a pension to Walter F. Carman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8722) granting an increase of pension to Edward B. Pendleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8723) granting an increase of pension to John N. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8724) granting an increase of pension to John H. Leslie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8725) granting to W. J. Ladd back pay as a pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 8726) for the relief of John Preston; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAY: A bill (H. R. 8727) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Cohee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8728) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Demaree; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8729) granting an increase of pension to David A. Wynegar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8730) granting an increase of pension to William S. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 8731) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8732) for the relief of the Western Distilleries, of Agnew, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 8733) for the relief of Joseph F. Tribble; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8734) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Brownlee; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 8735) granting an increase of pension to W. G. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8736) granting an increase of pension to Abram Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8737) granting an increase of pension to F. B. Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 8738) for the relief of Aun-je-gin-ewe; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8739) for the relief of Ne-gaun-e-gwon-able; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8740) for the relief of Clem Bellanger; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8741) for the relief of Nah-me-won-aush-e-quay; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8742) for the relief of Kay-zhe-bah-o-say; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8743) for the relief of Ne-bid-ay-aun-ah-quod; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8744) for the relief of the heirs of Kah-ge-gay-bin-ais; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 8745) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Mott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 8746) for the relief of the Ingersoll-Rand Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 8747) granting an increase of pension to Curtis Holder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8748) granting an increase of pension to William W. McAlister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 8749) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Duff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8750) granting an increase of pension to Granville Koger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8751) granting an increase of pension to William T. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8752) granting an increase of pension to James E. Newgent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8753) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Culp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 8754) granting an increase of pension to John Strauss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 8755) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8756) granting an increase of pension to John W. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8757) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8758) granting an increase of pension to George Kerns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8759) granting a pension to Luvina R. Prater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8760) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8761) for the relief of the Kanawha & Ohio Transfer Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8762) for the relief of James R. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 8763) granting an increase of pension to John G. Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Stetter Bros. and 7 other merchants of Canal Dover, Ohio, in opposition to the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers accompanying H. R. 6155, granting a pension to George W. Erway, of Dodge County, Wis.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: Resolutions of Local No. 12, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Martinsburg, W. Va., favoring the enactment of the illiteracy test; and Good Luck Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, New Creek, W. Va., favoring H. R. 15413 and other measures proposed by the Immigration Commission; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CARLIN: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of heirs of Job Thomas, deceased; affidavits in the case of John Sullivan, late of Stafford County, Va.; and papers in the case of John C. Newton, of Stafford County, Va.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of F. Mayer Boot & Shoe Co. and Bradley & Metcalf Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against placing shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Papers in support of Alfred Hosack, county of Whitley, State of Indiana, for increase in pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURLEY: Petitions of Parnell Club, of Boston, Mass., and Central Council, Irish County Clubs, protesting against enactment of treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: Resolutions from Local No. 5, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Gilbert, Idaho, protesting against discrimination in the handling of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Resolutions of the National Association of Tanners, protesting against placing leather on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany H. R. 5743, for the relief of Joseph C. Sponogle, of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petitions of Alice M. Goodwin and others, numbering 51, and Margaret Lamontagne and 49 others, relating to the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Samuel T. Duff, of New Castle, Pa.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to Granville Koger, of Franklin County, Tenn., and bill for the relief of William T. West, of Hamilton County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolutions of Camp No. 51, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of New Brunswick, N. J., favoring passage of the illiteracy test law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany H. R. 5285, for relief of Thomas S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May 5, 1911.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, for the beauty and simplicity of the Christian religion, which under the dispensation of Thy Providence has been revealed in the incomparable life and character of Thy Son, which has purified, enobled, dignified life. Help us in His spirit, encourage by His sublime example, to press ever toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God. In Christ Jesus. Amen.

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

COMMITTEE RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House the following resignation of Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD from a committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as member of the Committee on Expenditures of the Navy, and ask that it be accepted. Other duties render it impossible for me to devote to the committee referred to the attention its importance deserves.

Respectfully, ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
Ninth Ohio District.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution making appropriations for the payment of certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-second Congress.

ARMY CONTRACTS FOR SHOES.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I rise for the purpose of presenting a privileged question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 133——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the resolution be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 133.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the House of Representatives full information, as follows, with regard to certain