parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Dalziel-Moller Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Jackson & Tindle, of Pellston, Mich., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. James O'Reilly and members of Seventh-day Adventist Church of Onaway, Mich., protesting against passage of Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of numerous citizens of the second congressional district of Oklahoma, protesting against the passage of the so-called Scott antioption bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Arnett, Okla., protesting against the action taken in regard to the arrest of the McNamara brothers and indorsing the resolution of Representative BERGER for an investigation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolutions by the Milwaukee Clearing House Association, against the passage of proposed legislation affecting the cold-storage industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POST: Petition of Milwaukee Clearing House Association, protesting against bills affecting cold storage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REYBURN: Resolution of the Philadelphia Brigade Association that Congress set apart the anniversary of Appomattox to be observed; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Resolution of Branch 45, G. B. B. A., of Allentown, Pa., relative to the McNamara case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Calaveras County, Cal., that immediate action should be taken by the Government to secure the "Big Tree Grove" in Calaveras County, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petitions of numerous citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., asking that the duty on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the German-American Alliance of Coshocton, Ohio, and the Alliance of German Societies of the State of Indiana, urging an investigation of the administration of the immigration office at Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of America, condemning the manner of the arrest of the McNamaras and indorsing Mr. BERGER'S resolution for an investigation of the McNamara affair; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Delta County, Mich., protesting against the enactment of an arbitration treaty with Great Britain and France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Mrs. James Bennett in favor of suffrage for women; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of H. Planten & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Milwaukee Clearing House Association relating to proposed legislation affecting the cold-storage industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petitions of citizens of Trenton, N. J., urging the adoption of House resolution No. 166, providing for the investigation of the Immigration Service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June 17, 1911.*

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., delivered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, inspire us, we beseech Thee, with new devotion to those high and holy principles illustrated in the life and character of Thy Son Jesus Christ, that we may prove ourselves worthy of the dignity bestowed upon us as rational beings, sons of the living God, destined to immortal life, "for I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Amen.

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

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11019, a bill to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, according to my judgment, the greatest utterances on the question of tariff were from a Mississippian, Robert J. Walker, at one time Secretary of the Treasury. It appears to me that in the documents that he wrote during that time there were announced principles along the line of tariff regulation and tariff law that were just, reasonable, and right.

But we are not to-day to discuss the question of free trade. Speaking for myself alone, I believe most implicitly and most strongly in those principles; but for a long period of years, indeed from the beginning of this Nation, there has been pursued a certain policy with reference to the raising of revenue. We raise revenue to defray the expenses of this Government by laying imposts on articles that are imported into this country. So I shall not discuss the question of free trade at this time, but shall try to confine my remarks to the policy that has been adopted to these two propositions, namely, Shall we have a high protective tariff, or shall we have a tariff for revenue only?

Mr. Chairman, there has been much criticism with reference to the pending bill, criticism because the proposed duties are not high enough, criticism from another source because they are too high.

The reason given for placing the duties on raw wool and the manufactured products is that it is necessary to do so in order to raise revenue. I shall not discuss this phase of the question.

I favor the bill for another reason. The people have had to bear a great burden of taxation; they have cried out for relief and are entitled to it. This burden has been placed upon them by the protective tariff. The question arises, How shall they obtain it?

In considering this matter we must deal with conditions, not theories. We are confronted with the fact that the Republicans are in control of the Senate and the Presidency. It is vain, even unreasonable, to expect that a party that has been so long wedded to a policy, though a false one—that Ephraim-like has been so long joined to its idol, protection—could be induced within the short space of a few months to renounce that policy and accept the principles of Democracy along the lines of the tariff.

No matter how strongly we favor putting wool on the free list; no matter how much we favor a further reduction on the manufactured products, we must act in the light of the fact that it is not at the present time within the power of the Democratic Party to write such a tariff bill as it really favors.

It may be vain to indulge the hope that this bill will pass a Republican Senate, but I really indulge that hope, not because I believe the Republican Party wants to give the people the relief they ought to have, but because that party, or enough of its official members, have seen a great light; they have heard a great, wild roar of indignation and discontent. I believe that they will respond to it, although very unwillingly.

The President has denounced Schedule K as absolutely indefensible. This places his party in an awkward attitude to defend the woolen schedule.

Again, that party has a bitter recollection of the election last fall. Every time their minds revert to that event they see their party weighted down with broken promises, burdened with unjust and iniquitous laws, made unsightly by the canker of greed and graft, having the contempt and disgust of an outraged and indignant people, wrecked upon the rocks of their own wrongdoings.

Doubtless this memory haunts them day and night. If they have learned wisdom of experience they will grant some measure of relief to the people and pass this bill.

In the light of these conditions I believe that good sense dictated that we, as Democrats, offer a bill that at least has a

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

chance to pass, instead of offering one that had absolutely no chance to become a law.

Do we surrender any principle when we offer and vote for a bill that is the best we can get, simply because we honestly believe that the people are entitled to greater relief? I think not. A half loaf is better than no bread at all, according to the old adage.

If this bill becomes a law it will save millions of dollars for the people; therefore I favor it, hoping for greater relief later on.

Mr. Chairman, after hearing the debates on the tariff I have reached the conclusion that protection is either "the loveliest and most fruitful mother of the wealth of a nation, or it is an imposter and swindler, distinguished from other swindlers mainly by the vast scale of its operation."

I would place it in the latter class. There has been more deceit, more fraud, more injustice, perpetrated in the name of protection against the people of the Nation than in any other name. Whenever you take money out of the pocket of one man and put it into the pocket of another man, a great wrong is done to the first one. That is exactly what is done under tariff legislation enacted by the Republican Party.

A certain class comes before the committee of this House and says, "We can not prosper, we can not make money unless you take money from somebody else and take the property that others have toiled for and give it to us." There can be no right or justice in anything of that kind.

The protective tariff is simply robbery perpetrated by law. It enables the producer to exact from the consumer a price he would not otherwise get. It interferes with the natural law of distribution, and this should never be done, except so far as fiscal necessity may require.

Every protective duty causes the consumer to pay a tax which does not go into the Treasury of the Government, but merely aids or enriches certain individuals or corporations.

This is one of the greatest evils of the tariff. It is estimated that where $1 of revenue is collected for the Government under the present law from $7 to $10 goes into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country. The Government has no right to engage in the business of enriching certain classes of its citizenship.

Mr. Cooley, in his writings on constitutional law, says:

Where a tax is avowedly laid for a private purpose, it is illegal and void. Constitutionally, a tax can have no other basis than the raising of revenue for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imposts, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular impost for the benefit of some home manufacturer, may well be questioned as being colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principles.

A protective tariff breaches this great principle of constitutional law, because the very purpose of protection, as set out in the Republican platform, is to compensate the manufacturer for the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad and to guarantee to him a reasonable profit on his investments.

The argument is made that it is right to do this because it builds up a home market, that it gives employment to the people, that it causes higher wages.

I was struck by the remark made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] a few days ago, when he said that there was always free trade among labor. What protection does labor have? What protection has the Republican Party given to labor in this country by the laws that it has enacted? The doors are thrown wide open, or almost so, and we have vast hordes coming in day by day and week by week. Do they not compete with American labor? Is not a large percentage of the immigration of this country what has been termed "cheap foreign labor"? Are not native American citizens required to compete with the very kind of labor that you are supposed to be protecting the manufacturers against? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I favor more stringent immigration laws. Why, Mr. Chairman, I believe that more than a million immigrants came into this country last year; and yet, as I said, there is absolutely no protection to our labor against this foreign labor. It is the man of wealth, the man of capital, the manufacturer, who has all this protection.

Many false arguments are made with reference to the reason for giving protection to the manufacturers. It is said that wages are much higher in this country than in foreign lands. When you come to consider the cost of production there is more to be considered than simply the amount of the daily wage. I remember that a great Republican, James G. Blaine, had something to say along this line.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I will.

Mr. KOPP. Before the gentleman leaves that question——

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I am not going to leave the question just yet.

Mr. KOPP (continuing). I am interested to know what different protection was given the laboring man by legislation relative to immigration by the Democratic Party during the years it was in power than has been given by the Republican Party since that time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I do not know that there was any very great difference in the kind of legislation enacted during this period, but I know this——

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me, I think it could be well said that during the time that the Democrats were in power, and in the early history of our Government, the class of immigrants coming to this country was quite different to those encouraged by the manufacturers of the country to-day, who take the place of American labor.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman from Illinois contend that the class of immigrants coming to this country from 1890 to 1895 was materially different from the class of immigrants coming to-day?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I will state to the gentleman that in the early history of our country, when it was building up, we had not those manufacturers who were so desirous of securing cheap foreign labor, but it finally became so bad that Congress was compelled to pass a law stopping the contracting for labor in foreign countries that grew up under a Republican administration.

Mr. KOPP. The gentleman does not contend that the period from 1890 to 1895 was in the early history of our country before our manufactures had developed, does he?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. No, I do not, but I am simply speaking of the conditions when the Democrats had absolute sway in the early history of our country that the gentleman was speaking about, and not labor conditions.

Mr. KOPP. The point I am making is, that the last time the Democratic Party was in power the class of immigration was just the same as now, and that no attempt was made by that party to improve these conditions, and so the members of that party are estopped from attacking the Republican Party for failing to do what they failed to do.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I think the Democratic Party was more careful as to the class of immigrants that came into this country during the time that they were in power than the Republicans were before that or since.

Mr. KOPP. Was there any different law on the statute books?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I think the administration of the law was better.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I will state further, that as was well said by one of our colleagues of Mississippi some time ago, the Democratic Party was only in power for a very short time—in absolute control of the Government—while the Republican Party has had undisputed sway for many, many years, therefore they have had a greater opportunity to deal with these questions than has the Democratic Party. They have not remedied this great evil, although they have had every opportunity to do so. The Democratic Party when it was in power had so many wrongs to remedy that it could not remedy them all.

Mr. KOPP. One moment, if the gentleman will pardon me. I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe one of the greatest needs to-day is an amendment to the immigration law. I agree heartily with those who say that we should keep out a great many immigrants who are coming in. The only point I was attempting to establish by my query was that inasmuch as the Democratic Party had failed, even in attempting to modify immigration laws while they had an opportunity, that they are estopped now from attacking us because we have failed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. If we get the opportunity, I think we will make the effort to remedy this great evil. I agree that if there is one evil that ought to be remedied it is the evil attaching to the immigration law.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. For a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. More foreigners are coming into the United States now in one year than came in during the whole period from 1892 to 1897. More foreigners have come into the United States in the last 14 years under the reign of the Republican Party than came prior to that time in 60 years. The character of the immigrants that came in during the Cleveland administration was different from that of many who are coming in now. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], chairman of the Committee on Immigration, made a visit to Sicily two or

three years ago, and he asked, "What has become of the bandits, the awful criminals that we used to read about?" And he was told by natives that they had all gone to America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, when I was interrupted I was discussing the question of the cost of production, and had remarked that there was more to be considered in this matter than simply the amount of the daily wage. One great factor that should enter into consideration of the cost of production is the amount that will be produced by American labor and the amount that will be produced by foreign labor, and in speaking of this subject James G. Blaine had this to say:

> The actual labor cost of the American product is less, because the effectiveness of American labor is superior to that of the workingman of any other nation on earth.

The annual average output per laborer of the respective nationalities is as follows:

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

Thus it will be seen that, as the American laborer is more productive than any other, he is entitled to much higher wages.

It is argued in favor of protective tariff that it gives a better market for the products of this country. It may be true that a higher price may be obtained for our products because of the fact, but it is also true that the tariff requires the man who gains this higher price to pay much more for what he has to buy, and in the end the loss is greater than the gain.

Really it amounts to this: That the man who has something to sell must contribute out of his own pocket a part of the price of his own product. To illustrate: Suppose a man is raising hogs for the market, and that his product is sold to a man who is working in a factory. It will be said that the laborer is able to pay a better price for the products of the farm, because of the higher wage given him by virtue of the tariff. As the farmer has to pay a tariff on the very article that contributes to the wage of the laborer, does he not, in reality, help to pay for the very hog that he has raised?

In truth, the tariff is for the benefit of the manufacturers. They get a much larger proportion of the protection granted to the industry than does the laborer who engages in it; and this is the real purpose of the tariff.

Mr. Chairman, the protective tariff proceeds upon an erroneous idea. It is not the function of government to legislate wealth into existence, and it can not do so.

During last session of Congress I heard the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] use this language:

> However unfashionable it may be, my political faith is that of men who know that the thing called wealth is a social, not a political product; that this wealth is born of brawn of muscle, skill of hand, and vigil of brain, not of the roll calls of Congress; that the thing called industrial prosperity is a social, not a political product; that such prosperity is born of the energy and genius of man applied to the bounties of nature and not of the cunning and greed and craft of men applied to the powers of government. The power of government is the power to take, not the power to make; the power to tax is the power to transfer, not the power to produce. Our Government has no reserve fund or power out of which to grant privileges. It can grant privileges only by carving them out of the body of common rights. The Government, having no profits to bestow, the reasonable profit the law is to assure must be sponged from the victims the law makes.

Any scheme of taxation is unjust that is not levied upon the rich and the poor according to their ability to pay it. The protective tariff places the burden unequally. The true, the equitable, rule of taxation is to determine the actual needs of the Government when honestly and economically administered and then to so levy taxes that the burdens of government may be borne by the people in equal proportions, letting wealth contribute its just share.

The old theory of the tariff was that it was framed to raise revenue and granted incidental protection. The new theory seems to be that the tariff is framed for protection to the manufacturer with incidental revenue to the Government.

Under this system there have grown up great private monopolies and trusts. It is absolutely indefensible that they should be assisted by law through a protective tariff. It is a crime against the American people. They control the market, destroy competition, fix the price of raw and finished products, and to a very large extent regulate the price paid for labor.

Many of these great trusts carry a large amount of watered stock in their capitalization. Indeed, some of them have a larger amount of watered stock than paid-in capital, and yet the national platform of the Republican Party guaranteed to them a reasonable profit on their entire capital stock.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] stated that the Ways and Means Committee, before passing the Payne-Aldrich bill, heard evidence for several months; that they went thoroughly into this matter, investigating the questions involved. He admitted that that law was not perfect, because he claimed that no tariff bill ever written was perfect. That is true, and will always be true, so long as we follow up the system that has been followed so long in the United States, and especially will it be true so long as the Republican Party carries out its policy of protection to the great manufacturing industries. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He stated that this bill met unmerited and unintelligent abuse at the hands of the people. He stated further that the pending bill is absolutely indefensible from any standpoint whatever.

Let us investigate some details of the Payne-Aldrich bill and compare them with the present bill.

We find that cloths, woolen and worsted, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound, under the Payne bill are taxed at an equivalent ad valorem of 134 per cent. The same articles, valued at more than 40 cents and not more than 70 cents per pound, are taxed 119 per cent; valued at more than 70 cents per pound, 94 per cent. The articles under the present bill carry an ad valorem of only 40 per cent.

Blankets valued at not more than 40 cents per pound carry an equivalent ad valorem of 107 per cent. To show that this tax is absolutely prohibitory and placed that high for the specific purpose of giving a high rate of protection to the manufacturers, we have only to cite that during the year 1907 there was only $316 worth imported into this country.

Blankets 3 yards in length carried an equivalent ad valorem of 165 per cent, and only $40 worth was imported. Under the proposed bill these articles carry an ad valorem of 30 per cent.

Flannel for underwear valued at not more than 40 cents per pound is taxed 143 per cent, while under this bill they are taxed 30 per cent and 45 per cent, according to value per pound.

Flannels valued from 40 to 50 cents per pound carry an ad valorem of 101 per cent, and there was only $128 worth imported; valued at 50 to 70 cents per pound were taxed 105 per cent, and the importations amounted to $111.

Dress goods, mixed, cotton and wool, valued at 15 cents per square yard carried a tax of 106 per cent. I notice that these goods, the average import price of which is 13½ cents per yard, are classed by the Republican tariff bill as luxuries. A woman's dress which would cost from $1.25 to $1.50 is thought by that party to be a luxury. They force the women purchasing the same to pay more than double what it is really worth, yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], in the face of the fact that he voted for that tax, had a great deal of criticism to make of this bill because a tax of 45 per cent is charged. There was much of inconsistency in his argument, because it is readily seen that under this bill there will be considerable saving on each article purchased.

Wearing apparel, cloaks, jackets, and other outside garments for women and children are taxed 80 per cent under the present law, while we propose to tax them just half that amount.

Under the Payne bill men's hats are taxed 86 per cent, and shawls valued at $1.25 and above are classed as luxuries and taxed at 92 per cent.

Shirts, vests, union suits, sweaters, pants, and so forth, manufactured of cotton goods and valued at more than $5 per dozen are taxed more than 64 per cent. Under the Payne bill these articles are classed as luxuries. Think of it. The poor man buying a pair of pants, a sweater, or shirt valued at more than $5 per dozen is charged by this Republican Party with the purchase of luxuries. Has it come to pass in this great country of ours that it is a luxury for a man to wear cheap garments of that kind? Does it not show that the Republican Party has absolutely no regard for the poor of the land, but that their whole interest is centered in the manufactures and protected interests of this country? Does it lie in the mouth of any man who was guilty of helping perpetrate such a fraud, such an iniquity as the Payne-Aldrich bill, to criticize the present bill, which reduces the burden of taxation so much?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] stated that the committee that reported the Payne bill spent months in gathering the testimony upon which to base the bill. Who was it, in the main, that appeared before the committee and told them what ought to be written into the laws of the land?

They were men who were very much interested, who had a great financial interest at stake. As Senator Sherman once said, referring to tariff legislation, an important class—the consumer—was not consulted. That the tariff laws enacted by the Republican Party have been written in the interest of certain

classes, instead of the great body of the people, is shown by the remarks of a member of that party, Senator Dolliver. He said, after the Payne bill becomes a law, that—

> Veteran experts are given the right to fix our laws. Behind nearly every veteran expert that we have had fluttering around here in recent years is the veteran manager of the enterprise that is to be fixed.

Again he said:

> The most important business of the American people has come down to the bargain counter, and men are authorized to say, "This is the citadel of protection; if any of you have constituents that want anything, come here; we are the dispensing power; support what we want, and take anything that you think you need."

In reading the testimony taken during the hearing referred to by the gentleman, I could not help but exclaim to myself that these men who were seeking protection at the hands of the Government are the miserable product of human greed and commercialism, seeking to build up their own interests at the expense of the men who labor and toil. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican Party has carried the idea of protection into the free list. Of the 600 articles on that list, there are not a half dozen that enter into common use in every home in the land, but we find that millions upon millions of dollars' worth of various articles that are used by the great trusts and manufacturing industries in the land are permitted to come in free. This is simply another illustration of a desire of the Republican Party to foster the interest of a class.

That party has for a long period of time "fooled" the farmer by pretending to be his friend. A "sop" is thrown out to him occasionally in their tariff legislation. For instance, a pretense of protecting the farmer who raises corn is made by placing a duty of 15 cents per bushel on corn and 20 cents per bushel on corn meal imported into this country. To show that this is a mere sham and pretense, I have only to refer to the fact that last year the United States produced about three-fourths of all the corn raised in the entire world, and that nearly all of the great nations of the earth, except ours, were importers of corn, while we had corn to export. Of course, it follows that this duty was of absolutely no benefit to the farmers of our country.

The cotton farmers of the South have absolutely no protection. More than two-thirds of our cotton is exported to foreign countries. The Liverpool market regulates not only the price of cotton there, but the price of cotton here. It comes in competition with cotton produced by the cheapest labor in the world—the coolie labor of India. This great product contributes very largely to make the balance of trade in our favor, yet the men who produce this staple get absolutely no protection, but are required to bear very heavy burdens both by way of taxation and by way of enforced contribution to the pockets of the manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard it stated very frequently during this debate that if the proposed bill becomes a law the sheep industry in this country will be destroyed, and reference has been made time after time to the fact that the sheep industry was almost destroyed by the Wilson bill.

By reference to the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1910, I find that in 1893 there were 47,000,000 sheep in the United States, and in 1897 there were 36,000,000, a reduction of over 11,000,000 during the time the Democratic Party was in power.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] the other day, in asking a question of some gentleman on this side, had this to say: "Do you not believe that the tariff was one of the elements that caused this great reduction in the number of sheep in the United States during that period?"

Mr. Chairman, that might reasonably be contended if there was not evidence that during the same period of time in Australia, and, indeed, all over the world, there was a great reduction in the number of sheep during that same period. Did the American tariff affect the sheep outside of the United States? Not at all.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that tariffs do not make panics; that they do not prevent panics; and that they do not cause sheep to grow or to die. Let us refer to a period during a Republican administration, and see what the condition of the sheep industry was during that time.

In 1903 when the Republicans were in power and the Dingley bill was in effect there were 63,000,000 sheep in the United States. Two years later, in 1905, when this same party was in power and the same Dingley bill was the law of the land, we find that there was only 45,000,000 sheep in the United States, a reduction of 18,000,000 in three years. What caused that? Was it the tariff? If the tariff did not cause that reduction, which was much larger than during the four years of Democratic administration, why should we charge the great reduction from 1893 to 1897 to the Wilson bill? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I find by reference to Table 40, in the report of the committee, that in 1890 the per capita consumption of wool in the United States was 9.24 pounds, and in 1910 it was only 7.11 pounds.

It has been argued that by reducing the duty on raw wool there would come into our country about 200,000,000 pounds from other countries, and that because of this the sheep industry of the United States would be destroyed.

Let me suggest that if the people had not been so burdened by taxation, had not been so shamefully required to contribute to the great wealth of certain manufacturers; if they had been permitted to pay simply a just and reasonable amount toward the revenue of the Government, and had been permitted to keep the balance of the fruits of their labor, that they would have been able to purchase the same amount of woolen clothes in 1910 as they were in 1890.

And further, that if relieved of these unjust, unnecessary, and iniquitous burdens that they will again be able to purchase the same amount as formerly, and we find by multiplying the number of our population by 2.13, the difference between the amount per capita, used during the years referred to, that it will require about 195,000,000 pounds of wool more than was used last year. This is almost the identical amount that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says would come into the country, and thereby destroy the sheep industry.

Every time an effort is made to give relief to the people the cry goes up from the Republican Party that the financial interests of the Nation are about to be destroyed. The advocates of protection claim for it that it is the cause of our great national prosperity, of our wonderful advancement in national wealth.

Everything good is placed to the credit of protection; all the reverses are charged up to the Democratic Party. The fertility of our soil, the bounties of nature, the great stores of natural wealth in the bowels of the earth, the industry and intelligence of our people, art, science, and inventive genius are all overlooked by the Republican Party when they come to consider the causes of the progress and wealth of the United States.

Frequent reference has been made to the Walker tariff during this debate. There has been much criticism by Republican speakers of that tariff. To show that the charge that that measure was harmful to our Nation is unfounded I cite Mr. Taussig, a writer on tariff history. He says:

> There is no doubt that the period from 1846 to 1860 was a time of great material prosperity, interrupted but not checked by the crisis of 1857. The moderate tariff undoubtedly was one of the elements that contributed to the welfare. The crisis of 1857 was an unusually simple case of active speculation, overbanking, panic, and depression, and it requires the exercise of great ingenuity to connect it in any way with the tariff act. When the tariff act of 1846 was passed the protectionists predicted disaster, but disaster did not come.

The increase in our national wealth between 1850 and 1860 under a Democratic tariff measure was equivalent to 126 per cent, a much greater increase than is shown at any time since that under Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, the special interests have been protected too long; the farmer, the laboring man, the real producer of wealth in this country should be given a chance. The farmer is not here asking that a tax be levied upon anyone for his benefit, but he simply asks that no unnecessary burdens be placed upon him, and that he be not required to create wealth for the benefit of any particular class.

The Republican platform, as I have said, guarantees to the producer—which really means the manufacturer—a reasonable profit upon his investments. What other class in this country has any such guaranty?

What benefits have the farmers received from the tariff? The price of his cotton and his wheat is fixed by a foreign market, yet almost every article that he purchases bears a tax, and in most instances a very heavy tax. He has no guaranty from the Government of any "reasonable profit." He must trust himself to the forces of nature and the help of a beneficient Providence.

He goes forth in the morning tilling his ground and sowing his seed with a silent prayer in his heart that those forces of nature and that Providence will be kind to him, will smile upon him, and that his harvest will be plenteous and bountiful.

Instead of looking to the tariff for help, he must take the risk of the soil responding to cultivation, of the sunshine and rain coming in due season so as to cause an abundant yield. If the withering blast, the long-continued drought, or any pest shall

destroy his crop; if the earth shall refuse its accustomed yield; if sickness or misfortune shall visit him and impair his ability to labor during the crop season, the Government throws no fostering care around him. All he can do is to await another season, ever hoping that the future will deal more kindly with him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HENRY of Texas 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 bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 23. An act to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW.;

S. 238. An act to authorize the extension of Lamont Street NW., in the District of Columbia;

S. 1524. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, in western Shawnee County, or in Wabaunsee County, in the State of Kansas;

S. 2052. An act relating to the removal of the North Point light station, Wisconsin, to another site;

S. 2224. An act to amend an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; and

S. 2532. An act providing for an increase of salary for the collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho.

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MAYS].

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to apologize to this House for the time that I have taken up in Congress heretofore in debate upon this floor. I have gone all the gaits of a Congressman since I came to Washington as a member of this body, except, perhaps, the running canter of the daily debaters upon this floor, and I do not say this, Mr. Chairman, in any sense of criticism of the members of that order, for I commend them not alone for their ability, but their industry, their interest in and their devotion to public affairs; and my remarks do not apply to one side of this House alone, but to both sides; and I believe that that order is of as much value to this great body of men as a picket line to a great army, and their uses much the same—that neither be taken unawares. In the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the leader of the majority upon this floor for the few minutes' time given me to make a speech, incidentally upon the tariff bill, and I want to commend him for his able leadership upon this floor and declare that, in my opinion, he ranks high up with the great men who have held sway as leaders in this body since the foundation of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I want to say to the Democratic people throughout the United States that if they are as harmonious on all great questions of public welfare as the Members of this body and as earnestly desire Democratic supremacy there will be no question of the election of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President in 1912. [Applause on the Democratic side.] One of the troubles heretofore with the Democratic Party against its success has been the multiplicity of its leaders. It has been an army of generals and colonels, each general with his ideas of the campaign. Consequently we exhausted ourselves fighting in our own ranks; but to-day we find the Democratic Party here in this House—and the eyes of the country are upon it—a unit for the cause of good government; and in my opinion no man in the Union is entitled to greater credit for it than the great man who is Speaker of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if this Democratic Congress carries out its promises to the people, makes good to them, the man who beats CHAMP CLARK for the Presidency in 1912 will know that he has been in a race. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When I came to Congress two years ago it was at the call of the President in extra session to revise the tariff bill. So objectionable had the Dingley law become to the people of the United States that a Republican President deemed it wise, imperative upon him, to call an extra session of Congress to revise the tariff downward, as he had promised on the stump. The session was called, and after five months of strenuous debate upon this floor, with every department of the Government in the hands of the Republican Party, the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was passed, much to the dissatisfaction of all the people, as no reduction had been made, and the Republican Party's promises to the people had been broken. Yet a Republican President signed that bill and afterwards declared that it was the best tariff bill ever made by the Republican Party.

And what do we find to-day? We find that same Republican President calling an extra session of Congress here to relieve an outraged people, suffering from the beneficence of the Payne tariff bill. We find as a result of that bill here a Democratic House, by a large majority, and we find in the White House a Republican President appealing to a Democratic House and the Democratic Members in the Senate to relieve the people from the high cost of living, from the outrageous taxes placed upon them by his own party. Was there ever such a spectacle before in the history of this country, a Republican President praying to be delivered from his Republican friends? [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the beginning of this Government the tariff was used for the purpose of raising revenue for the expenses of the Government. What do we find to-day? That it is the great issue, dividing the two great parties of our country. The Republican Party championing a tariff for a specific protection and not for the protection of the people, from whom the revenue is derived, but for the purpose of protecting the few against the many. Thereby creating great trusts and monopolies on the plea of protecting infant industries that to-day have become giants on account of the great favors received at the hand of the Republican Party and are a fast-growing menace to our Republican form of Government. On the other hand, we find the Democratic Party still clinging to the old doctrine that taxes should be taken from the people only for the running expenses of the Government, economically administered.

The people of the United States have grown tired of false promises and of the reckless extravagances of the Republican Party. See the change—from a majority of 47 in the last House on the Republican side to 63 majority on this side in the present House—and, my friends, this is not a Democratic exaggeration, but is an actual fact, and it is enough to carry consternation to the hearts of the strongest standpatters in the Republican Party. It must convince you Members on that side of the Chamber that something has happened to the Republican Party. Especially when you see the former head of the House down on the floor and its brains scattered from Minnesota to Maine. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The people have turned to the Democratic Party for relief on account of the promise by it of reform in every line and in every department of this Government. The first promise was to do away with Cannonism, to take away the czarlike power of the Speaker of the House to stifle or control all legislation.

This has been done by taking away the power of the Speaker to appoint the standing committees. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Then by curtailing the expenses of running the House alone we have saved the people $182,000 a year without lessening its efficiency in the least. Have also appointed committees to investigate every department of this Government, and from hearings before these committees you will be convinced that criminal extravagance and gross carelessness has been practiced in many departments. So much so that you will be fully warranted in turning the Republican Party from power as unworthy and recreant to the trust you have given them.

We have passed legislation without hesitation that the people of our country have been demanding for many years—that they be allowed the privilege of voting for the election of United States Senators, in order that they may send men to the Senate who will be their servants and not the servants of the great trusts and monopolies, and who will look to them—the people—for their election and not the trusts and corporations of this country. We have passed the publicity bill, which requires the making public campaign expenses before as well as after elections. We have passed the bill admitting New Mexico and Arizona as States without asking what their politics will be, Republican or Democratic, when admitted, carrying out our platform promises regardless of party advantage.

We have been called here by the President to pass the Canadian reciprocity bill, and without playing politics, we have done so, but I acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, that it is directly against the agricultural people of this country—the farmers—and why? Because, not a single line or syllable in it carries any encouragement or advantage to them; but every line in it is for somebody else's benefit. Its sole purpose is to cheapen the cost of living, to cheapen food products, and who produces food but the farmer. This measure is a great benefit to the dwellers in the city, the laborers in the mines, in the factories, and mills, and to the manufacturers especially, as it leaves him with protection on his wares, while to the farmer, all that it does, is to cheapen his products, while it does not make cheaper the articles that he must buy. But, Mr. Chairman, this Democratic House is not forgetful of the farmer man. It has also passed the

farmers' free-list bill, that does give hope and encouragement to him, while it gives joy and relief to the multitude. While it takes away from the revenues of our Government only $10,000,000, it saves to the consumers of our country $300,000,000 annually. If these two bills become law, this Congress will go down as the greatest in the history of our country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Will give new courage to our people, renew confidence in the Government, and will take away forever all talk of socialism and discontent. The people of this country are wiser to-day than ever before in the business of our Government; they are keeping pace with all questions that affect public welfare. They have formed opinions of their own, and one is, Mr. Chairman, that this mysterious tariff is simply a tax and that the ultimate consumer pays it, and to-day they are demanding that it be laid equally on all men, that there shall be no favored few taken into partnership with the Government and guaranteed, not only against loss on investment, but a reasonable profit on their business, at the expense of the many, whose backs are already bent with burdens too heavy to be borne. Our people know, Mr. Chairman, that we must raise revenue for the expenses of the Government, but they know also, Mr. Chairman, that a high-protective tariff does not make revenue for the Government, but does make great trusts and monopolies.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill reducing the tariff on wool—Schedule K—which even a Republican President has condemned and declared to be indefensible. It is enough for me to know that the people themselves have condemned it as the most outrageous and unjust tax ever heaped upon a people. Then, my Democratic friends, shall we reduce it? By all means. What excuse has the Republican Party for this iniquitous tax in the Payne bill, and can you look the people of this country in the face and even attempt to justify it? Is it not better that the lambs on a thousand hills go unherded for the lack of a shepherd and go unsheared for the lack of a reasonable profit and gambol in the sunshine forever than for the children of the multitude to lack clothing and covering sufficient to keep them warm and comfortable? Even take the Republican argument as true, that we need the prohibitive tariff to hold up this industry, which I deny, will you stake the life of an industry against the life and health of the people—and this a civilized country, a Christian Nation? God forbid. If so, then do you wonder that the question is asked:

> Is there no place on the face of the earth
> Where charity dwelleth; where virtue has birth;
> Where bosoms with kindness and mercy will heave
> When the poor and the wretched shall ask and receive?
> Is there no place at all where a knock from the poor
> Will bring a kind angel to open the door?

And the answer comes back:

> Go search the wide world wherever you can,
> There is no open door for the moneyless man.

I do not propose to discuss the woolen schedule in all of its phases. It is considered by the Republican Party to be full of mysteries. The Republican leader, Mr. MANN, vehemently declares that even the Democratic leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD, whom he declares the best posted on this side, is ignorant of the woolen tariff. And Mr. MANN declares that even he himself does not know all about it. A wonderful confession for him to make—that there is anything under the sun that he does not know. And he also says that we ought to wait and get information from the able Tariff Board appointed for that purpose. With the highest regard for every member of that board—and I do not know who they are—but in the light of former investigations and reports, what are we to expect of them? Do men gather figs of thistles, or would a Republican take his ideas of the tariff from a Democratic board? Then how could you expect the Democrats to be guided by a Republican Tariff Board?

As for me, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members of Congress, the representatives of the people, ought to make the tariff, and not delegate the power to any board. Why should this board be better fitted for the work, to gather information on the tariff, than Members of Congress and Senators who have been here for years, have helped to make tariff bills in the past, and who are still honored and trusted by their people? There are at least two schools of the tariff—tariff for specific protection and tariff for revenue with incidental protection. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican Party believes in a high protective tariff, while the Democratic Party in a tariff for revenue only. At last, whatever school has a majority on the Tariff Board, their idea will prevail. And a Republican President will appoint a Republican majority on the board and a Democratic President will appoint a Democratic majority. Consequently, the tariff will be left at last for Congress to settle.

Gen. Hancock, while a candidate for President, is quoted as saying that "the tariff is a local issue." Mr. Chairman, these are the words of a soldier, a man whose life has been given to war, and if followed to their last analysis would take us back to the Dark Ages, when every man was a law unto himself and every clan believed that it had the right to depredate upon its neighbor. Mr. Chairman, I had rather believe that we are our brother's keeper. In equal rights to all men, the greatest good to the greatest number. In union of States, of hearts, and of hands. That patriotism, like Old Glory, not only should, but does encircle us in its folds.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the tariff question has been before the American people for years, almost since the foundation of the Government, and will remain an issue, as it necessarily must, as it is a question of taxation, until it is settled right and until it is placed on a proper principle of pure taxation for the support of the Government and not for the benefit of a favored class in this country.

In the campaign of 1908 the Republicans promised to revise the tariff, which led the people to believe that they intended to revise it downward, and the campaign speeches, especially in the West, led the voters to believe that the platform meant a downward revision. After the Dingley law had been in effect for 10 years the Republican Congress elected in 1908 undertook its revision in the special session of 1909. But when they had completed their work at the close of the extra session it was ascertained that the average rates were higher than the Dingley law, which had been in force since 1897. The people had asked for relief from high taxation upon the necessaries of life, and they were answered by a revision that continued the high, or higher, taxation as before. "They asked for bread and were given a stone; they asked for fish and were given a serpent." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

During the consideration of the Payne bill the Republicans for the first time admitted that the tariff was a tax and the people must pay it; many of them had contended before that time that if it were a tax, the foreigner paid it. The people of this country are too intelligent to believe the statement that high taxes are a benefit to them. If they are intelligent enough to maintain the free Government that our fathers established, they will not believe your party when you tell them they can be taxed into prosperity in a tariff bill such as you gave them in 1909.

There is an element of the Republican Party that believes that the promises made to the people should be kept, and they insisted that in the revision of the Dingley law duties should be reduced. After the Payne tariff bill had been in operation less than a year it became so apparent that prices had not been reduced on manufactured articles that there came a revolt of the American people at the ballot box in 1910. The friends of the Payne bill hoped that prosperity would return to the people after the passage of that iniquitous measure and that they would forget the broken promises, but the people had good memories and knew they had been fooled, so when the election of 1910 came they did not hesitate to put out of power the party that had betrayed them as the money changers were thrown from the temple.

A Democratic House was elected charged with the duty of revising the tariff in the interest of the people and not solely for its beneficiaries. In that election there were a number of questions which the people determined by their votes, but first and foremost that the tariff on the necessaries of life should be reduced below the rate of the Payne-Aldrich bill and the highest rate should be placed upon the luxuries. Articles in more common use, those bought by people of limited means, should be taxed as little as possible, that the cost of living might be reduced.

This Congress was called together in a special session by the President of the United States and asked to pass the reciprocity pact with Canada. No mention was made by the President of any other legislation. He failed to call attention to other abuses in the Payne bill, among which is the woolen schedule, which he has said was indefensible and ought to be revised. The Democratic majority agreed with the President in the treaty with Canada; but they go further and insist that the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill should be reduced wherever that can be done in the interest of the people and the condition of the Treasury will permit. They have passed the free-list bill giving the people relief on many of the necessaries of life that are now controlled by the trusts of the country, which compel them to pay exorbitant prices as tribute to their greed and selfishness. The Democratic Party has always stood for the least possible taxation of the people for the needs of the Government, eco-

nomically administered, believing that all forms of taxation are more or less burdensome upon the people, which should be kept as light as possible. The Democratic Party does not believe that any form of taxation increases the prosperity of the people. It believes the power of taxation should only be used for the support of the Government, and they do not object to taxation for that purpose, but they do object to being taxed for the benefit of the privileged few.

Democrats hold that it is wrong to tax one class of people for the benefit of another; they believe that every man should bear his just proportion of the expenses of government, but should not be asked to contribute for the benefit of a favored class of citizens and which does the Government no good and only enriches a few at the expense of the many. This system of protection has so permeated the body politic of our citizenship that protective laws of every form have been proposed to give one person the advantage over another. Men come to Congress and ask that laws be passed that will enable them to gather from their neighbors a portion of their earnings to enrich themselves.

The doctrine of "equal rights for all and special privileges for none" has been a Democratic doctrine for years, and it was no truer when it was uttered than it is at the present time. There never has been a better time in the history of the Government to put it into effect than now. Every individual citizen of our country should be given an equal chance with every other, and no law should be passed that has for its purpose to take from the earnings of the one and put them in the pocket of another without giving anything in return therefor. Out of this system of indirect taxation and the protection of a certain class of our country has also grown up the extravagant appropriations and the squandering of the people's money.

The people do not directly see the amount of taxes placed upon the individual articles which they are compelled to buy, and led to believe they are paying but little of the tax, and the object of protective interests has been to increase appropriations to such an extent that we must keep up this vicious system, under the plea that it is necessary to raise the revenue for the support of the Government. All appropriations should be considered as so much taxes upon the people, which must be paid by the producers of the country.

We can not escape the fact that the wealth is produced by the labor of the country, so that taxation must, in the last analysis, fall upon those who are the producers, those who create the wealth. It is not contended that tariff taxation should be removed entirely, but should only be levied with the idea of securing revenue for the Government. Years ago the idea of strict economy in public affairs was demanded of the people's representatives, but I am sorry to say in the last few years there has grown up in this country the idea that what was secured from the National Government is so much gained, to which we have not contributed our part; that the money taken from the great body of the people is returned to them in increased wages for their labor and better prices for their products, and that they are thus compensated for the wrong done them by this vicious system of taxation.

The majority on this side of the House has been intrusted with the responsibility of giving relief to the people from the burdens of taxation and to see that the expenses of the Government shall be reduced so that in the end the producers may be relieved of any unjust burden of taxation, and we are endeavoring to enact such laws as will give the relief that the people have asked for so long. No lobbyists, as was said of the last bill which passed Congress, have made this bill, but it has been made by the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In writing the bill under consideration the Ways and Means Committee have made a new departure. The Wool Trust was not consulted about the preparation of the bill. The framers of this bill had in mind two very important things which have not heretofore been considered—the lightening of the burdens of the consumers and the needs of the Government for revenue—hence, for the first time in a half century there is presented for the consideration of the American Congress a tariff bill not framed by so-called experts, the provisions of which are so plain and simple that the ordinary man or woman can understand them; a bill that should serve as a model for all future tariff legislation.

No agents of the Wool Trust have had access to the Committee on Ways and Means of this Congress that they might write the wool schedule. The committee has not asked, desired, or permitted them to do so.

The reprehensible methods which have hitherto obtained in the framing of the tariff bills were exposed by the late Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, in a speech in the United States Senate June 13, 1910. In that speech, one of the greatest ever delivered in the Senate, after showing how President Taft had been deceived and led to declare in a speech that the marked increases in the cotton duties provided for in the Payne law were applicable only to the high-priced cottons used by our people as luxuries, Senator Dolliver said:

No expert in the New York customhouse ever conceived this job I have referred to in this cotton schedule without the knowledge and consent of people standing behind the scenes. This very expert, who seems to have done the cotton business for us, is a veteran. He was just as helpful to you, my Democratic friends, in 1894 as he ever has been to us. He went home from the session that wrote the Wilson tariff law, boasting that he was the author of it. In the presence of one of the most distinguished citizens of Massachusetts, once connected with the Treasury Department, he stated with evident pride that he represented the textile industries of New England; that he had a contract with them that if he would drop his business as general appraiser he could go with the Textile Association with three times the salary of the office which the Government of the United States had confided to him. This veteran expert helped the Republican side of the committee in 1897 in the daytime and the Democratic side of the committee at night. He was a messenger between hostile camps. He certified to the Republican members of the committee that the sugar schedule did one thing and certified to the Democratic members that it did another. Instead of being an expert, he is an employee, and he has come down now for nearly a generation, dominating the proceedings of Congress, telling everybody what ought to be done, relieving even the great committees of their duty of investigation, writing these laws, and presenting to the American public a scandalous transaction such as I have exposed here to-day.

He also said:

If the committee does not have a care the public will get the impression that the tariff was revised by its most intimate friends, and the defense of the performance left to a total stranger. It is probable that those who engineered the tariff bill through the two Houses indulged the expectation that the exact nature of the transaction, while it was going on, could be hidden by the intricate movements of the machinery. But it may well be doubted whether the most buoyant lobbyist about the Capitol expected that the bungling work of Congress, when known and read of all men, could be surrounded by such an array of bogus statistics and high official sanctions, disseminated in speeches, in private letters, and by personal telegraphic messages throughout the country, as to very long conceal its actual operation from the American people. I do not propose that it shall remain the practice of the Republican Party if I can help it. I do not propose that the work which it brought here last summer shall be forced into the platform of the Republican Party and made a test of party fealty and party duty and party obligation. I propose that the job shall stand on its merits, and that the American people shall inquire to the full limit of their curiosity into every detail of the performance.

Again, I do not like this idea of having customhouse officials, to whom most of us have never been introduced, write our tariff laws. It hurts my pride to start with. Those who know us begin to see what a bubble this Senate business is; that the majority does not represent ideas—which my friend from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] so well says is the one potent thing there is in this world—that its debates have no significance, that when you want to get anything done you send out to the customhouse and get an expert—a veteran expert, if you can—to fix it up. Well, I am tired of it, and I will tell you why. The veteran experts that are given carte blanche to fix up our laws do not appeal to me as they used to. Behind nearly every veteran expert that we have had fluttering around here in recent years is the veteran manager of the enterprise that is to be fixed.

At another time he said:

The refusal of Aldrich to permit a proper revision of the wool and woolen schedule, with its excessive rates upon the necessities of life, the consumption value of which amounts to over $700,000,000 per year, was without doubt the worst feature of Payne-Aldrich tariff legislation.

Mr. CLARK, the Speaker of the House, in his speech on the conference report of the Payne-Aldrich bill, read an article from the Washington Times in reference to the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, page 4705, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31, 1909, as follows:

With the closing days of the tariff session in sight and many of the schedules already agreed upon, scores of professional lobbyists are buying tickets for home, the hotels are feeling the effect of the exodus, the expressmen are doing a land-office business, and Members of Congress are feeling some confidence in being able to leave their committee rooms without being held up every 10 steps by some one who wants to talk tariff.

While there have been no scandals about the tariff lobbies, the lobbyists have done enough entertaining to occasion the remark that "a pleasant time was had."

Some of the lobbyists have been in Washington since the day the Ways and Means Committee held its first public hearing. Some of them have devoted their entire time to one particular schedule, while others have been working for half a dozen interests. A few of the lobbyists are lawyers, but most of them are either experts in a particular line or are former employees of the New York customhouse, thoroughly familiar with the workings of the tariff.

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

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

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

The bill now under consideration to reduce the tariff upon wool and woolen clothing is intended to afford some relief to the people in one of the great necessaries of life. In the colder climates people are compelled to buy woolen clothing and woolen blankets to keep them warm, and, as a matter of health, it is essential they should supply themselves with such clothing; and I was surprised at my colleague, the distinguished minority leader, saying that it was contended by some that certain woolen clothing was unnecessary and unhealthful.

You must remember, also, that the coal miners of the country, of which there are many thousands in the State from which the minority leader comes, must buy wool clothing. They are compelled to buy it. Let us help these men by giving them cheaper necessaries of this kind. We believe that it is the duty of the Government to reduce taxation upon these articles to as low a figure as possible to do in view of the condition of the Treasury.

When we look at the statistics and history of sheep raising and woolgrowing in the United States some peculiar facts are brought to our view. It has been claimed by those who believe in a high tariff upon wool and woolen goods that it is of great benefit to the woolgrower and the wool manufacturer of the country. There is no doubt that, so far as the manufacturer is concerned, it has been of great advantage to him, as under this system the tariff has been prohibitive. When an argument is made upon the wool question it is pointed out that the decrease in the number and price of sheep and price of wool under the Wilson bill is an argument why a high tariff ought to be retained.

The Republicans point to the era of depression from 1893 to 1897 as the result of the Wilson bill, not recognizing the fact that the depression of that period began before the Democrats gained power and had begun to disappear before they went out of power, and that the depression was world-wide in all branches of trade. The Republicans use these stock arguments whenever as standpatters they are called on to defend the wool schedule.

Our protectionist friends attempt to make much of the fact that a sharp decline in the price of wool followed the passage of the Wilson bill in 1894. They attribute that decline to the placing of wool on the free list, when the fact is that the price of wool began to fall below the general level of the prices which had prevailed for several years to 1885, but after a decline of 6 to 10 cents a pound in that year prices took a lower level, which was maintained till the financial depression of 1893 set in when a still further decline took place, until in April, 1895, fine wool dropped to 16½ cents a pound, the lowest price ever known in the eastern markets. Chester Whitney Wright, in his "Wool Growing and the Tariff," writing of the effect of the Wilson tariff law on the price of wool, says:

> The final enactment of this bill in August, 1894, had but little effect, its expected passage and the general business depression having previously made allowances for it.

Again, the increased use of cotton for clothing had considerably to do with lessening the demand for woolen goods, and consequently lessening the demand for wool. It will be observed that there are three great downward slides as to the production of the sheep and wool, but they are silent as to two of them, but proclaim loud as to that from 1893 to 1897. This happened to be during a Democratic administration, and therefore charged to the reduction of the tariff on wool. It is true that during this period there was a decrease of 9,500,000 sheep, or more than 3,000,000 a year. But how about the slide from 1885 to 1890? During this latter period the average duty on wool was about 11 cents, or practically that of the Dingley law, yet we lost 18,000,000 sheep. It surely will not be contended that the removal of the tariff had anything to do with that.

In the decline of the production of wool and sheep we find that, as stated, in 1903–1905 the number of sheep decreased 19,000,000, or that in two years there was a reduction in the number three times as great as the loss when there was no tariff on wool and when the duty on wool under the Dingley law was 11 cents a pound, as it is to-day. It will certainly not be denied that there are other causes which are shown by these figures which operate to decrease the number of sheep. Among these causes are winter exposure, scarcity of food, the depredation of dogs, wild animals, and thieves, the high price of land, and the low price of wool.

In 1895, according to the agricultural report, winter exposure killed off 2.9 per cent, or 967,000 sheep, while losses from all other sources was over 857,000. If we add these together we would find that the loss was 1,824,000, or within 100,000 of the loss of 1896 over 1895. In other words, the low price of wool had little or no perceptible effect, as it was limited to less than one-third of 1 per cent.

We hope to be able to show that the Wilson bill was not responsible for the fall in prices from 1890 to 1896. Souerback's compilation of prices on 45 staples for England, Prof. Conrad's compilation for Germany, the Bank of Japan for 40 staples for Japan, and the compilation of Economic Research for the United States show the change in prices of 1890–1900:

	1890–1896	1897–1900
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Great Britain	[1] 15	[2] 17
Germany	[1] 23	[2] 22
Japan	[2] 31	[2] 26
United States	[1] 23	[2] 23

[1] Fall. [2] Rise.

All of these countries, as we know, were on a gold basis. The United States had the advantage of high-tariff legislation, yet all of them had a rise beginning in 1896, so that the cause of prosperity must have been something more than tariff legislation one year after the rise began. In England this rise in prices began in 1895, two years before the passage of the Dingley law. The fall in prices in three of these countries began in 1890, while the Wilson bill was not passed until 1894 and had nothing to do with the decline.

The money question had much to do with this world-wide depression. During the period the gold of the world was hoarded, and there is no doubt that the fall of 15 to 24 per cent was due to the limited supply of gold, and the rise in prices was due largely to the increased production of the metal. It must not be forgotten that Russia had obtained $500,000,000 of the supply of gold, which she hoarded and did not begin to pay out until 1897, when she returned $300,000,000 again to circulation. Austria also hoarded gold from 1890 to 1896 and returned it to circulation in 1897. France, Germany, and England also protected themselves by increasing their supply of gold from 1887 to 1896 more than had ever been done in their history.

We must not forget the fact that about the time that the gold began to be returned to circulation there came a rise in prices the world over. It must also be remembered that there came a larger production of gold in 1897. These are large factors in the rise and fall of prices all over the world. The rise and fall of prices for four years before and after 1896 correspond to the rise and fall of the world's deficit and surpluses for the same quadrennial period. It is also true that the fall of prices of gold and the rise in prices of 1896–1899 to the fall of that commodity. There is no doubt had the Wilson bill continued to 1899 there would have been the same rise in prices. It must also be remembered the prices began to rise in 1896, before the passage of the Dingley law, and that this increase of prices is entirely outside of the power and force of that law.

It must also be remembered that the rise and fall of prices were world-wide during this late period, while the Dingley law, of course, was only confined to the United States. It must not be forgotten that the increased production of gold effected this world-wide rise in prices, while the passage of the Dingley law effected the creation of many trusts in the United States, and this produced the rise in the American trust-made goods far in advance of the slighter world-wide advances. In England prices rose, from 1896 to 1897, 27 per cent, and in the United States 49 per cent; and in 1908, 61 per cent. The English rise in prices may be fairly taken as a result of the increased supply of gold, and in our own country the increase would be divided as follows:

Increased prices, 12 years.

	Per cent.
Increase in United States prices	49
Increase due to gold supply	27
Increase due to tariff trusts in 1907	22
Which in 1908 had risen to	34

Market value of sheep imported into the United States in the market from when exported as shown by Agricultural Yearbook:

Import prices per head.

1892	$3.78
1893	3.66
1894	3.25
1895	3.34
1896	2.65
1897	2.51
1898	2.82
1899	3.47
1900	3.58
1901	3.73
1902	3.58
1903	3.44
1904	3.42

Import prices per head—Continued.

1905	$3.77
1906	4.24
1907	4.98
1908	4.82
1909	4.90
1910	5.52

Prices of sheep have advanced all over the world from 1897 to 1910 irrespective of tariff laws.

On the other hand, sheep for export brought excellent prices, as the statistics will show:

Export prices per head.

1892	$3.43
1893	3.39
1894	6.29
1895	6.48
1896	6.26
1897	6.27
1898	6.08
1899	5.96
1900	5.83
1901	6.49
1902	5.41
1903	6.03
1904	6.49
1905	6.29
1906	5.64
1907	5.54
1908	5.83
1909	5.40
1910	4.69

Beginning with 1894, export prices for American sheep almost doubled and held their rank for 11 years, when there was a slight decline.

Prices of wool.

DUTY, 22 CENTS A POUND.

[Foreign prices are for washed wool, duty unpaid; domestic prices, New York.]

Years.	Foreign.	Domestic, Ohio XX.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
1894	20	23½
1895	18	18½
1896	16	19
1897	17	24½
1898	19	29½
1899	17½	31½
1900	23	32½
1901	17	27
1902	20	29½
1903	46½	32½
1904	53	34
1905	29½	35½
1906	34	34½
1907	36	34
1908	31	32½
1909	26	36

It is clear that prices of wool were as low relatively abroad for the period 1894–1897 as they were in the United States.

It is plainly evident that no duty whatever from 1894 to 1903 was needed to protect American woolgrowers, but that notwithstanding this, the duty, or a part of it, was added to the price. The foreign price in 1903–4 was higher than the domestic. The foreign could not compete duty paid in 1905; the duty, 22 cents, added to the foreign price, 19½ cents, made 51½ cents laid down in New York, against the home price of 35½ cents. Foreign wool in 1906, 1907, and 1908 was as high as domestic, irrespective of duty. During the periods of two or three years natural law fixed foreign prices as high as, or higher than, our prices, during which the woolgrowers needed no protection.

On first-class washed wool not on the skin the duty is 22 cents a pound—a rate not justifiable by foreign prices. Domestic wool at all times could have held its own without a tariff of any kind. Domestic woolgrowers produce about two-thirds of all the wool consumed in the United States; the remaining one-third must be purchased abroad. The above table shows beyond peradventure that the woolgrowers of the United States not only have the domestic market, but can always have that market for all their goods, and can stand a material reduction in the present tariff laws.

American wool in the markets to-day is selling for less, compared with what it might sell for, inasmuch as foreign wools, duty unpaid, are running at about the same price.

It is contended by the opponents of free wool, and the opponents of this bill as well, that taking the tariff off of wool or reducing it tends to lower the price. A comparison of prices under the Walker tariff, that placed a 30 per cent tariff on wool, under the tariff of 1857, which placed wool on the free list, and the Morrill tariff of 1861, do not sustain this contention. During the life of the Walker tariff the average price of wool was 45.5 cents per pound, and during the three years that wool was on the free list under the tariff of 1857 the price was 44.6 cents a pound, a decrease of only nine-tenths of a cent a pound. [Applause.]

It is true that a rise in the price of wool followed the enactment of the Morrill tariff law in March, 1861, and from 1862 to 1865 the average currency price advanced from 44.6 cents in 1861 to 73.49 cents in 1865, or an average increase of 67 per cent. The tariff had little or nothing to do with this increase. The increased demand for wool to clothe one of the largest armies the world has ever seen during those years may have had a slight tendency to increase prices; but the truth is, there was very little increase in the price of wool during those years, when you reckon prices on the gold basis. That the prices of wool from 1862 to 1879, when the resumption of specie payments was declared, were inflated prices, is shown by the fact that the prices of wool steadily declined from the average price for the three grades of 51 cents a pound in 1880 to 22.6 cents a pound in 1894, with the duty ranging from 42.60 to 108.24 per cent.

This is more clearly shown by the following table, taken from the report of the tariff commission of 1882 (vol. 2, p. 2435):

Average prices of domestic wool per pound.

	July, 1857–April, 1861—Gold.	April, 1861–July, 1864.		July, 1864–April, 1867.	
		Paper.	Gold.	Paper.	Gold.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Fine	49.15	66.15	47.73	75.54	49.05
Medium	42.73	64.23	46.73	71.12	46.01
Coarse	33.69	57.15	38.20	65.00	41.63

An analysis of the prices in this table will show that, measured by the gold standard which prevailed in 1861, the net increase in the average price of wool during the Civil War and the 11 years subsequent thereto was only 3.71 cents per pound, so that the increased demand for wool occasioned by the war and the high protective tariff together advances the gold price of wool only $8\frac{8}{10}$ cents a pound.

If it were true that the woolgrowers are benefited by a high protective duty on wool, it is unjust to the consumers who constitute the greater part of our people. To show the inequality and injustice of the high protective tariff on wool and woolen goods, take the State of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in part. The amount of raw wool and its equivalent in fabric consumed by the people of my State during the year 1910 amount to about 40,000,000 pounds, while the production of raw wool amounted to only 2,450,000 pounds, or slightly more than one-twentieth of the amount consumed.

The average rate of duty for the same year on all classes of wool was 44.31 per cent, so that the 5,638,591 people of Illinois were taxed to the tune of $4,600,000 on raw wool alone, and in addition were taxed at exorbitant rates on the woolen goods they consumed. [Applause.]

According to the census reports for 1910 there are 250,853 farms in the State of Illinois. Of this number only 26,240 made returns of sheep, so that only about one out of ten of the farmers of my State keep sheep on their farms, and these only keep them as a side line, for the purpose of consuming forage and roughage that other stock will not eat, and for their value for clearing up fields that have run to briers and undergrowth. The few farmers who keep sheep do not keep them for their wool clip, but for mutton, usually selling their male lambs as soon as they are of marketable age, keeping the ewes for breeding purposes. The farmers of my district and, I believe, of the whole State of Illinois are vastly more interested in securing cheaper woolen goods for themselves and their families than they are in maintaining excessive tariff rates on wool and woolen goods.

The farmers of my district are intelligent men, who love justice and fair dealing, and none of them are asking or desiring that Congress shall enact laws that will give them an advantage over other classes of their fellow-citizens. I have not had a single protest against the passage of this bill from my people, and I feel confident that my vote for this measure will receive the hearty approval of an overwhelming majority, if not all, of my constituents, irrespective of their political affiliations. [Applause.]

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I desire to read to you what I consider one of the most remarkable statements that has been made in years in another body at the other end of the Capitol. It is as follows:

So, Mr. President, even though we were receiving no benefit from our present protective duties the future welfare of the farmers of wheat, barley, oats, and flax demands the maintenance of the present protective

law. That, Mr. President, is what I have been praying for. I hoped to live to see the day—

Mark you these words—

when production of wheat in this country might be a little less than the home demand, just sufficiently less to give the farmer the full benefit of protection.

I am surprised that there is any man who would stand in Congress and say that he hoped and prayed that a time might come in this fair land of ours when wheat and bread would be so scarce that in consequence the price must be raised because we are compelled to import it from a foreign country. Has the protective theory of our Government gone so far that protectionists pray that the bread which goes into the mouths of our people may be made higher in price by being taxed? [Applause on the Democratic side].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Could I get about 10 minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 10 minutes more.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am sure no farmer in all this land is offering such a prayer. He loves justice and fairness too well to ask such advantage of his neighbor, though he does want the best price for his products to which he is justly entitled. He is tired of being compelled to sell the products of his farm in competition with the world and to buy the necessaries of life for himself and his family in a restricted market; and each time he makes a purchase he is compelled to unjustly give up a part of his earnings to the protected interests. It is unjust and unfair to the farmer, and I for one am here to protest against such treatment. What I do want, and what I insist on, is that the producer shall have fair treatment. He wants no more, he should have no less. [Applause.]

The reductions of duty under this bill and placing articles on an ad valorem rate certainly is an improvement over the Payne-Aldrich bill, because the duties on all wool and woolen goods are at least 50 per cent less than under the law now in existence. The letter of Edward Moir, from which Mr. MANN, the distinguished minority leader quoted the other day on the pending bill, says:

Special privilege was written into the tariff bill in 1867, and by shrewd manipulation has been continued by the Republican Party in the revised Schedule K.

The duty on yarn of 30 per cent is certainly a great reduction over the present duty, which amounts to 82.38 per cent; that on cloths, knit fabrics, and so forth, a reduction from 97.11 to 40 per cent, will give relief to the people under the Payne tariff. On blankets and flannels composed wholly or partly of wool from 95.57 to 30 and 45 per cent is a reduction that will certainly be appreciated by the buyers of these articles. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] talked of the tariff of 45 per cent upon women's and children's dress goods he seemed to lay some stress upon the statement he made of the taxing of these necessary articles 45 per cent, and in that way tried to cover up the fact that these same articles are now taxed under the Payne-Aldrich bill to the amount 102.85 per cent, a saving of more than 50 per cent upon this class of goods under the bill now under consideration.

The woman who goes to the merchant to buy a woolen dress for herself or children will certainly be thankful that she is not robbed of the extra $4.50 out of every $10 purchase she makes. On ready-made clothing and articles of wearing apparel the reduction from 81.31 to 45 per cent will certainly be appreciated by the people who buy this class of goods, and it must be remembered that those who can not afford to pay $40 or $50 for a tailor-made suit must depend upon the ready-made clothing for their supply, and I am sure this class of people will not forget the fact that they were taxed this extra amount under the present law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On webbings, goring, and other articles enumerated under paragraph 9 the reduction from 87.6 per cent to 35 per cent will relieve the Woolen Trust of a portion of its protection, which it now enjoys at the expense of the American people. The large reduction on the different class of carpets will be of benefit to those who buy this class of goods, and will enable the American people to purchase carpets, rugs, and so forth, from 10 to 35 per cent less than they are now able to do. So, considering this bill from the interest of the consumer, those who are compelled to buy of the class of articles enumerated in this bill, there is certainly relief to the people from this unjust taxation and it takes away from the Woolen Trust the right to exploit the American consumer.

The Democratic Party has stood, and still stands, for the principle of the lowest possible tax on wool and woolen goods. This has been a cardinal principle of the party, on account of the almost universal use of this commodity, that they should be taxed as little as possible so the people who are compelled to buy may not be subject to the demands of the trust. The party does not believe that it is right to tax a person who is compelled to buy a blanket to keep him warm, more than a hundred per cent, or a suit of clothes, which he is compelled to buy for himself or family, of several times the value of the wool that enters into its manufacture.

The poor of this country, who have shivered in the wintry winds, will be thankful that they are able to buy woolen clothes at a reasonable price, and not be compelled to pay tribute to the Woolen Trust of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These trust magnates, who are ever ready to contend for the right by law to put their hands in the pockets of the people, remind me of a story of one member of these protected industries, who had his picture painted and called in his friend to examine it. There was a finely painted picture of the man standing erect with his hand in his pocket, and, after viewing his friend's picture for a few minutes, he was asked his opinion of it. He replied: "It is a good likeness of you, but there is just one thing wrong; you have your hand in your pocket, but, to make it natural, you ought to have your hand in some other person's pocket." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill may not meet the expectations of all men who believe in lower taxes on manufactured woolens or free wool, but it does reduce very materially the tax on these articles. When wool is reduced from 44 per cent per pound to 20, it is a material reduction, and the average reduction of manufactures of wool, reduced from an average ad valorem duty of 90.10 per cent to 42.55 per cent, will give some relief to the buyers of this class of goods. As Democrats, let us not forget our promises made to the people to reduce taxation on the necessaries of life that the burden of the people might be as light as possible and that the highest tax should be placed on the luxuries.

The last platform of the Democratic Party declared we were for a gradual reduction of tariff taxation to a revenue basis. We are not going to forget our pledges to the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We propose to go on and revise the whole Payne-Aldrich tariff law until all the schedules are brought to a revenue basis. Having put our hands to the plow, there will be no turning back. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For the Democratic Party to hesitate or falter in its purpose to reduce taxation, to put a stop to the reckless and unnecessary expenditure of the people's money, would be to show itself unworthy of the high trust and confidence reposed in it by the people. The Democratic Party has turned its face toward the pole star of freedom, and with the old Democratic shibboleth of "equal rights for all and special privileges for none" emblazoned on its pure white banner it will rally to its sacred cause the men and women of this land who love liberty and justice, and in God's own good time it will deliver this Government from the hands of the spoiler and the greed of the privileged few and place it again in the hands of the people. Then will this Government be conducted in the plain, simple, frugal manner in which it was conducted by the Democratic Party for more than half a century, during which period millionaires were few, tramps were unknown, and there was no such thing as enforced idleness in all the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when that glad day shall come and justice resumes her sway, every man will be secure in the enjoyment of his earnings, and be able to live "under his own vine and fig tree, with none to molest or make him afraid." Then will the justice and righteousness of the principles of pure and unadulterated Democracy be crystallized in the Constitution and laws of our country. Those principles which will be living, vital principles when—

The sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

When these glorious principles bear their full fruitage in the legislation and administration of the affairs of this Government, and the burdens of unjust and unequal taxation are lifted from the shoulders of the millions who toil and produce the wealth of this country, then will justice and freedom and Democracy hold sway, and the glad time will have come that was foretold by the Hebrew Seer—

And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them.
They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat.

[Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I propose to discuss the bill [applause] now pending before the House—if it is pending, and has not already been acted upon [laughter on the Republican side]—and shall make, preliminarily, some reflections upon the business of the House as it has progressed thus far, as to which our friends on the other side of the aisle are patting themselves on the back and telling what a good record they have made up to the present time; and after that I propose to discuss the present tariff law; and when I am discussing that, so far as I have time, if there is anybody on that side of the House who knows anything about it, I would like to have them ask questions; and even if they do not know anything about it, I would still like to have them ask questions. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, our friends on that side are telling us what a wonderful record they have made. Well, they have passed a joint resolution to amend the Constitution with respect to the election of Senators. I voted in this House for such a joint resolution—not precisely like this—on three different occasions, when nearly all of the Members of the House joined in voting for it. But there was no "joker" in the joint resolution that we proposed. We did not amend anything else than the Constitution. This House passed a law, a sort of corrupt-practice act, in relation to the election of Members of the House, an amendment to the bill that we proposed a year ago in this House, and sent it over to the Senate, requiring the publication of campaign expenses as applied to Members of the House; and then the next day you provided for the election of Senators by a popular vote, and also provided that Congress can not regulate or require publicity or do anything else with reference to the honest election of United States Senators.

Now, if they can get any satisfaction out of that, if there is any reason in all that why they should refer to it as a wonderful record, they had better make the most of it speedily, because the truth will get out and will get after them in a few days, and the country will see what a perpetual humbug all legislation of that kind is, proposing to do something and then nullifying it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That resolution will come over here from the Senate—it is here now. It will have to be acted upon by the House in a few days, and I shall look at the roll call when we come to the vote to agree to the Senate amendment, because they have left in the Constitution the power for Congress to pass a corrupt-practice act in reference to senatorial elections if this amendment carries, and I want to see how many men there are on that side of the aisle who voted for a corrupt-practice act in regard to Members of the House who will vote to prohibit the Congress of the United States from passing a corrupt-practice act in regard to the popular election of Senators of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] Well, they passed the reciprocity bill——

Mr. GARNER. Before the gentleman goes to the reciprocity bill, will he yield for an interruption?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Did the gentleman from New York vote for the resolution offered and passed by the House, amending the Constitution, providing for the direct election of Senators?

Mr. PAYNE. I have voted for it in three prior Congresses. As the gentleman knows, I was unable to be in the House at the time that resolution passed at this session of Congress. I have voted for such a resolution three times since I have been in Congress.

Mr. GARNER. A number of gentlemen on his side of the House did vote for the resolution, and I did not know that they had the custom of voting for things that had jokers in them. The gentleman says this had a joker in it.

Mr. PAYNE. Sometimes, when we have a Democratic House and a Republican Senate, it is well to get the resolution over to the Senate, in order that it may be put in proper shape. [Applause on the Republican side.] So these gentlemen were entirely excusable for voting in the way they did.

But you passed the reciprocity bill. You have passed what you call a free-list bill. You have sometimes had the courage, to say nothing about the lack of discretion, to call it a farmers' free-list bill. I suppose that is because the farmer's meat is put on the free list, not only as to Canada where it is not now, even under the reciprocity arrangement, but as to the Argentine Republic, Australia, New Zealand, everywhere where they raise beef, and can raise it more cheaply than we can in the United States.

Well, if you are disposed to do that, I am perfectly willing you should, but think of the amazing effrontery of saying that it is a farmers' free-list bill. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Did the farmers want it? Did the farmers ask for it? Why do you call it that? Well, of course, I am not in the councils of the Democratic Party, but I can see what is going on. There is some resentment amongst the farmers about the reciprocity business. You have heard of it. I also have heard more or less about it. About the time you began to hear that, and it was coming in here, and you had in mind this free-list bill, you dubbed it a farmers' free-list bill for the purpose of fooling the farmers on that subject. Well, when the farmers get hold of a question and settle it by reflecting upon it in their own minds, they generally settle it right. I mean the real farmers. I do not mean the fellows who sit down on a sugar barrel in the grocery store and discuss public questions while their farms are going to rack and ruin; I do not mean the farmer who leaves his tools out during the winter because he has not the energy to put them under shelter, or has not had the energy to provide shelter for them; but I mean the real, hard-working, thrifty farmer. When he stops to read and think, in the winter evenings, he may not have anything more than a weekly paper from which to get his news, but when he comes to his final conclusion he is generally right about it. He may be led away by fake publications for a while, but he gets around to the real thing before he gets through, and when any party starts in to gain popularity and win the vote of the farmer by proposing things that would not deceive an ordinary 12-year-old child, we will find, when it comes around to election day, that the farmer has not been fooled by the operation.

What is there that you have done at this session of Congress that you pride yourselves on? I know you talk about the splendid record of this Congress, but what have you really done that entitles you to anything on that record? You have passed that free-list bill, and there is not a man on either side of this House who can tell anywhere from $15,000,000 to $50,000,000 what the cut will be in the revenue on account of that free-list bill. No such crude measure was ever brought into the House by any party as that bill.

You tied yourselves up in advance in the caucus. I heard some man shouting this morning about how you had gotten rid of the one-man power in this Congress. It does not make any difference whether it is one man who enforces the rules in the Speaker's chair, who appears in the open and whose acts and deeds are known and read of all men, or whether he pulls the wires that control the caucus, and the caucus votes blindly, without knowing what is in the bill, and especially without knowing what is the effect of the bill, to stand by it to a man when it comes into the House, and not vote for any amendment, no matter how ridiculous the amendment offered shows the bill to be. You call that ridding yourselves of the tyranny of your leaders.

You criticized us in the years past for coming in here with a rule and having a five minutes' debate on a tariff bill, and allowing amendments proposed by the committee first to be considered, and because we did not get through with the entire reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

How much better is it for you to discuss a great bill like this wool bill for four hours in caucus and having four hours' debate in favor of the proposition, and giving five minutes' debate against the proposition, and then agreeing in caucus to stand by that bill?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I wish to correct the gentleman from New York, because in the caucus the arguments and discussions occupied 10 hours.

Mr. PAYNE. I accept the amendment; and still there was five minutes for the opposition. I have understood that my friend from Colorado did not stay during the whole time of the caucus.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I was there all the time.

Mr. PAYNE. Did not the gentleman walk out?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. No; I did not walk out. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Was the gentleman carried out, or did he roll out, or how did he get out? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I wish further to correct the gentleman, in that the caucus did not bind every Member on this side. I think the gentleman will remember that I was the only Member on this side who was permitted to offer an amendment of free meat to the provision of the bill, which I did, and was the only Member on this side who voted for it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am learning something; I did not know anything about that. I am glad there is one man on

the whole Democratic side that still does his thinking under his own hat and carries his conscience with him, even into the sacred precincts of the Democratic caucus. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] That may be a good way to legislate, but I do not believe the people of this country are in favor of it. I do not believe the people of the country think that you are redeeming your pledges of free discussion and deliberation here and allowing every man to do as he pleases. What difference does it make if the caucus, at the dictation of one or two men, makes up the legislative program and sits down on any fellow that proposes anything different?

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. In a moment; I will yield as I go along. How about that situation over in Atlanta? I understand the Government has turned over some real estate to the city, and the city has built a courthouse, or a city building, on this Government reservation, and a Member from down there is not allowed to bring up a little bill to remove the Government exclusive criminal jurisdiction on that little parcel of land so that the people who put their money into the county building may be able to hold court there.

Are you proud of that thing? Have you the pride to go before the American people and tell them honestly about it and say, "Look at us; we have fulfilled our pledges to the American people"? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You brought in the wool bill. How many agreed to it? I do not mean now, but when it was first proposed. How many of you agreed to it then? How many of you wanted a bigger duty on wool? How many wanted an absolutely free wool bill? It was reported that a majority of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, a majority of four, were in favor of free wool. They finally yielded. Yielded to what? What is the influence behind this duty on wool? Are you advertising that you are trying to appear so prettily before the American people, so nicely and so divested of everything that you have been ranting about for the last 10 years on the stump, that the American people will put you in full possession of the Government in 1912? You are on your good behavior. Twenty per cent duty on wool now. Some of you can not help flopping over. I believe the caucus allowed you to speak when you got into the House. How many came in and said this is only a step in the right direction, and you hoped to get down to the Democratic idea by and by?

Are you trying to justify what that great Democrat from Lincoln, Nebr., said about you—masquerading? Not only masquerading, but derelict to principle. He said he does not believe that you can fool the people. Well, Mr. Chairman, he ought to know—he has had ample experience. [Laughter.] He does not believe that you can fool the people by any such moonshine as that. He has learned something from his experience—why do you not try to learn something also? Why do you not bring in what you actually believe? Why do you not allow your people to vote as they actually believe? Why do you shut out my colleague from New York [Mr. HARRISON], who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee? He is brimful of this subject of free wool. Why not let him in on this debate? Why close it up to-night? He might tell you something about it. He might hold up the Democratic platform. He might hold up the Democratic bills that you put in one after another when you had a chance of passing them in the House, and that you have passed in the House. He might tell you some wholesome truths on the whole subject. Is there any suppression over there? Is there any idea of tyranny, or are you afraid? Well, you are about as free as the white slaves we hear so much about.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does not the gentleman from New York, the distinguished ex-chairman of the committee, realize that the Democrats have settled their differences on this question in caucus and are all going to stand together on this bill in the House?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, Mr. Chairman, I do not realize that they have settled their differences. They have had their differences of opinion for, lo, these many years, and they have their thinking machines with them. They have not settled anything. They want to get this bill through; they are told it is politic to get it through, and they are yielding their principles to the policy of the thing because some gentlemen at home have told them that it would ruin them, and that it would ruin their State if they did not do something about putting a duty on wool. There is my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who rose to ask a question a short time ago——

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman from New York declined to yield at that time.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I did at that time, but I said I would yield later, and I desire to yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from New York continues to criticize caucus action on the part of the Democrats in this House. I want to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to party caucus?

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all.

Mr. GARNER. Why does the gentleman continue to criticize the thing he has advocated himself on his side of the House?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I am criticizing it because it shows that the Democratic Party, divided about equally on this question, are swallowing their convictions now—not so much the caucus do I criticize, but the reason that you give and that crops out here as to why you take this action.

Mr. GARNER. The reason we gave was that under your régime, under a Republican House, you had a one-man caucus, where under a Democratic House we have a 227-man caucus. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Well, and one man pulls the lever and you all follow. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, the wool question is a warm question with my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER]. He has a lot of sheep in his district and a lot of shepherds, and while the sheep do not vote down there I suppose the shepherds do. Why, it would crucify him to vote for a free-wool bill. I bet you he told you so. [Laughter.] Try to fool those people down there in Texas with a free-wool bill! I do not know but in principle he believes in a duty on wool. I do not know but in principle he is a protectionist on wool, but I do know where his interests are, and that is for a duty on wool. Well, you have to have a duty on wool I suppose to get the boys together, not for the purpose of protecting wool. Oh, no! The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whom I do not see in his seat now, in his speech of delayed publication in the RECORD, as I recollect it, said that there was not any line of protection for the wool or the wool industry in this bill. It was especially divorced from that. My friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] will not circulate that speech in his district—that speech of Chairman UNDERWOOD. Oh, no! He will confine it to the speech of the gentleman at whom I am looking now, and from him get speeches to serve out as the proper pabulum for the people down there in his district.

Why, Mr. Chairman, they even had to tag this bill when they brought it in here. There was the other gentleman from Texas—and I am sorry I do not see him here now, because he told me the other day that he wanted to be here when I made my speech. Well, I am here and he is not, but in his absence I will have to speak about some things that occurred when the bill came in. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] was asking unanimous consent to have a resolution read so as to get it in the RECORD. He said it was short, and so forth, and no objection was made to the resolution and it was read. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill revising Schedule K, as presented to this caucus by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, is not to be construed as an abandonment of any Democratic policy.

What in the world did you put that in for? Did you have the idea anybody would construe that as an abandonment of Democratic policies? If you did not, why did you put it in? Oh, I know confession is good for the soul, but why not make an open confession? Why subject yourselves to the charges that are coming from that great Democratic organ which is published at Lincoln, Nebr., about your bad faith—how you are going to fail to fool the people on this proposition? Why, you confess that it is against Democratic policies by the very language of this resolution, and I have here very competent authority, the chairman of that caucus, that this resolution is "God's truth." I think that part of it by way of confession is. You are abandoning Democratic principles and policies.

But in view of the Democratic platform demand for a "gradual reduction" of the tariff and of the depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury, a result of Republican extravagance, a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool is now proposed as a revenue necessity.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. Was it stated in that meeting yesterday that there is now a surplus for this fiscal year of from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000 in the Treasury?

Well, I did not look at the daily report for two or three days, but there was $8,000,000 surplus in the Treasury according to the Treasury report of that day.

Mr. BURLESON. I do not recall that any statement of that character was made.

Mr. PAYNE. Was a statement made that the Treasury was $20,00,000 better off to-day, or, rather, the 31st day of May——

Mr. BURLESON. No.

Mr. PAYNE (continuing). Than it was a year ago?

Mr. BURLESON. No; there was not a single erroneous statement made during the entire caucus proceeding. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in that connection I ask unanimous consent to print the Treasury statement of May 31, in order that the gentlemen on the other side may have exactly the official information which I was trying to give the gentleman from Texas by a question, but it appears he would not accept it——

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join in the request in order that the statement of the gentleman from New York may be thoroughly refuted.

Why, you made BURLESON believe it in that caucus. Of course I assume the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made the same statement he made to the House a few days afterwards, because he made it over at the time he made his speech, and he seems to be reflecting on it ever since he made his speech. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

I began to have cold chills, because I did not know but the sheep in Mr. GARNER's district were going to cut off the truth—

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to get that consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York will suspend, the Chair will endeavor to get the consent. Is there objection to the publication of the statement which the gentleman from New York mentioned? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The statement follows.

Statement of the United States Treasury at close of business, May 31, 1911.

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS, MAY 31, 1911.

(Exclusive of postal revenues and disbursements, except postal deficiency.)

	This day.	This month.	This month last fiscal year.	This fiscal year ending June 30, 1911.	To this date last fiscal year.
Ordinary receipts and disbursements:					
Receipts—					
Customs	$983,099.20	$24,073,286.02	$23,010,989.23	$289,487,993.87	$305,124,965.02
Internal revenue—					
Ordinary	466,275.00	21,855,740.91	21,702,565.15	261,823,939.58	242,413,127.31
Corporation tax	17,934.55	895,285.59	489,271.80	8,241,127.92	696,705.30
Miscellaneous	5,293,818.70	14,408,131.21	6,405,557.74	54,830,384.44	44,158,960.23
Total	6,761,127.45	61,232,443.73	51,608,383.92	614,383,445.81	592,393,757.86
Disbursements—					
Civil and miscellaneous	594,897.49	15,320,967.29	13,584,595.46	162,505,710.32	156,777,391.38
War	729,628.19	11,864,109.81	10,598,514.30	148,049,425.97	144,672,844.18
Navy	331,953.35	9,475,439.56	8,679,309.11	109,821,849.78	112,382,674.25
Indians	4,736,441.49	5,836,319.97	4,017,313.53	19,286,313.63	16,497,113.72
Pensions		14,367,455.64	14,309,208.56	146,245,224.61	148,838,544.75
Postal deficiency		1,035,192.00		1,040,004.74	9,495,628.45
Interest on public debt		1,976,867.94	1,954,760.31	21,210,627.55	21,207,544.19
	6,392,920.52	59,876,352.21	53,143,701.27	608,159,156.60	609,871,740.92
Less repayment of unexpended balances	3,129,455.82	3,967,998.33	4,964,030.07	651,625.16	4,202,872.71
Total	3,263,464.70	55,908,353.88	48,179,671.20	607,507,531.44	605,668,868.21
Excess of ordinary receipts over ordinary disbursements	3,497,662.75	5,324,089.85	3,428,712.72	6,875,914.37	[1] 13,275,110.35

[1] Excess of disbursements over receipts.

Surplus (as above) May 31, 1911	$6,875,914.37
Deficit (as above) May 31, 1910	13,275,110.35
	20,151,024.72

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. GARNER. Now, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MANN. Oh, ha, ha, ha.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, did any gentleman rise in his place and object?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] was standing in the aisle when he objected.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER]?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Well, I think everybody understands the Treasury statement in the House now; even Mr. BURLESON, of Texas, the chairman of the caucus, I think, understands it now. If they do, it is hardly worth while to mention it now. If they do not understand it, I commend them to page 1720 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that they may see the statement on that date, and if they do not get it into their understanding the first time, why try the daily statements of the Treasury as they come out and see if you can not understand them. The statement made yesterday was that we are $24,437,570.98 better off than we were a year ago on that date, and while we have that deficit of $12,000,000 for a year ago at that date, but a surplus of $15,806,328.94 at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1910, it looks as though I put it a little too low when I suggested that the surplus at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, will be $35,000,000. If the corporation tax is paid in this year as promptly as it was last year, it will be $40,000,000 surplus at the end of the year. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, why did not some of you people challenge that statement when it was made in the caucus that there was a deficit in the Treasury, that there was going to be a deficit of $50,000,000 at the end of this year, some of you people who want free wool? I do not see my friend from New York on the Ways and Means Committee. Of course he knew about these daily statements. I supposed that all members of the committee took these and examined them from day to day as they had the time to do so; why did not the gentleman state that in the caucus?

An honest statement in the caucus as to the surplus would have defeated this "hypocritical" caucus resolution, and this bill would never have received a two-thirds vote.

Why did he not state that in the caucus? Was it because you only had 5 minutes' debate on the side of free wool and 10 hours on the other side? Was that the reason of it? Could you not get the time? Why let the Democratic Party go wrong? Why not let them hunt around for another reason and not put it all on the deficit in the Treasury and the necessity for getting revenue in order to save that deficit? Why did you not do it? You do not seem to be very anxious to answer—any of you. Did you not know it? Was that the reason? Did one man fool this whole caucus with a Treasury statement? How much better it would be for you to bring in a bill here and learn something, even if you had to learn it from this side of the House, rather than make such an egregious blunder as that and herald it to the country. It shows the necessity of having two parties; shows the necessity of party consideration and opposition in debate; shows that you might have learned something even from Republicans if you had stopped and hearkened long enough, because you have learned it now. You all understand it now, and you are all looking forward and anticipating the time when you will meet your dear constituents, and they will want to know why, when this tax of 20 per cent was put on wool and they did not get it on the free list in the caucus, you did not dispute the statement about the $50,000,000 deficit that was going to happen on a Treasury statement. Oh, what a sorry spectacle you make. And still in the face of all of it, like the animal that is first cousin to the Democratic Party, you parade around in a lion's

skin and say, "What bold people we are and what a splendid record we are making to go before the people with." [Applause on the Republican side.]

You even fooled the college professor over here in New Jersey, who is and wants to be a presidential candidate, into believing you have made a good record on the wool question, however much he may have been bound up in free wool, as he was against the initiative and the referendum and the recall until he saw the sudden light that gleamed from the White House a few months ago and found there was good in all things. I think it was on his western trip that he discovered that. I do not know whether he saw the light or whether he listened with his ears and the bee got buzzing in his bonnet and whispered to him how nicely "President Wilson" would sound to his family and his friends and himself. And he went back on the reason that he had given, against his whole life record, in favor of this initiative, referendum, and recall.

Now, gentlemen, of course, if you are proud of all of this thing, I have not anything more to say. If you glory in your shame, all I can do is to expose the shame and let you go on and have the glory. But you will get the ashes of disappointment when the people get hold of what you are doing and get after you, as they will, and see that your record was simply moonshine or worse and that you are trying to deceive them, in the language of the greatest Democrat who lives to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Well, let us get at this bill.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from New York is certain that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] did make the statements in regard to the Treasury condition that he refers to in the House?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] the other day had the Official Reporter's notes, and read them to the House, and I do not know whether the gentleman from Wyoming will ever read them anywhere else or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I asked the question, Mr. Chairman, because I have been reading the RECORD very diligently ever since that time, and have not been able to find them in the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know anything of where they are. I have not the slightest knowledge on that subject, whatever suspicion I may have.

Mr. MONDELL. The statement was undoubtedly made?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly.

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

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

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has had very long service in the House. Can the gentleman recall heretofore a time when the opening speech upon a tariff debate was not published until after the bill had been passed?

Mr. PAYNE. No. I recall a number of speeches that were pretty lengthy which were put in the RECORD next morning after they were made, and weeks before the bill passed the House. I remember one speech of mine of nine hours and a half that, I think, got into the next day's RECORD, although it took two days for delivery. But then there had not been any blunder pointed out in that speech about the depletion of the Treasury [applause and laughter on the Republican side]—a statement $85,000,000 out of the way. I am not saying that the speech was perfect, but still I do not know that any question was ever raised concerning the speech or respecting any statement contained in it. But whether it was or not, there was not any such blunder as that in it, or any such reason as that for keeping it out of the RECORD.

I do not say that there is any such reason in this case. The gentleman from Alabama is a friend of mine, an intimate friend of mine, and I like him very much. He has a good deal of sense, and sense on the tariff question. I supposed he knew more about the daily Treasury reports. I am disappointed in him in that. And I had supposed he knew more about the construction of a tariff bill than that. But I remember now that he never had any hand in the construction of a tariff bill before. The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee made the McKinley bill, the Dingley bill, and the present bill; and, if I remember correctly, the gentleman from Alabama was not here when the Wilson bill was under consideration. If he was here he was not a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

I was disappointed when I looked over that free-list bill, when I looked at the language that was employed, the terms, the indefinite terms, the chance to drive a four-mule team right through any of the provisions when the goods got into the customhouse, if they ever did get in under a bill like that.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. PAYNE. In just one moment; yes. Why, Mr. Chairman, the hardest work, the most exacting work in the formation of a tariff bill is to study the language in its provisions, in view of the industry, in view of the manufacturing, in view of how it will be interpreted by the courts, so that the bill will be interpreted as meaning just what the committee that framed it means; and weeks and months have been spent in studying these questions on all the three bills with the construction of which I was intimately connected.

Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does not the gentleman from New York think that the fact that the gentleman from Alabama, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has been actively in charge of all the debates on the floor of this House ever since the day when he made his speech a few days ago is a sufficient excuse, by reason of his duties in the House, for his not having had time to revise his remarks?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not criticizing him. All I can do is to say to my friends on the other side that I have had charge of this debate on this side, and if I had made the opening speech I would have had plenty of time to correct my speech and put it in the RECORD the next day. Two years ago I had charge of the tariff bill and made the opening speech, and my recollection is that I published it in the next day's RECORD after the speech was delivered. I am not finding fault with the gentleman from Alabama. In fact, if I had made that speech of his, I think I would never publish it in the RECORD at all. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will admit, at any rate, that there is sufficient excuse without his going to the length of imputing an unfounded motive to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know what peculiar experience the gentleman from Alabama has had. In what the gentleman from New York states there is not sufficient excuse; but there may have been a number of other duties for him to perform that I do not know anything about, and the gentleman from Alabama, occupying the responsible positions of chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and chairman of the committee that peddled out the selection of members of the committees of the House, has been peculiarly busy, and he has shared the responsibility—I assume he has; I have not been to any of their conferences—with the Speaker of the House in formulating the plans of the Democratic Party in order to give orders to the Democratic caucus as to what they should do, and has been sustaining those orders as well as he could in debate in the Democratic caucuses. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I do not recall, however, that there have been many Democratic caucuses recently. There was one Democratic caucus the other night, but it lasted only a few minutes. I saw one of my Democratic friends go to it and return in a very short time. It hardly seemed any time at all after he went away before he returned. There was only one Democratic caucus held since the gentleman's speech was made. Now, I hope I have answered the gentleman's question.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced the Walker tariff into the discussion and spoke about the wonderful prosperity of the country under the Walker tariff, and he attributed it all, by implication, to the Walker tariff. Well, the country was prosperous in a way. Prices were good, people were moving West, and people bought farms, building up the farming industries in the West.

Sheep did not thrive amazingly, but some of them survived. There was the Crimean War, which made a market for farm produce for three or four years during the period of the Walker tariff. My friend from Georgia [Mr. BRANTLEY], generally a learned man, had never read of that, or he forgot to mention it in his speech, or perhaps it did not chime in and would have been a note of discord in his speech if he had mentioned it. During the early years of that tariff we had the Mexican War, and that made a great demand for American goods and American foodstuffs.

Then gold was discovered in California in 1849. You all know about that. Even those who were not born in 1849 know that from reading it in history. That added to the wealth of this country. Great heavens! something had to add to it, because of the drain on the resources of the country under the Walker

tariff. I have a little statement here showing something about that drain.

The Walker tariff went into effect December 1, 1846, and was succeeded by another tariff of similar import, with some changes, with lower ad valorems, July 1, 1857.

In the first fiscal year of the Walker tariff, while it had been a law only seven months, there was an excess of exports over imports of $34,000,000. That excess had been running for several years, and the balance of trade was in our favor, and even the Walker tariff, in the first seven months of its existence, had not entirely wiped it out. If it had not been for the Walker tariff, the balance in our favor that year would undoubtedly have been larger.

In 1848 the balance was the other way, and it continued the other way every year that the Walker tariff was in existence for the next 10 years, and the total balance of trade against us for the 10 years was $291,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] If it had not been for the gold that came in, we would have been bankrupt to pay our debts abroad for the goods that we were buying. Of course, we were not paying the same expense then for the carrying trade, because we were getting a good deal of it in our own bottoms and our own people got the money, but this $291,000,000 was a dead loss, a give-away from the resources of the Nation, and had to be made up in some way. The California gold helped to do it.

But notwithstanding the Crimean War and the great exports of foodstuffs and farm products wasted in that great war, there was still this enormous balance of trade against the United States of imports over exports.

On the 8th day of December, 1857, at the close of 11 years of the Walker tariff, President Buchanan, in his message to Congress, took an entirely different view of the prosperity of the country from that presented by the gentleman from Georgia. Buchanan was in the midst of things and had the responsible duty of communicating to Congress on the state of the country. This is the gloomy picture he presented on the state of the country in that message:

> We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, whilst the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.
>
> Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people. With this the Government can not fail deeply to sympathize, though it may be without the power

This, it will be observed, follows closely upon the termination of the period under the Walker tariff.

Prior to this, and when the tariff of 1846 had been in force for six years, President Fillmore called attention more explicitly to the Walker tariff and the manner of its operation in his annual message sent to Congress in 1852, when he said:

> In my first message to Congress I called attention to what seemed to me some defects in the present tariff and recommended such modifications as in my judgment were best adapted to remedy the evils and promote the prosperity of the country. Nothing has since occurred to change my views on this important question. Without repeating the argument contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is the effect of large importations of foreign goods on our currency. Most of the gold of California as fast as it is coined finds its way directly to Europe in payment for goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing establishments are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost. Thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer is to that extent deprived of a home market for the sale of his products. In the third place, the destruction of manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our markets, and the consequent rise in articles sent here for sale is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England.

I sometimes think you gentlemen never would glory at all in Robert J. Walker if it was not for the fact that it has been so long since you have had any glory on that side of the Chamber. We took charge in 1860, and we have been doing business ever since, except the little time that you had Grover Cleveland, and most of you have not sense enough to be proud of Grover Cleveland. [Applause on the Republican side.] Some of you appreciate him, some of you cuss him even to this day; but when you point with pride you go back to 1846 and shout "Robert J. Walker!"

There was a time, not many years ago, when Cleveland was triumphant, that you pointed with pride to the great leader there in Nebraska. Not as many of you point with pride to Bryan now; but still everybody knows he will write your next platform when it comes to the convention, and will tell you whom you can nominate, and he will be the one-man power in that convention, although his presence is not here, and he could not be the one-man power in your caucus, owing to the exigencies of the occasion.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it is as necessary to have wool and sheep in this country as it is to have battleships. [Applause on the Republican side.] This is no new discovery of mine. The statesmen of the past have always declared that principle. There have not been many who dissented from that. When driven to the wall, their claim has been that sheep would wear out their rivals, on lands that were valueless, tended by shepherds to whom 10 cents a day was a big wage, and would exist in this country without any protective tariff on them. But they do not dispute that sheep are necessary to put an army in the field. Why, it is as necessary to have Army blankets as it is to have guns and cartridges. The enemy may pick off some of the men with guns, but without good woolen blankets in the cold winter, colds, pneumonia, and all such kindred diseases will pick off a mighty sight more men than the guns of the enemy will.

We must have wool. How shall we get it? Well, we have had a duty on wool from the sixties on. You say the schedule is not right. I never concealed my opinions about the wool schedule. They were known two years ago. I wanted to revise and equalize the wool schedule, equalize the duties. I was not able to carry it through. We took some evidence on the subject.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Tennessee wait for about five minutes?

Mr. HULL. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question right on that point.

Mr. PAYNE. I have just opened a sentence on that point and I may cover the whole subject.

Mr. HULL. I wanted to inquire if the President was correct in his statement that it was through the influence of the woolgrowers and the woolen manufacturers that the schedule was not revised. The gentleman says that he was desirous of revising it but was prevented.

Mr. PAYNE. I would have told the gentleman all about that if he had waited a minute. We took considerable evidence on the wool question. Here is the volume on wool, 800 printed pages. We had long hearings, and nine volumes were published, and in those hearings we gave pretty full consideration to the wool question. After the people who desired to come before the committee had been heard, I subpœnaed people who did not desire to be heard. I summoned experts in order to get their knowledge on the subject of wool and the wool duty. I spent a great deal of time trying to work out a schedule. I was not like my friend from Alabama; I could not do it in two or three weeks. I was not like any member of the Democratic caucus; I could not understand the whole business in one evening. I am slower of thought than that. I worked it out. My idea was to put the specific duty on the amount of scoured wool in the fleece the same as we put a specific duty on the pounds of lead in ore or the pounds of sugar with the sugar and dirt together that comes with it. That would make a uniform duty on the wool. That would rid it of any inequalities that there were in the schedule. Inequalities exist, but not to the extent that the public or some Members of Congress believe. But there were some inconsistencies, some differences in duties. I could not convince my colleagues that I was right. We had not time to get the evidence on the subject to clearly present it; enough to satisfy me, but not enough to satisfy others. What other reasons there were for voting against the reduction of the duty, God knows; I do not. But I know that they claimed that they had not sufficient evidence of it to reduce this schedule.

You know that they were men that wanted light; they were not like you people on that side, who can take up great industries involving $400,000,000 and with a single dash of the pen, without thinking and without knowing, and not requiring evidence of any Tariff Board or data, dispose of it at once; they were men who wanted to know the facts.

We had a gigantic undertaking on our hands; we had the whole tariff business. The country had grown in size, and the number of people who wanted to be heard was large. We heard several times as many people as ever were heard upon any other tariff bill. We took more evidence than was ever taken before. I challenge any man on that side of the House who is a candid man—and I assume that you all are candid men—to read carefully through that evidence and say that the chairman of that committee, or the majority members of it, did not try to get at the truth, no matter who appeared before them or what kind of cross-examination it required to worry the truth out of them.

Still we did not get all of it. I had made up my mind before that that if we could have notice that a revision of the tariff was coming, that the best way to gather evidence was for the Ways and Means Committee to form a sort of tariff board under their instruction and their guidance and employ experts, have the money to do it with, get the statements from all parts of the earth and tabulate them and find out what the cost was.

But we have heard a great deal of hypocritical talk about getting at the exact cost, saying that it is all different in different factories. Of course it is. It depends somewhat on the element of chance, just as it does in selling articles. The force of labor may be weak in insisting on its right, and the employer may be strong and sturdy in his position. All men are not alike in buying in the open markets. There is just as much difference between the buyer and the seller as there is between the employer and the employee, and yet we have no difficulty in getting at the market price of commodities that are sold in this country.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does the gentleman recollect the extraordinary confusion that existed during the debate on the reciprocity bill wherein the different market prices in the same commodities in a chain of cities on the same parallel varied from 10 cents to 50 cents?

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman was not here during the reciprocity debate, but he has some knowledge and information on the subject, and while the locality may have a different price, and it may be dear, yet there is no difficulty in getting the general price in the country, and all our market reports are founded upon the aggregation of the general market. I want to illustrate that idea a little further. I live within 7 miles of a village connected with my home city by trolley, and meats sell for from 5 to 12 cents a pound less in the village than they do in my city. The first markets in the city, the central markets, will charge for the choice cuts of meat 5 and sometimes 10 cents a pound more than you can buy them for if you go out into the outskirts where they do not have much demand for the choice cuts, where they sell the rough meat, and, on the other hand, the rough meat is in greater demand at those places in the outskirts. Of course there are differences of that kind, there are differences in the different factories in the same city, but to get the general trend of the market, to get the general trend of the prices of labor, especially where the general trend shows that the wage is twice as much in this country as in Great Britain, or three times or two and a half times as much as it is in Germany and France, is a comparatively easy matter.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. And assuming that the gentleman is correct, that you can get a general price on such a commodity as meat or we will say corn or wheat or something of which the price is fixed in a general world's market, how does that apply in ascertaining the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad of a hat or a necktie or a pair of sleeve links? In other words, the gentleman convicts his own party of having produced an unscientific theory of fixing the rates.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, we hear a great deal of bosh, and it is bosh, about a scientific adjustment of the tariff, as though you could take a pair of apothecary scales and measure out these schedules.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Is not that what your platform calls for?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Why not?

Mr. PAYNE. It does not say anything about apothecary's scales.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It says something about the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, which is a thing impossible to ascertain.

Mr. PAYNE. It certainly does say something about the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and that can be fairly ascertained; but you can not obtain it down to a mill or the fraction of a mill on a pound of stuff.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Having ascertained that difference in the cost of production here and abroad and added on a reasonable profit for the manufacturer, is not that a prohibitive tariff? In other words, what is there to induce the importation of goods?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, it simply puts our people on the same plane as those across the water. If the gentleman calls that prohibitive, he has a different idea of prohibition than I have. It is competitive. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. What is it that induces the importer in this country to import anything if we have entirely offset the difference in the cost of production here and abroad and then added on a reasonable profit for the manufacturer?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, some people will give more for some things than for another. Some people want imported goods, and they will pay a larger price than they get the home goods for. There are all sorts of inducements. You have got to go into the workings of the human mind to find out why a man wants to pay anything at one place or another. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of New York. It may be that that is true as to fancy or freak articles that some people may desire for special reasons. At the same time, are not general importations excluded by such a method of tariff adjustment?

Mr. PAYNE. Why, no. The goods will be dumped on us when they get an opportunity. We cut the duty down on shoes, and we cut it down, as the gentleman knows, as low as it ought to be, and possibly a little lower, and you come in here with your fake free-list bill and try to make a little party capital. Why, you are trying to get onto every band wagon that comes along.

When the department starts in on a trust some Member rises up and wants to investigate, and tries to appropriate a part of it to himself when the Government has done the business.

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

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman can contain himself for a moment. Now, I have seen illustrations of that right here in this session of Congress—regiments of them. People hear something is being done and bring in resolutions to investigate. I remember the other day talking to the Attorney General, and he said he had a letter of inquiry, or something of the kind, from the House about certain matters. Why he did not prosecute a criminal in one case, and he said he wrote back that he had the parties indicted some two months ago. In the other case the question was asked why he did not prosecute, and he said suit had been commenced. You are trying to jump on the band wagon all the time. But, gentlemen, you have got to do lots of work; you have got to do some real business; you have to come out and show what your principles are that the people will recognize them as Democratic principles, and then if they approve them—your course and principles here—they will ratify you. But you are not going to carry another election on false pretenses. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOWLER. Did you not develop before that committee, so far as the manufacture of boots and shoes is concerned, that the American manufacturer, if he had free hides, could compete with the world in boots and shoes.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, there were two or three gentlemen who testified to that, and, as I recollect, they all came in the next day and took it back. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FOWLER. Did not one of them say that the world would be a "cinch" for the trade if you gave them free hides?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not remember any such language in reference to it. [Laughter.] But I will tell the gentleman for his consolation, if that will do just as well, that one of the manufacturers said he could compete with anything beneath the sun, as I recall the expression. I am perfectly willing to admit anything that was said, but, of course, I am not bound by what was said there. I will only admit what they said.

Mr. FOWLER. If I should read from those tariff hearings that the gentleman did say that the world would be a "cinch" it would be true that that developed in the hearings, would it not?

Mr. PAYNE. I assume the gentleman can read correctly. Yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. I mean that it would not be manufactured if it is read from that report?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I will read from it in my speech, if I have the honor to make one.

Mr. PAYNE. And if I have the honor to listen when the gentleman refers to it in his speech, I will know whether it is read correctly or not. Now, Mr. Chairman, we did cut down those duties. We did not take them all off, but we gave them free hides, and what is the result to-day? Since that two years have passed the American Shoe Machinery Co., in this country, where we make the best in the world, have taken their machines to Germany and England and put them in there, and put people in there to instruct their people how to use those machines and how to make the shoes, and they have taken American lasts, and they are making shoes over there, and the factories of England have their agents here for the convincing of retail dealers of shoes in America, getting into our market, and bringing them in competition, as my colleague said, although we had tried to make up the difference between the cost there and the cost here in our tariff bill when we adjusted this duty. The trade is shrinking, and some of those people are getting alarmed about it, and none of them to-day would go in before the Ways and Means Committee and say they could stand free shoes. Most of them would try to demonstrate by

facts and figures that the duty was too low now. I trust they will get along with the duty as it is. Of course they will never get the "fake free-list bill" into law, and they will not be put on the free list. That is a matter that will not come to pass, because the people do not believe in destroying the shoe industry in this country, that wonderful industry that employs so many people [applause on the Republican side]; yes—and I will say in the presence of my friend from New Jersey—brings so much happiness to the homes of the American people.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield, though not on that particular point, for a question? I would like to ask the one-time chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, which considered the Payne-Aldrich law, on what principle they dealt with the file schedule? I suppose the gentleman has as much time as he desires, and therefore I will trespass on his patience and state this circumstance a little fully. I remember being in the Ways and Means Committee room when a gentleman who has a factory in my district stated that he was paying a high price for his steel rods or other raw material that he used in the manufacture of his files. He said he did not complain about that. He said he paid more than the foreigner had to pay; that he paid high wages in this country, which I from personal investigation know to be true; he does, I think, pay good wages, as wages go in the file industry; that he was then able to ship those files abroad and pay a tariff to get into the German market and there sell in competition with the under-paid labor of Germany, taking into consideration at that point the fact that the German got his raw material much cheaper. But he was demanding right at that very hearing a 200 per cent tariff upon a certain kind of file that he said he was unable to make in this country with 100 per cent duty. Now, the committee, as I remember, cut his duty in half, but still left it prohibitive, and I would like to know on what theory the Ways and Means Committee dealt with that schedule?

Mr. PAYNE. There was no 100 per cent or 200 per cent duty. The chairman of the committee learned something in reference to the matter of files from the statement that had been made, and with the permission of the committee he subpœnaed the manufacturer, and cross-examined him for a long time. He was not from the gentleman's district.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. He has a factory in my district.

Mr. PAYNE. Is that the Providence man?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes. He has a factory in my district.

Mr. PAYNE. He had a number of factories. He made his statement, and it appeared to me the duty ought to be reduced, and the committee agreed with me and they reduced it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And still left it at a prohibitive rate though.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think it was prohibitive, because files were already brought in in quite a quantity under the former duty. The duty was not prohibitive. I want to say to the gentleman that the bill went to the Senate, and they increased the duty, and we compromised it in the conference committee.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is still, according to his statement, a highly prohibitive duty. And I maintain, according to the hearings before your own committee, and according to the information elicited by the gentleman from New York himself, that this man was abundantly able to compete with the cheapest file manufacturer in the world, and under the tariff was getting a much higher price in this country than he sold for in Germany.

Mr. PAYNE. He said in regard to it that he adopted the policy of hiring some college graduates and sending them to the different countries to try to get in there with files, and he had built up considerable of a trade—I do not remember how much, but not a very large one, but a considerable one—and that the expense of selling was so great that he could not get his files in there and make anything. That was the gist of his evidence on that.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will permit me, my recollection is that the record will show that he stated that what he was selling abroad he was selling at a loss.

Mr. PAYNE. He said it had not been profitable. I have not looked at that evidence for two years, and I can not state definitely about it. It is difficult to recall just what the facts were. The gentleman refers to that law as the Payne-Aldrich law. I think I ought to say right here it was named the Payne-Aldrich law because it was known that the Senator from Rhode Island was in favor of a higher scale of duties than the "gentleman from New York," the chairman of the committee, and that was done in view of the general talk all over the country to in every way possible throw suspicion upon the bill itself. If I may say so, I was intimately connected with three tariff bills—the McKinley, the Dingley, and the present law—and the Senate made less inroads on the bill as it left the House—I mean the present law—than they did either on the McKinley or the Dingley law. It is due to the committee of the House and to the House conferees to say that much. So far as I am concerned myself, I do not care a little bit. But if I could get the people to understand and read the record of that law, as I shall present it later on, that would be the height of my ambition.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think that everybody is willing to admit that if the gentleman from New York had been permitted to have his own way we would have had a much better tariff law than the present one. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the gentleman for his compliment and I hope he is right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why was this 20 per cent duty put on wool in violation of the platform and policy of the Democratic Party? There must have been some reason for it. Why was it? Is Mr. Bryan right about it? Does any man dare say he is not right about it? Why, I see my distinguished friend, the Speaker, is here. [Laughter and applause.] I think I will say it, now that he is here—I would not say it in his absence—that I have been looking over the census reports on sheep, and I find that while the number of sheep and lambs in the United States has fallen off 0.0312 per cent, yet in Missouri the number has doubled. Of course, I understand the sheep have been driven down there from States farther west because of failure of pastures, but the failure seems to be owing largely to the fact that the upper countries are being divided up and put into forest reserves, and all that sort of thing, and they are not available longer for pastures. The farmers of Missouri, always interested in wool, are getting more and more interested, and this year they are more interested than they have ever been.

Missouri has gotten into the habit of voting the Republican ticket occasionally. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I do not know whether the sheep are allowed to vote there or not. They have been electing Republican governors in Missouri, and if they did not put all the Republican majority in one district, and if there was a fair distribution of districts, the Republicans would elect a majority of the delegation from Missouri to this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Right you are!

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I am not going to accuse the Speaker [laughter]——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if he can point out as great a discrepancy in population between any two districts in Missouri as the discrepancy, in proportion, between two New York districts, one of which has 125,000 people and another 375,000, the districts being adjoining?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman now is coming to a State where there has been the most phenomenal increase of population, in certain districts of it, of any State in the Union or any country of the world. The gentleman is talking about some New York districts, New York City districts, some uptown districts, which have been settled up in the last 10 years, as my friend from New York [Mr. HARRISON] will not deny, and it is unfair to compare them with the districts in the State of Missouri. Why, I remember my friend said once that he did not believe in gerrymandering, but that if people were going at it, his own State had the most scientific job done in it that was ever done in that direction. [Laughter.] And he will not deny it now that they did that job, although he may not recollect what he said on that occasion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say what I said about gerrymandering, and I will say it now—that it is an unfortunate habit [laughter and applause]——

Mr. PAYNE. That is putting it mildly enough. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me make a complete statement. It is a thing that everybody condemns in theory and favors in practice. [Applause and laughter.] I think we would be better off everywhere if it were abolished; but we are not going to abolish it until human nature is transformed and purified. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman a moment.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I acquit the distinguished Speaker of any guilt in the gerrymandering of the Missouri districts. But if

what he says is true, if it requires a change of human nature to change that system of gerrymandering which has been practiced, I am frank to admit, by both political parties—both of them are guilty of unfair gerrymandering in the United States—would it not be well for us to make a law which would enable the people in the several States to apportion the districts themselves? In other words, if in each State of the Union the Republicans and the Democrats would be obliged to submit to the voters a fair scheme of apportionment, we could be reasonably sure that that scheme would be a good one, because both parties would know that the people would have to pass upon it, and then it would not make much difference whether the Republican or the Democratic scheme was adopted by the people. They would be reasonably sure of having a good apportionment. That was the point we made in connection with that discussion some weeks ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You made the point simply because you happened to have the advantage of having an accidental governor at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. We are getting away from the tariff proposition. The sight of the genial face of my friend from Missouri caused me to raise the inquiry and to wonder why it was that they put a duty on wool. I remember that in my early days in this House Mr. Samuel S. Cox, known to fame as "Sunset" Cox, was making a speech one day on the question of the tariff of 1883. He was a free trader and for free wool in principle. He was asked if he did not go through Ohio and make speeches in favor of a tariff on wool at the election succeeding the Democratic tariff of 1883, which cut it down. He said no, he did not do anything of the kind, but he said he went through the district and told the people that every time he met a sheep the sheep would say, "Ba! ba! John Sherman. Ba! ba!" And I did not know but my friend was afraid that the sheep might get after him in Missouri if he did not consent to a little bit of a duty of 20 per cent on wool as a sop to the farmers who own the sheep; but he shakes his head, and of course I take it for granted that that never entered his thought. [Laughter.]

Now, the duty on wool is 20 per cent. The duty on woolen cloth is 40 per cent, and on clothing 45 per cent, and on cloth with cotton backing I think it is 40 per cent in this bill. Sixty-five per cent of the cost of cloth is wool. If you put a duty of 40 per cent on cloth, something must come out of it for the protection you put on wool. If the wool is worth 65 per cent, 20 per cent of that will be 13 per cent on the cloth for the wool duty; and you must deduct that 13 per cent from the duty which you have put on the cloth, which would leave 27 per cent in the one instance and a lower percentage in the other.

In the Wilson bill they put wool on the free list, but they put a higher percentage on the manufactured article than you do, all through their bill. There was not anything to be taken out as a compensatory duty for the wool in the cloth.

What effect will this bill have on the manufacture of cloth? You say in your report that it will increase the importation of cloth nearly threefold—from $23,057,357.78 in value to $63,831,000.

I think you are right about it. I think this reduction of duty will have that effect. Now, if you do that, you will bring in here 85,000,000 pounds more of wool, in the form of cloth, than you bring in now. What effect will that have upon the Missouri sheep and lambs, and the sheep and lambs in the rest of the country? You say that you will increase the importation of wool by over 100,000,000 pounds in order to get your revenue. You say this in the bill that you printed for the caucus. I suppose that was the argument in the caucus, if it contained any argument; but it does not. The argument is expressed in the resolution that you put through in the caucus. What effect will the importation of 185,000,000 pounds of wool into this country—raw and in the cloth—under your bill have upon the domestic production of wool in this country? How will sheep be affected? On an average, we produce about 300,000,000 pounds of wool in this country. It has run up as high as 317,000,000 pounds. One hundred and eighty-five million pounds taken from that would be not quite 65 per cent displaced by this increased importation of foreign wool. If I had figured it close, it would have been 65 per cent, because I have figured in some of the cloths and other articles at the wholesale, while I let tops and noils and shoddy, and so forth, some of it go.

What effect is that going to have on the production of sheep in this country? What effect did the Wilson bill have?

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

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Does not the gentleman recollect that the actual per capita consumption of wool is about 20 per cent less in this country than it was 20 years ago?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not recollect the exact percentage. I do know it is less. I know people are wearing cotton underclothing, not because they can not afford to buy woolen, but from choice. I have not worn any woolen underclothing for 15 years. I got what I supposed was linen, and wore that for several years. I was told it was cotton. I told them it was all right if it was cotton; I was going to wear that for the reason that in our northern climate when a man goes into a warm room with woolen underclothing on he perspires, and when he goes out he is liable to catch cold. As a matter of health, a great many people are wearing underclothing in which there is no wool.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. PAYNE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman a leading question about the very thing he is talking about. Suppose the effect of this bill, if it becomes a law, were to reduce the cost to the consumer of woolen goods 25 or 30 per cent. Does not the gentleman believe that the increased consumption of woolen goods in the United States would be so great that we would use up more wool than we are now producing and importing?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not; I do not know how the gentleman with a sanguine mind can expect it is going to reduce the cost of clothing 25 per cent when so little of the cost of clothing is due to the wool it contains, and much less in duty on the wool.

The cost is nearly all in the trimming, the tailoring, the sewing, and so forth.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman believe that cutting down the tariff, as this bill does, on wool would have the ultimate effect of reducing the cost of woolen things to the consumer?

Mr. PAYNE. I understand the difference in the cost of clean wool ready to be used in making tops and noils, and so forth, to manufacture into woolen cloths in this country is $2.30 for a suit of clothes and in England $1.12. There is a difference of about $1.19 in favor of the low price in London over this country. That $1.19 is not going to make any difference of 25 per cent on a $12 suit or a $25 suit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that the figures he has given would be a fair measure of the difference of cost between a $12 suit of clothes with this tariff on?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say that I figured on that before the present law was passed, and I noticed that after it was passed, as the gentleman from Missouri did, that where we reduced the duties the most there was the least reduction in the price of goods. It was all absorbed by the retailer or the wholesaler.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. May not that result have been brought about by the fact that many of these things are controlled by combinations or trusts or gentlemen's agreements, or whatever you are pleased to call them?

Mr. PAYNE. It might be if you are going to draw on your imagination, but I always want some tangible evidence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from New York and I agreed to take the tariff off hides. Both of us helped do that, and the promise was made that shoes would go down 25 or 50 cents a pair. I would like to get hold of that crowd that came down here and promised that. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry that the gentleman was fooled; they did not fool me, for I did not believe a word of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: When we did take the tariff off hides, does not the gentleman believe that the price of leather and shoes would have gone down, as the makers swore they would go down, if it had not been controlled by the Leather Trust and that gang that runs the trust in the machinery for making shoes?

Mr. PAYNE. The hide business was getting into the control of the packers of beef. They cut off the market for the local tanneries, especially in Pennsylvania and States between there and Chicago, and they were tanning the hides of the cattle themselves and also of the tanners. The tanners could not get hold of any hides with the duty on them; they went to Germany, and Germany made the leather. We did not get a look-in at all for the local tanners, and some tanners, in despair, had rented their tanneries to some Chicago packers, and the business we were losing entirely, except what was being done by the Meat Trust. There seems to be evidence that there is such a thing as a Meat Trust. One of my strong reasons for taking off the duty on hides—and I was against the duty 20 years ago, because the duty was of no benefit to the farmer whatever—

but my strong reason for being anxious to take it off was to get at the people in Chicago. I never had any idea that it would do what they claimed. I told those gentleman if they could save the whole tariff it would amount to but 2½ or 3 cents on a pair of shoes; and I said to them, What is the use of your coming up here and making this pretense that it would save 25 or 50 cents a pair?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is true, is it not, that the Massachusetts shoemakers, and others—I believe there were some of our St. Louis friends mixed up in it—did come before the Ways and Means Committee and swear that if we put hides on the free list shoes would go down 25 to 50 cents a pair, and they explained to us that shoes did not go down or up 5 cents a pair, or 10 cents a pair, or 15 cents a pair, or 20, or 30, or 35, or 40, or 45 cents a pair, but they went up and down by quarters?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I think Mr. Jones, of Boston, stated that at least, and I do not remember the others.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And Jones stated it and elaborated it, and then cut it out, but the others did, too.

Mr. PAYNE. Did not Jones take that back the next day?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not the next day, but about a week afterwards, after my good friend, Hon. AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER, got after him up in Massachusetts and sandbagged him or did something to him [laughter]—I do not know what it was—but Jones did come back and retract part of that, and Mr. GARDNER's contention was, to be fair to him, that Jones's statement might be all right for fine shoes, and lightweight shoes, but that it would be ruinous to brogan-shoe makers and the heavy shoes; that they could not stand it. That was Mr. GARDNER's contention about it from the first, and he stuck to it until the last.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Albert Clarke, of Boston, came before the committee the next day after Jones made the statement and said Jones had retracted it before he left the room after making it. I sent for Jones, and he appeared about a week later and retracted the statement. I think the heavy-shoe makers were in more danger than the fine-shoe makers at that time. Since that time conditions have changed, recently, by reason of the American machinery having been taken over to Europe and the people being instructed there to make fine shoes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was there not evidence before that Ways and Means Committee that this crowd that controls the shoemaking machines constituted as tight a trust as there is on the face of the earth?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know how tight the trusts are, but it was my idea that it was a trust.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the gentleman heard anything of Attorney General Wickersham jumping on that trust?

Mr. PAYNE. No; and I am sorry to say that I never have called his attention to that evidence, so I think I am as much to blame as the Attorney General is, as is also the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, I am not a prosecuting officer. If I were, I would shut them up before six months elapsed.

Mr. PAYNE. And I am not either, but when I discover a trust I think it is my duty to notify the people who prosecute, as it is also the duty of the gentleman from Missouri. I know and the gentleman knows, for he has been a prosecuting attorney as well as I have, that the prosecuting attorney does not know always what is going on, and it is only by people telling him, and then he must prosecute, and if he does not, he is to blame.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, returning to the subject of wool, supposing the gentleman's contention is correct, and we will not get all the reduction in the price of clothes that we hope from reducing this duty on raw wool—that is, assuming certain grades of clothes will still continue to be sold at the standard prices—does not the gentleman believe that by reducing the duty on raw wool and making it easier for our manufacturers to get more real wool, clothes would be made out of wool instead of out of substitutes?

Mr. PAYNE. Now, I fear the gentleman has brought up another question. The Wilson bill, of which I was about to speak when I was interrupted, put shoddy on the free list, and rags and every abominable thing of that kind. Shoddy came over here in immense quantities and substituted itself for wool. Every pound of shoddy was a substitute for a pound of scoured wool. Shoddy, to a certain extent, is legitimate to put in manufactured clothing, but if too much is put in, the cloth is good for nothing, and in trying to compete with the shoddy goods that came in from Great Britain our manufacturers then did make a good many shoddy goods, and we had a good many of them, and millions of pounds of importations came in under the Wilson bill. Now, when we came to make the Dingley bill we put a duty on shoddy that we believed was prohibitive, and we did it purposely, 15 cents a pound, which is more than 100 per cent, and it did stop the importation of shoddy. There were only a few pounds came in. Some ignorant fellow imported a few pounds and ran up against the law, in all human probability. They could not import shoddy. We had a good deal of shoddy manufactured here in our own mills, and from the rags that came from clothing here.

It is a saving when legitimately used; but, while it is an advantage, it displaced the wool. But the difficulty is that they put too much of it in and make the warp and the woof—and especially the warp—of shoddy, and that makes a very weak thread and a suit of clothes that is an imposition on any poor man who buys it. I remember when we had a wool discussion up once—I think it was when the Dingley bill was under consideration—and Jeremiah Simpson, of Kansas, the man who won immortal fame while here in the House, came in with a suit of clothes he had bought, taken from the back of a Virginia farmer, as he said. I do not know whether Jerry would know a Virginia farmer from a hobo, but he said he got it from the back of a Virginia farmer. He brought it in here and he tore it up. It ripped easily, and he wanted to know what kind of a suit of clothes that was for an American farmer to wear. Of course, there was only one opinion about the suit of clothes, but it encouraged me to try to stop the use of this shoddy in this country so far as I could, so that there would not be a temptation to put so much of it in a suit of clothes as that one had, so that mainly the shoddy thread ran both ways, with only a little wool to hold it together.

That was a practical illustration I had of shoddy. That was a specimen of the miserably poor goods that were made under the Wilson law with the unlimited importation of shoddy, which was free.

But we put a prohibitive duty on shoddy. We thought there was enough produced in this country to meet all the legitimate demands of the manufacturers, and the result has proved that we were right.

In a circular recently issued, the firm of E. H. Van Ingen & Co., woolen importers, long conspicuous for the handling especially of English goods, says of the quality of the product of American mills:

> There are no more expert manufacturers anywhere than the best of those in this country. They are wonderfully quick to catch ideas, to modify, alter, improve, and to meet quickly the ever-changing demands of fashion and fancy. They produce as great a variety of woolen cloths as can be found in the whole of Europe together. The fine and medium grade of woolen cloths made here are generally better than those of equal quality to be obtained in any other country. American colors are, as a rule, better, clearer, and more lasting than those of similar foreign-made fabrics. The designing talent in America is quite equal to any in Europe.

This circular adds that only in the relatively small quantities of the finest and costliest cloths bought and used by a few very wealthy people has Europe any advantage over the United States—

> But in sound medium grades Americans are not only better, but much cheaper than similar foreign goods of the same qualities.

This means, of course, that the American goods are cheaper as compared with the foreign fabrics, duty paid. The tribute to American manufacturing is the more significant as coming from a firm that favors lower duties in the interest of a large use of British cloths—the object of the circular quoted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask my friend one more question.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does it happen, if this tariff in your bill and the bill of your predecessor is such a good thing, that while the number of the people in the United States has about doubled since 1880 that the number of sheep has absolutely diminished, being 42,192,000 shearing sheep in 1880, 40,876,000 in 1890, 39,853,000 in 1900, and only 39,039,000 in 1910?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I think I can answer the gentleman to his satisfaction. The great falling off between 1880 and 1900, the greatest falling off was during the three years we ran under the Wilson bill, and if the gentleman pursues these statistics a little further he will find the great falling off——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know, but the trouble about that is—I will restate the figures. It was 42,000,000——

Mr. PAYNE. I was going to answer the gentleman's question in regard to the falling off and I was speaking of the greatest cause——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was 42,000,000 in 1880, 38,000,000 in 1890, thirty-nine millions and some odd thousands in 1900, and only 39,039,000 in 1910, so it has been going down under those two last tariff bills.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, to finish my answer, if the gentleman is through repeating his question, there is no doubt, as the gentleman knows fully as well as I do, if not better, that there has

been a great change in the area where sheep can be raised and grazed in this country owing to the settling up of the country by small farmers. They can not have large flocks; they have small flocks, comparatively, even over in Texas, as I understand it to-day. My friend who stands there will correct me if I am wrong. It is the same in the States and Territories. The land has been withdrawn for forest reservations and conservation and like things and there is not that free range that there was prior to 1880 or 1890 over the country. The people have to pay rent for the land to the United States, and they have to do some fencing which they never had to do before, and that has been the great cause of the falling off of the flocks.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion——

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado (continuing). To the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri, the Speaker. Do not you realize that we have been eating more mutton from year to year; that since the time the Speaker mentioned we have trebled the number of mutton slaughtered, and the last year it was sixteen or seventeen million sheep we ate over the period of time the Speaker mentioned; it is about two-thirds more.

Mr. PAYNE. That is true as the gentleman says, and in the Rocky Mountain States also they have been slaughtering lambs to a large extent in the last few years. That has increased.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is true, is not it also true, then, that those people do not raise the sheep for the wool, but that they raise them for mutton?

Mr. PAYNE. They raise some sheep for the mutton and wool. They can not raise sheep in Ohio for the wool itself; the land is too high. I doubt whether they can do it in the gentleman's State.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I want to say to the gentleman they can not do it in our State.

Mr. PAYNE. In the course of 10 years that land will be so high they can not anywhere.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman this question in order to get at the very philosophy and root of the whole business: Is it not true in your State and my State, and every other State, that when the price of land goes up the number of sheep diminishes, and that you can not raise sheep either for mutton or for wool at a profit on high-priced land?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not think they can raise sheep and throw away the wool and sell the sheep for mutton, or throw away the mutton and sell the wool. I do not think they can do that anywhere. I think on the high-priced land they need both the mutton and the wool to help out.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Certainly the statement of the gentleman from Missouri is not true as to Ohio, because there are substantially the same number of sheep there to-day as there were 10 or 15 years ago, and the average price of farm land has increased probably three times.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I will ask the gentleman from Ohio, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will yield, if it is not true that the sheep industry, principally in Ohio, has been driven into the hill or rough land down next to the Ohio River?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think that is true. I think that the sheep industry in Ohio still remains as it always has, a very diversified industry, conducted in almost all counties. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] the other day published in his speech a record of the number of sheep in all counties in Ohio, and the gentleman can find from that how that situation is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio another question while he is on his feet. How does it happen that in Ohio in 1880 there were 4,903,000 sheep and in 1910 there were only 2,998,000, a falling off of nearly one-half? These are official statistics.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not understand it is true that there are less than 3,000,000 sheep in Ohio to-day.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio would not contradict the figures of a Republican administration?

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is a great question as to where those figures have been procured.

Mr. HELGESEN. If the gentleman will excuse me, I have some figures which I obtained from the Census Bureau yesterday, and which have not been published. They were sent to me privately. They show that Ohio has 3,975,000 sheep.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask you, since you are volunteering the information, if that does not include lambs?

Mr. HELGESEN. It includes the total number of sheep.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But I am referring to shearing sheep.

Mr. PAYNE. It excludes all lambs under a year old.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, taking the gentleman's own figures, how does it happen that the number of shearing sheep in Ohio fell off from 4,903,000 in 1880 to 2,998,000 in 1910?

Mr. HELGESEN. The gentleman says that as land goes up the number of sheep will decrease. If he will look at the latest figures from the Census Department for Missouri—and I imagine land in Missouri is going up—he will find the total number of sheep 10 years ago was 1,087,213, while in 1910 the total number was 1,808,038, an increase of nearly three-quarters of a million. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no sort of trouble about explaining that statement. A vast amount of wild lands in the mountainous part of Missouri has been opened up in recent years. Government land has been entered, and lands owned in large tracts have been cut up, and men have gone in there, and in the part of the State where the wool industry flourishes the most the number of sheep has increased. And it carries out what I have said all the time about this business, that, for some reason I have never been able to understand, as the price of land goes up the number of sheep diminishes. They raise a good many sheep in my part of Missouri, a very rich agricultural part, lying down between the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. But they are fine sheep. We ship them to the West and to the Northwest and to the South, and sell them at fancy prices for breeding purposes. And I do not believe, in the eight counties in my district, north of the Missouri River, there is a single scrub sheep, unless it has been imported in there for feeding purposes. Now, in the two counties south of the river there may be a few, because those counties extend to the foothills of the Ozarks. The thousands of sheep brought into Missouri to fatten, and which stay there only a few weeks, are all counted in the official figures. Most probably they are counted twice—once in Missouri, where they are fattened, and once in the Western States, where they were raised.

Mr. PAYNE. Of course, as the value of land goes up the number of sheep would diminish, because it would cost more there to raise the sheep.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, why is that? The number of hogs does not diminish; the number of cattle does not diminish; the number of horses and mules does not diminish as the value of the land increases.

Mr. PAYNE. Because it is more profitable to go into some other branch of industry on the farm than sheep raising.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. PAYNE. I will in a few moments.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Missouri is looking for the figures he wants, will he permit me to read some figures on the wool industry during the life of the Wilson bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The number of sheep fell off during the life of the Wilson bill; but it has fallen off under the Dingley bill, too, and under the blessed Payne bill. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman will realize that in speaking of Ohio, Ohio was hit harder than any other State in the Union by the Wilson bill. The gentleman from Missouri will remember that the number of sheep fell off in less than three years from substantially 4,000,000 to not much more than 1,000,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The number of sheep in Ohio?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; Ohio.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to cut off this joint debate after a little while.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will give the gentleman a rest [laughter]; but, first, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio about that hill-country business. Is not Cadiz, Ohio, just about the center of the wool industry in Ohio?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I can not answer that question positively.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am afraid I know more about Ohio than the gentleman does. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am afraid the gentleman from Missouri does not know as much about the effect of free wool upon Ohio sheep as I do. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman this question. In the year 1860 Ohio had 3,160,000 sheep; in 1870, 4,929,000; and in 1880, 4,903,000; while in 1890, now that you are talking about the calamitous Wilson bill, they had 4,061,000——

Mr. LONGWORTH. That was before the enactment of the Wilson bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; that was after the Wilson bill. In 1880 Ohio had 4,903,000 sheep, and——

Mr. LONGWORTH. And in 1890 how many?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In 1890 it had 4,061,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And in 1897?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My figures here do not give the number in 1897. Yes; in 1900 it was 2,648,000——

Mr. LONGWORTH. According to the gentleman's figures, as to the authenticity of which I do not know——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are Treasury figures——

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Missouri must admit that the number fell off in less than three years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know that; but what I am talking and contending about is that they fall off under any tariff bill. In 1890 there were 4,000,000; in 1900 there were 2,648,000 sheep in Ohio; and now, after 15 years of a high tariff, the gentleman has in Ohio only 2,839,000 sheep.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, but the gentleman heard the correct figures read a moment ago.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but——

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is practically 4,000,000. It is 3,900,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These are the shearing sheep; and those figures that the gentleman read included the lambs.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, they are wool sheep in both sets of figures. The gentleman made the positive statement that——

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I must insist to the gentlemen that I be allowed to close sometime this afternoon.

Mr. HELGESEN. Here are the figures of the wool-producing sheep——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I insist that if the gentleman from New York cuts us out, he ought also to cut out the gentleman from North Dakota. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. My genial friend from Missouri knows that it is difficult to secure time, but if there is anything that he wants to recur to after this gentleman has finished, I will give him time.

Mr. HELGESEN. In Ohio in 1910 the number of sheep and lambs was 3,907,055. In 1900 the number was 4,020,628. That is, in 1910 there were 113,673 less than 10 years before.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman from New York one more question.

Mr. PAYNE. I shall warn the gentlemen who are carrying on this joint debate in my time that I will strike all their figures out of the RECORD. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does it happen that the shearing sheep throughout the United States in 1903 were 63,105,000, and in 1904 they had fallen off to 51,630,000? That is a fact that needs explanation on the gentleman's theory.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Missouri is reading something now that appeared in an Agricultural Yearbook a few years ago and not in the United States census reports.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman surely is not going to dispute about the statistics that the Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, gives out. He is the most reliable Republican functionary who has been here since I have been in Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman assumes that everything a Republican functionary does and says is the exact truth. Well, that is a very reasonable conclusion, but they can not get an estimate of the sheep in this country that will be exact. The census may get pretty close to it. It is like the price of mutton.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to go back to the effect of the Wilson bill on the consumption of wool in this country, and so forth, a question that agitated my friend from Illinois yesterday. In 1896 there were carried over from the previous year 194,000,000 pounds of wool; American clip, 272,000,000; imports, 159,000,000; imports of shoddy, noils, rags, and so forth, 17,000,000 pounds; total supply, 643,000,000 pounds; consumption and exports, 250,000,000 pounds; carried over at the end of the year, 393,000,000 pounds.

In 1897 there was less wool produced and the imports were double, and the importations of shoddy, and so forth, increased from 17,000,000 pounds to 44,500,000 pounds under the Wilson bill. The total supply was 1,254,000,000 pounds and the amount carried over was 794,000,000. I will put this table in the RECORD in full. In the year 1898, 761,000,000 pounds were carried over, and in 1899, 589,494,000; in 1900, 494,000,000, and in 1901, 396,000,000 pounds were carried over; in 1902, 314,000,000 pounds; and in 1903, 286,000,000 pounds.

The visible supply of wool—the wool that was not used—increased to nearly 1,000,000,000 pounds during the Wilson bill period, but finally got down to between 200,000,000 and 300,000,000 pounds under the duties of the Dingley bill. I suggest that to the gentleman from Illinois, because I think he had a slightly mistaken idea about it. I understand he is going to make a speech to-day, and I would prefer to have him make it in his own time and not in mine, unless it is absolutely necessary. Here is the table referred to:

Wool supply at the end of each year, based on production and imports, less consumption and exports.

	1896	1897	1898	1899
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Carried over from previous year	194,724,651	393,986,523	794,484,726	761,515,011
American clip	272,474,708	259,153,251	266,720,684	272,191,330
Imports of wool	159,776,015	356,839,482	99,850,404	105,867,574
Imports of shoddy, noils, rags, etc	17,011,149	44,505,470	459,197	317,331
	.....	[1] 200,000,000	.....	.....
Total supply	643,986,523	1,254,484,726	1,161,515,011	1,139,891,246
Consumption and exports	250,000,000	460,000,000	400,000,000	550,000,000
Carried over at end of year	393,986,523	794,484,726	761,515,011	589,891,246

	1900	1901	1902	1903
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Carried over from previous year	589,801,246	494,073,762	396,818,135	314,760,961
American clip	288,636,621	302,502,328	316,341,032	287,450,000
Imports of wool	139,908,718	124,964,377	176,292,639	173,573,891
Imports of shoddy, noils, rags, etc	637,177	277,668	309,155	312,861
Total supply	1,019,073,762	921,818,135	889,760,961	776,097,713
Consumption and exports	525,000,000	525,000,000	575,000,000	490,000,000
Carried over at end of year	494,073,762	396,818,135	314,760,961	286,097,713

	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Carried over from previous year	286,097,713	283,622,700	253,524,107	180,299,002	158,115,586
American clip	291,783,032	295,488,438	208,915,130	208,294,750	300,000,000
Imports of wool	186,572,686	249,135,746	201,688,668	203,847,545	[2] 120,000,000
Imports of shoddy, noils, rags, etc	169,272	277,223	1,171,097	674,289	[3] 400,000
Total supply	764,622,700	828,524,107	755,299,002	683,115,586	578,515,586
Consumption and exports	481,000,000	575,000,000	575,000,000	525,000,000	[2] 350,000,000
Carried over at end of year	283,622,700	253,524,107	180,299,002	158,115,586	228,515,586

[1] Added to cover the increased efficiency of 113,958,915 pounds of shoddy over grease wool imported during 1895, 1896, and 1897.
[2] Estimated on basis of 10 months.
[3] Average consumption for 13 years, 483,000 pounds.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, for a question.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask for information—what does the Bureau of Statistics of the Agricultural Department mean by the total consumption in the column headed "Total consumption" for certain years?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know anything about what that means or what the report is.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not that mean that the consumption was so much during that year?

Mr. PAYNE. You will have to ask the Secretary of Agriculture what he means by it, if he said so.

Mr. FOWLER. Now, I will ask you if it is not a fact that during the panics that have occurred in America the foreign importation of wool was the greatest, compared with the other years?

Mr. PAYNE. Which panic does the gentleman refer to, the panic of 1857 that followed the Walker bill or the panic of 1895 and 1896?

Mr. FOWLER. I refer to the panic of 1872 and the panic of the early nineties.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not looked back at the statistics of 1872. The early nineties did not show a greater importation of wool, but 1895-6-7-8 did.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask you if it is not a fact that the per cent that was imported from foreign countries in 1872 was not 45 per cent of the consumption?

Mr. PAYNE. I am not able to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. FOWLER. Was not that the greatest foreign importation for any year prior to that, or any year subsequent to that, until the panic of the nineties?

Mr. PAYNE. I want simply to say to the gentleman that I have read the official figures and I will put them in the RECORD.

He can study them there. I am not going to try to hold any school on the subject any further.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon for one more question, and that is all.

Mr. PAYNE. All right.

Mr. FOWLER. You said that the greatest falling off in the number of sheep was during the Wilson bill. Now, I will ask you if during the time from 1870 to 1872 there was not a falling off of more than 9,000,000 head of sheep?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not carry the statistics of the last 50 years in my mind. I know there was some falling off on account of the tariff of 1883.

Mr. FOWLER. I ask you if there was not a falling off of more than 2,000,000 head during the panic of the early seventies than the biggest falling off during the operation of the Wilson bill?

Mr. PAYNE. That was not in the early nineties.

Mr. FOWLER. The Wilson bill was in the early nineties.

Mr. PAYNE. It began in July, 1894, and continued for three years.

Mr. FOWLER. I will now ask the gentleman——

Mr. PAYNE. I can not yield to the gentleman further.

Mr. FOWLER. For one more question.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has said that three times. I can not allow my time to be used up in that way, and I do not think the gentleman ought to impose on me.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I do not mean to impose on him.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, not only the sheep disappeared and wool was carried over, but the machinery was idle. I refer, gentlemen, to page 5406 of the hearings upon wool two years ago. In 1896 42 per cent of the woolen machinery in this country was idle; 43 per cent of the woolen mills was idle; 47 per cent of the knitting machinery was idle; 53 per cent of the knitting mills was idle. You go into the kindred industry, the cotton industry, and I think 57 per cent of the mills was idle. It not only caused the slaughter of the sheep, but it caused the stoppage of the mills, and I think gentlemen may be mistaken in regard to this bill. Goods will come in, they will get the revenue, they will get within a million and a half dollars of the present revenue, but they will stop the mills and send the price of sheep down from $4 to $1.70, and, perhaps, to 50 cents, as they did in 1896. Gentlemen may doubt that statement; and still it was testified to by men who appeared honest and credible, men in the sheep business. One man told about buying 3,000 or 4,000 sheep at 50 cents a head in 1896 under the Wilson bill, and he kept them until after the Dingley bill went into effect and made a small fortune. He took his chances; it was a speculation; but he made his money.

Even a woman came before the committee and testified to her recollection of what occurred in Idaho in regard to the sheep industry during the perilous years of the Wilson bill.

Now, you gentlemen had all these facts before you. You pretend to say that you do not know what is the difference between the cost of wool and woolens in this country and countries abroad. Here is something that will furnish you a lesson on the subject, and that is the greater protection on woolens that was in the Wilson bill flooded the country with woolen goods and struck down the machinery. Free sheep stopped the growth of the sheep industry and reduced the number during the years of the Wilson bill. I believe myself, Mr. Chairman, that we have got somewhere near the limit of sheep raising in this country. Possibly by increasing the weight of the fleece, as they have been doing, from 3 pounds up to 6 or 7 pounds in later years, it may have some tendency to revive the industry; possibly by crossbreeding they may get sheep that more nearly answer the double purpose of producing wool, producing mutton and lamb, and that may help the industry. But at this time, when the number of sheep is not increasing, when the industry is not growing stronger under the present tariff, it is mighty poor policy to cut all the protection out from under it and leave it to languish and die.

You gentlemen can not excuse yourselves by saying that the caucus did it and that you got the best terms possible. They send people here to stand up and vote for what they believe. They expect to send men here with backbone. You can not tell them you got a beggarly 20 per cent on wool. They will tell you it will not do; they can not raise sheep; they will tell you that they can not maintain the flock, and they will look around for a man that has a little backbone when they send him to Congress.

Talk about protection being local to the district, and all that sort of thing. People at home have some rights to be represented in their districts. I do not know what I got for my district in making the last tariff bill, except that one little industry that employed 100 men was driven to the wall by the low duty that I put into it. Most of them voted against me in the last election. I did it because it was right, and I would do it again under similar circumstances. Some of the more intelligent ones who have studied the question concluded that I was right and still voted for me, notwithstanding the great temptation to do otherwise. I only speak of this as an illustration, and men are a good deal the same all over the country.

You can not fool all of the people all of the time. You may fool all of the people a part of the time, but not all of the people all of the time. You have got to give them something tangible and reasonable when you make a wool bill, and not go to them, as you will have to, with the confession that you did not know what effect the bill would have on the industry; that you had no knowledge that you had voted for an appropriation of $250,000 within the last four months to get the light and to get the information, but the exigencies of party politics, as you understood them, would not permit you to wait until next December, the time when you ordered by your vote the investigation and the report to be made, and that under the whip and spur of a party caucus you had to do it now, with your great leader protesting against it, and many of you protesting against it in secret, but not openly. Oh, how are you going to excuse yourselves? Why ruin a great business and a great industry? If the duty is too high, lower it, but do it intelligently. If the protection is too great, remove part of it, but do it intelligently. Do not guess at it. Do not put on a duty that is much less for manufactured goods than under the Wilson bill, when the mills were closed. Have a care! The day of reckoning is coming. Election is only a year from this fall. We will be there and you will be there, and we will do our part of the fighting. We will stir them up by way of remembrance about what you did. We will tell the people how you lost your opportunities. We will tell them how you went back on your policies. We will tell them that this bill is neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, but simply a carelessly drawn and negligently made bill—to allow a great business of over $400,000,000 to be slaughtered in the supposed interest of party success.

But, gentlemen, I am spending more time on this than I expected to. There is something else I wanted to talk about, and that is the present tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.] I know you all want to hear this. There is nothing about it that I am not willing to talk about from the enacting clause to the repealing clause at the end of it. I can maintain that it is just what the President said in his speech, the best tariff law ever enacted. One thing it had in it that rendered it better than the previous laws was putting the imports from the Philippine Islands on the free list.

You say it is a small matter, a side issue. It was a great matter, however, to 9,000,000 of people living over there under our flag who desired the privilege of the American markets. It was a great matter to them. It built them up; not only built up their schools and added to their intelligence, but it has given them more money and more hope for the future. They are making homes down there, and they are becoming every day more fit for citizenship. We took them against their will, and we are holding them partially against their will for their own good, as we believe and are able to demonstrate. They came to us by accident, not by preconceived design, and some of the best work that I have ever done in Congress has been in connection with the Committee on Insular Affairs, trying to devise means to help out the people in these insular possessions that came to us. The best part of it is this bill putting on the free list the products of the Philippine Islands. You must admit that is an improvement over former bills at least.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we paid more attention to the definite and technical language of the bill than was ever observed in any other tariff bill that has been passed. It is a great improvement on them all in this respect. That took time and thought and study—study of the decisions made under all of the tariff bills—for we believed it was most important when you imposed duties that everyone who imported should pay the same duty that his neighbors paid for the similar importation of goods, and should not escape by anything that could be misconstrued even, and the result has shown the wisdom of the course, because the bill has been more easily interpreted than any former bills.

We provided a Customs Court, and once in awhile I see a gentleman who simply knows that there is a Customs Court and that it has cost some money and will cost more, and he sneers at it. Before that, suit could be brought in any circuit court of the United States, and there were diverse decisions on the same class of cases in the different courts of the United States, and then they had to go up to the Supreme Court—a question of no great importance as a question of law, but involving much in the way of revenue—to have it reviewed there. We placed it in the power of a court which should have the final say on the subject of all these cases, no matter where they

arose, in any part of the United States, and deprived all other courts of jurisdiction.

We improved on all the former bills in this respect. My friend from Missouri has gone out. He knows that I spent much time on the valuation clause and the perfecting of that clause; that because there was no sale but only a consignment of certain articles, which were not sold in open market where produced, we could not establish any foreign market price on which to levy an ad valorem duty. We put in a provision fixing the value in such cases from the selling price here, making proper deductions for expenses in transportation of the articles, landing them on the wharfs in New York in order to determine the cost of the goods abroad; I remember the gentleman from Missouri saying at one meeting of the committee that, if I could accomplish that, I would accomplish the greatest result that had ever been attained in making any tariff in the United States. Well, I got the clause in. There have not been many cases arising under it. The importers seem to be afraid of it, but now they supply the figures they would not supply before as to the cost of the goods abroad and the prices where before they had no prices. It is one of the minor points of the bill, perhaps, but one which your Speaker thought was an important point at the time. Now, you are making an ad valorem, the very worst class of duty that there is. Why, no Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, except Robert J. Walker, ever advocated an ad valorem. Your last Secretary, Mr. Daniel Manning, of my own State, who filled the position as ably, perhaps, as any man who occupied it, made a long report against this ad valorem duty business and quoted the former Secretaries, and that has been the universal feeling of men of experience who have tried the enforcement of ad valorem duties; that they occasion frauds, and we ought to have specific duties. England, Germany, France, Spain, all the great commercial nations of the world have specific duties and not ad valorem, where it is possible to have them. We have been increasing the number of specific duties in the tariff bills we have passed. It has been our policy to make a specific duty wherever we could. Sometimes, of course, you put a duty by the pound and it will result in a large ad valorem on the low-priced goods and a small ad valorem on the high-priced, and we have sought to avoid all such cases as that. We have in former laws and in this law added to the specific duties, and we have improved in that respect over other tariff bills ever passed in the United States. Oh, Germany is said to have an ideal tariff law. They make their duties specific.

From principle and because of our experience we put a maximum and minimum clause in this bill, and that was an improvement on all former bills ever passed in the United States. It had been adopted by every great commercial country in the world. They have driven sharp bargains under it, some of them. We were getting the worst end of the business; we had nothing to offer them. They would give us the worst of it every time, and our rivals got the better of us. We put in the maximum and minimum rate of duty, and that has stood the test of time, and has enabled the Executive to get our goods into foreign ports at a lower rate of duty than ever before. In many cases we have the best rates, or as good as any other country, and in some cases where there are treaties we have not got as good, but we have increased our exports by reason of this clause in the bill. Last year, for the fiscal year 1910, we had a billion and a half exports; it was larger than we ever had. This year we have now for 11 months up to the 1st of June the largest exports ever in any 11 months in any year. If they keep on to the end of this month the exports for this fiscal year will be over $2,000,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] Orators stand on the street corners braying to the tune of the Democratic donkey, and saying, "The worst bill ever passed; the most iniquitous tariff bill ever passed; the most outrageous bill ever passed." I wish we had all of you here, I would like to give you a few brief instructions on this subject so you would know what to look for in reference to the present tariff law passed in 1909, and you have no excuse for your ignorance——

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

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. For the sake of information, which I would be very glad to have, will the gentleman tell the House briefly what countries have lowered their tariff rates, and in what commodities, operating under our maximum and minimum clause?

Mr. PAYNE. I could not give the gentleman details of that in half an hour. I do not have it here, either.

We have the largest free list of any bill that was ever passed except the McKinley bill. The McKinley bill put sugar on the free list, and a little larger percentage of the importations were free under that bill than under this. But the free importations are greater than in the Dingley bill, and greater than in the Wilson bill. Almost 50 per cent of the goods coming into this country come in absolutely free, and we added to the list, and still, I suppose, some of you will go out and say we increased the duties, even in places where we took them all off. It does not seem as though there was an Ananias of that kind in the House of Representatives, but there have been so many Ananiases in the last two years that I begin to doubt any man when I look into his face as to whether he is telling the truth or not. I will put these statistics in. We increased the duties on luxuries, on whiskeys, on wines, on jewelry, on spices, and feathers that are fixed up for adornment, and toilet articles of a fancy kind, and fancy soap, and various things of that kind. We increased the duties on those in order to get more revenue. We would do it again if we were to make the bill again. I do not believe that you, with all your idea of tariff making, will take them off, either, or will reduce them a dollar's worth, or even introduce a bill to do it, or even let it get through your caucus. I think while the duties on sheep would move you, the high duties on luxuries might possibly restrain you from doing any such foolish thing as that.

As a revenue measure, it was a complete success. We were cutting down revenues in the McKinley bill, and before the period was over, after the Democratic election, we were short on our duties, and we had an actual deficit of revenue with which to meet the expenses of the Government; a thing that was continued under the Wilson bill. We passed the Dingley bill, and we had revenues under that. And we started the work of building the Panama Canal.

I did not meet a man in the House, or hear him say a word, in favor of paying the expenses of building the Panama Canal out of the current expenses of the Government and increasing the revenues in order to do it. It was the consensus of opinion that this wonderful work, the greatest undertaken by any individual nation, should be paid for by posterity, that we should issue bonds to pay for the work, and in the meantime, when we had a surplus revenue, it was a mighty good place in which to deposit it in paying for this canal as we went along. We pursued that policy, and when there was not enough accumulation of surplus—there has always been a surplus since—we issued the bonds to take the place of the money out of our current funds that had been used in building the canal.

Now, I am going to refer to this daily statement once more. June 1, right under the statements we put in, on page 2, we find "Panama Canal," and then follows "Receipts—Proceeds of bonds" and "Disbursements for canal," and "Excess of Panama Canal receipts over disbursements," with a star referring to the statement that it is a case of disbursements over receipts, because during the past year no bonds have been issued, and we have paid out for the canal during this year, up to June 1, $34,909,000, or nearly $35,000,000; to this date last fiscal year, $31,207,834.86. Now, the total amount expended on purchase and construction of the Panama Canal from its inception to this date, June 1, was $239,005,414.10; of this the Treasury has been reimbursed from the proceeds of bond sales in the sum of $87,309,594.83. The balance expended out of the general fund of the Treasury and reimbursable from the proceeds of bonds not yet sold, $151,695,819.27. The total bonds authorized by the existing law for Panama Canal—the estimated total expense—$375,000,000. The total bond issue to this date is $84,000,000. Balance of bonds authorized and not yet issued, $290,569,000. And $50,000,000 of these bonds have been advertised and the bids are to be received to-day, and they will go to reimburse the money that has been paid out of current funds and in the building of this canal. We passed two bonding acts in reference to the canal. One of them was contained in the present tariff law, and under this provision the bonds are being sold. It shows the intent of the American Congress to pay that out of the sale of bonds and charge it to the future, and let the future pay for it, and the generations to come ought to pay for it. Last year, on the 30th of June, in the Treasury reports, there was a surplus under this law that had been in force 11 months, of $15,866,328.94.

To-day we are $24,400,000 better off than we were a year ago to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] Add that $24,400,000 to your $16,800,000 and you get $31,000,000——

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Forty-one million dollars.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; $41,000,000. I used to be a lightning calculator, but some of it has left me. It is $41,000,000. That is the amount indicated as surplus in the Treasury for this year. I put that over your false statement, which comes here with the unanimous sanction of your caucus, that the Treasury is depleted and depleting, framed in order to conjure up an excuse for putting this duty on wool. Oh, how hard pushed you were

that you could not stop even to read, much less to study, the actual statements as to the condition of the United States Treasury when you were rushing this bill through the caucus and getting the assent of the weak brothers to it—men who had conscientious scruples about consenting to it!

Now, I have a statement here from the Bureau of Statistics. Here it is. It was furnished to me last fall, after the present tariff law had been in existence for a single year, commencing on the 1st day of August and running for a year. Of course five days of it ran to the Dingley law. The rest of it was under the present law. I have the amount of the imports under this law, under the McKinley law, under the Wilson law, under the Dingley law, and the revenues each year on those importations. The percentage is figured out for the entire period under each law while it was in existence. I will not stop to read all the figures. I will put them in the RECORD. They are good food for you gentlemen on that side to ponder over about the time you say your prayers and ask God to forgive you for all the lies you have told unwittingly about the present tariff law. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Here are the figures: Under the McKinley law, 44 months, percentage of duties on the dutiable goods, 47.1 per cent; the Wilson law, 35 months, similar statement, 42.8 per cent; Dingley law, 144 months, 45.8 per cent; present law, 41.3 per cent. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And remember, these figures include the high duties on the luxuries that we put into the present bill. Go out now and look some one in the face in the street and say it was not a revision downward, but a revision upward all the time! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, we took the duties almost off of shoes and leather of every kind. We put hides on the free list. We reduced iron ore from Cuba from 40 cents a ton to 12 cents a ton, and 15 cents a ton from other countries. We had to run over my brother from Michigan [Mr. YOUNG] in order to do that, but we did it, and we cut off the duty on pig iron from $4 to $2.50, and the duties on structural steel, except the finished shapes, and we put slightly higher duties on those. All through the schedules of the bill we adjusted the duties to the difference in cost of production between this country and abroad. The result was, of course, a reduction of duties. Why, we cut some duties down so low that we made the industry bleed. They are getting in more iron ore than my friend wishes we were getting, and more pig iron and more scrap iron.

Competition? Yes. They are coming here and taking part of our market. You say we promised a lowering of the tariff. It was an implied promise that where it was higher than the difference in the cost of production here and abroad we would lower it, and we promised, also, that where the duties were not protective we would still make out the difference in the cost between here and abroad. That is what we tried to do, and that is what we did with a great portion of the bill.

As I said before, we could not change this duty in the wool schedule, although some of us wanted to and believed we ought to do it. We did not do it, however, because some of the Members believed that the evidence we had before the committee would not warrant it. They had a right to their opinion and I had a right to mine. They have not changed their opinion since and I have not changed mine.

Here is the table of the Bureau of Statistics:

FIRST FULL YEAR OF NEW TARIFF LAW.

Imports of merchandise into the United States, the per cent entered free of duty, the customs receipts, and the average ad valorem rate of duty during the first 12 months' operation of the Payne tariff law (Aug. 1, 1909, to July 31, 1910), compared with the corresponding period of earlier years; also a comparison with like data covering the entire period of the Dingley, Wilson, and McKinley laws, respectively.

[Prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, Department of Commerce and Labor.]

Tariff laws in force.	12 months, Aug. 1 to July 31—	Imports (million dollars).			Per cent free.	Customs receipts (million dollars).	Average rate of dutiable imports.	Ad valorem duty on total imports.
		Free.	Dutiable.	Total.				
							Per cent.	*Per cent.*
McKinley tariff	1891[1]	378.0	456.4	834.4	45.3	211.1	46.3	25.3
	1892	456.2	369.9	826.0	55.2	179.1	48.4	21.7
	1893	444.2	419.7	863.9	51.4	209.6	47.8	23.2
	1894	387.6	269.5	657.1	59.0	125.6	46.6	19.1
Wilson tariff	1895[2]	357.1	382.6	739.7	48.3	157.6	41.2	21.3
	1896	359.6	399.2	758.8	47.4	157.6	39.5	20.8
	1897	388.5	377.8	766.3	50.7	181.1	47.9	23.6
Dingley tariff	1898	281.7	331.6	613.4	45.9	148.3	44.7	24.2
	1899	306.6	399.6	706.3	43.4	207.9	52.0	29.4
	1900	363.3	490.2	853.5	42.6	236.2	48.2	27.7
	1901	345.5	487.1	832.6	41.5	240.0	49.3	28.8
	1902	399.2	510.2	909.4	43.9	257.6	50.5	28.3
	1903	432.3	596.5	1,028.8	42.0	282.6	47.4	27.5
	1904	449.4	530.7	980.1	45.9	258.3	48.7	26.4
	1905	521.8	609.0	1,130.8	46.1	264.2	43.4	23.4
	1906	554.9	689.7	1,244.6	44.6	305.2	44.3	24.5
	1907	659.5	797.0	1,456.5	45.3	335.9	42.2	23.1
	1908	507.6	648.6	1,156.2	43.9	277.4	42.8	24.0
	1909	606.7	731.3	1,338.0	45.3	310.3	42.4	23.2
Payne law	12 months[3]	768.0	794.6	1,562.6	49.2	327.9	41.3	21.0
	August, 1909	54.2	62.9	117.1	46.3	28.6	45.5	24.4
	September, 1909	59.6	61.4	121.0	49.3	27.3	44.5	22.6
	October, 1909	64.6	63.1	127.7	50.6	29.3	46.4	22.9
	November, 1909	76.0	64.5	140.5	54.1	25.6	39.8	18.2
	December, 1909	77.6	61.1	138.7	55.9	27.1	44.3	19.5
	January, 1910	70.5	63.2	133.7	52.7	25.7	40.7	19.3
	February, 1910	59.6	70.5	130.1	45.8	27.5	39.0	21.2
	March, 1910	76.7	86.3	163.0	47.1	33.7	39.1	20.7
	April, 1910	62.7	71.3	133.9	46.8	27.3	38.3	20.4
	May, 1910	54.7	65.0	119.7	45.7	23.0	35.4	19.2
	June, 1910	54.1	65.7	119.9	45.2	27.7	42.1	23.1
	July, 1910	57.7	59.6	117.3	49.2	25.1	42.0	21.4
Entire period of—								
McKinley law	47 months[4]	1,642.1	1,454.0	3,096.0	53.0	684.8	47.1	22.1
Monthly average		34.9	30.9	65.8		14.6		
Wilson law	35 months[5]	1,080.4	1,132.7	2,213.1	48.8	485.0	42.8	21.9
Monthly average		30.9	32.4	63.2		13.9		
Dingley law	144 months[6]	5,428.5	6,821.5	12,250.0	44.3	3,121.8	45.8	25.5
Monthly average		37.7	47.4	85.1		21.7		
Payne law	12 months[3]	768.0	794.6	1,562.6	49.2	327.9	41.3	21.0
Monthly average		64.0	66.2	130.2		27.3		

[1] Includes 2 months under tariff of 1883.
[2] Includes 1 month under McKinley law.
[3] Includes Aug. 1-5, 1909, under act of 1897.
[4] Includes Oct. 1-5, 1890, under act of 1883; and Aug. 28-31, 1894, under act of 1894.
[5] Excludes last 4 days of August, 1894, included under McKinley law; includes July 24-31, 1897, under act of 1897.
[6] Excludes last 8 days of July, 1897, included under Wilson law; excludes Aug. 1-5, 1909, included under Payne law.

NOTE.—A reduction of about $55,000,000 was caused in customs receipts under the McKinley Act, due to reduced imports in the closing months under that act in anticipation of passage of Wilson tariff, whose revenues were correspondingly increased. Likewise, a reduction of about $45,000,000 was caused in customs receipts under the Dingley Act, due to heavy imports in closing months of the Wilson law, whose revenues were correspondingly increased. The high percentage of free imports under the McKinley law is largely due to the fact that sugar was on the free list under that act. Of merchandise other than sugar imported under that law, 39.56 per cent was free of duty.

Mr. FORDNEY. A few minutes ago the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], on the question of files, said that this man, Samuel L. Nicholson, who was making files, stated that they were selling them abroad at a profit. I want to show you by the record that he stated they were selling at a loss. I refer the gentleman to page 2201 of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee in the preparation of the Payne tariff bill. You will find that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in questioning Mr. Nicholson, said:

I want to know whether the amount or price at which you were selling your files on the average in these markets is less than the cost of production, with freight added.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I should say that the actual transaction in those two countries—Germany and France—was showing no profit.

That was the thing I had in mind.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me to read a statement in reply to that, to get it into the RECORD?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; please give the page.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Page 2201:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In Australia you are not selling at a loss?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. You are selling files in France?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes; to a limited extent.

And then he goes on and asks a number of other questions, and the concluding one is:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It does not show you a loss, does it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. We do not figure it as a loss, because there are different ways of fixing what your cost is.

And the testimony shows that he was chased through 20 or 30 printed pages of testimony, and that he qualified, ducked, evaded, and dodged, although it is quite apparent to everybody who read the testimony that he was conducting his operations at a profit in those foreign countries, because he complained at one time——

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman make his speech short?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I will conclude in a second or two. He complained at one time that in one country he was going to do less business than he had the year before on account of the raising of the tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. If you will read the whole paragraph you will see he states that because the tariff was imposed upon those goods they were doing business without profit, but in the countries where there was no tariff they may have made some profit, if they figured their cost in a certain way. That is what the gentleman has read.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. If the gentleman will buy me a box of cigarettes, I will buy him a cigar.

Mr. FORDNEY. If I owed you one, I would buy it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I think the committee understands it now. Of course, Mr. Chairman, figuring the percentage on the dutiable goods, you give us no credit for the duties that are remitted entirely. For instance, hides disappear from the dutiable list and go on the free list, and of course they show no reduction in the general percentage. So with the other matters placed upon the free list. For the entire period of the McKinley law the percentage of duty on the whole list, dutiable and free, was 22.1 per cent, and that with free sugar. Under the Wilson law the percentage was 21.9, under the Dingley law 25.5, and under the present law 21 per cent, or lower than any of them. [Applause on the Republican side.] We were revising the Dingley bill, and we reduced these duties from 25.5 to 21 per cent exactly.

But, gentlemen, what was the percentage of reduction of the duty itself? Of course you must subtract the percentage of the duty under the present law from that under the Dingley law and divide that difference by the Dingley ad valorem to get at that fact. When you do that you will find that the reduction in the duties on the dutiable list in the present law is a reduction of 10 per cent from the duties in the Dingley law, on the dutiable list, and the reduction of the duties on the whole business, the equivalent ad valorem under the present law, is a reduction of 0.176 per cent as compared with the duties on the whole business in the Dingley law. Was that a revision upward? Now, honestly, gentlemen, was that a revision upward? These are the Treasury figures of the entire receipts on the goods imported. What is the use? Let justice be done, though your imaginary Democratic heavens fall. Come out and confess the truth, just as you are willing to about the revenue, now that you have been so thoroughly exposed.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Does the gentleman admit that heaven is Democratic?

Mr. PAYNE. I yield first to the gentleman from Ohio. I did not catch the remark of the gentleman from New Jersey, and I do not want it to go into the RECORD unless I understand what it is.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to a statement made by me in the debate last year in reply to a statement that the Payne law had increased the duties on the necessities of life. I challenged any gentleman, as I do now, on that side of the aisle to mention one article of daily necessity used either in the poor man's home or on his table, or upon his person, the duty on which had been increased, and the only answer I received was "lemons."

Mr. HARRISON of New York. All sorts of cotton manufactures. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman can not name one.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I had the time and the strength I would pursue this thing. There is not a phase of it that I am not willing to meet anywhere with any man that lives. [Applause on the Republican side.] All I want is the truth. I do not care to gain my cause by lying, and never did. I have generally weighed my statements before I made them, and sought to verify them. If I have made mistakes, they have been unintentional mistakes. [Applause on the Republican side.] Some of you people have made honest mistakes. Do not repeat them. Find out about it; and if you find you are wrong, say so. It will not make much difference. The period of vilification in the public press has passed. They begin to speak well of this bill. I have had people writing for the muck-rake magazines introduce themselves to me, take me by the hand, and say, "I was prejudiced against your bill and your action in the committee. I did not think you went in for an honest revision of the tariff. I did not think you reduced the duties in the tariff; but since then I have read every word of the evidence, every word of your examination of the witnesses, and I have compared the bill with what went before, and I want to apologize to you now and say that I have been utterly mistaken in regard to this bill and the way it was made and in the framing of it."

Of course, gentlemen, like all others, I like to have a good reputation. I do not like to be hounded and followed with slanderous vituperation. I have had a good deal of it in my day, and I have got to be pretty thickskinned.

I had the Porto Rico business for several months after the bill became a law, and on an appeal the Supreme Court decided our powers in regard to the taxation of imports from Porto Rico, and after the constitutionality of that law was affirmed by the Supreme Court a certain Senator in the Senate had put on the civil government bill, that had been reported by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. COOPER, chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, and it was announced in the papers and in the bill and was referred to in the Supreme Court decision as the law of that Senator.

I never got any credit for it. I do not care anything about that. I do not care anything for abuse or for the vilification. In the law itself I put a provision that the money raised for this should go for the support of schools and the building of schoolhouses and civil government in that island. I found that they needed the revenue. A newspaper editor came from the West and said he never got any idea that that was in the bill. Constituents wanted to know why I did not put it in. But that does not make much difference. That is past history. But here is a great piece of legislation involving the welfare and the comfort of millions, and no partisan exigency, no spleen manifested outside of this Hall ought to keep them from telling the truth about the present tariff law. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished honor of following the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] in these concluding hours of the debate I fully appreciate. I assure the House that their patience will not be wearied nor their time be taxed by unnecessary details.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and the author of the present tariff law, has taken a very wide range in the discussion of this bill. He has talked about almost everything except the bill. His attack upon the Democracy, Democratic doctrines and policies, and statements of Democrats in recent years, seems to be mixed with a considerable amount of feeling. That feeling appears to be largely personal, a thing I regret, because questions of this kind are not generally seen very clearly by those who have personal feeling to blear their vision and to influence the method of mental procedure in considering the various questions at issue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is rather harsh—perhaps not intentionally, but in the force of his feeling—in characterizing the various Democratic statements that have been made in reference to the Payne bill, a measure which he, as its author, vigorously defends. I think his reference to the Ananias Club is hardly appropriate. The Ananias Club, as I understand it, is an

organization purely Republican in its origin. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The gentleman says that the present bill is simply a tissue of falsehoods, and he characterizes it as "lies" and objects to our going to the country with "lies," and he says that if we go to the country in that way we will be repudiated. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I agree with him that the country will not commend us for falsehoods and lying, or for any kind of deception. So far as the danger of being repudiated by the people on account of lying is concerned, I am quite sure that the information is very reliable, coming as it does from a stand-pat Republican. Experience is a great teacher, and the Republican machine has had much experience in deception and in receiving the punishment therefor.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is not a lying bill, it is not a deceptive measure. Whether it is wise or foolish, whether it should meet with the approval of the American people or not, whether it should become a law upon the statute books or should fail to pass, are matters that can be discussed fully, fairly, and clearly. There is no necessity nor cause for snarling anger. The bill is clear in its terms, and there has been ample time for its consideration and discussion. Many speeches have been made during this discussion relevant and irrelevant to the bill. Many of them, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, will stand as beacon lights to guide future legislators in considering and revising this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Many of them, not so relevant to the bill, are nevertheless full of information and wisdom, and they will be read by coming generations, and studied by men who desire honestly to serve the public. Right here I wish to say that the weakness of the Republican position in reference to this bill is very apparent. They show the paucity of their store of arguments when their principal speakers spend most of their time in discussing what they claim was a great mistake made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in reference to the daily financial report of the Treasury. The gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, stated in his opening speech that the Treasury was in "a depleted and depleting condition." The same statement is made in the report of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting this bill; and like allegation was made by resolution of the Democratic caucus. This statement is denied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], Republican leader on that side, and the denial reiterated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

If the gentleman from Alabama made a mistake in reference to one item in a long and intricate financial daily Treasury statement what does it signify? The gist of it is this, that the Treasury under a Republican administration is, and has been for a long time, depleted and in a depleting condition. They may make all the denials they think proper; the facts remain. The money has already been appropriated out of the Treasury by statute for 1911 and 1912. The incidental revenue has been phenomenally large in the last few months (a condition that can not be counted on to remain). Gentlemen may take advantage of the fact that, on account of a number of unusual circumstances, the general fund in the Treasury has not been depleted and is not depleting so much as it has been, but the fact stands that the expenses of this Government are more than the revenue that can reasonably be expected from the laws as they stand to-day; and I reassert in my place here in this House that the records will bear it out, and I reaffirm the fact, as stated by the gentleman from Alabama, and as stated by the caucus, and as stated in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, that the Treasury of the United States is in "a depleted and depleting condition." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That being the case, the Democracy of this House, in framing tariff legislation, should endeavor, of course, to provide for the expenses that have been contracted for the coming year. The Canadian reciprocity bill, a Republican measure, already passed by this House, will cause a loss to the Treasury of some ten or twelve million dollars a year, according to some estimates. It will probably pass the Senate and become a law. The Republican leaders in the House earnestly, apparently (because I will not question their sincerity and call their position "lies"), declared most vehemently that this administration bill was a blow at protectionism, and that it would deplete the Treasury.

The ludicrous part of their contention, however, was the plea that the bill would injure the farmer. These champions of the protected interests were awfully afraid the farmer would suffer. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], in the conclusion of his speech against Canadian reciprocity on February 14, 1911, said:

Mr. Chairman, I have shown that this measure is an unwise business measure. I have shown you years of disaster under a Canadian reciprocity agreement, and after its denunciation succeeding years of great prosperity down to this blessed day. I have shown you that this measure is unrepublican; that it violates the principles of the Republican Party; that it abandons protection and espouses free trade. It is a violation of the pledge of every Republican platform for the last 50 years of our history. [Applause.] I have shown you that this measure is obnoxious class legislation, that it sacrifices the farmer, the bone and sinew of the Republic, and destroys his interests. And now I fain would appeal to party loyalty, but I know it is of no use. The Republican protectionist, when this vote is taken, marches to his doom. He can not resist a united Democratic Party and such Republicans as hear from somewhere else an appeal louder than the appeal of party loyalty. United, together they will march to victory under Democratic leadership under the folds of the Democratic free-trade flag. I decline to follow. I shall stand where I have always stood, and go down with my party.

He followed this speech with a motion—

to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instruction to report the same back with the addition of the following articles to the reciprocal free list, to wit:

"Fresh meat and all meat products, flour, prepared cereal foods, bran, agricultural implements, cotton ties and bagging, binding twine, and lumber."

In his desire to be just to the farmer, in his desire that the bill should be fair, he offered this motion. Now, he knew that would endanger the passage of the bill.

The Democrats did not take the bait, but passed the bill, in good faith, through this House, passed it up to a Republican Senate, passed it as an administration measure, a step in the right direction, of a Republican complexion, which at the same time did promise some relief. Mr. Taft had gotten up that measure in answer to a nation-wide clamor for relief from the Payne-Aldrich bill. Mr. Taft had gotten it up to meet that popular clamor, and yet——

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. FOCHT. I would regret very much to have the remarks of the gentleman pass into the RECORD without some protest with respect, at least, to the statement that this is a Republican measure. It may be an administration measure, but, as the gentleman well knows, a majority of the Republican Members voted against it, and I say to-day that it does not reflect the Republican sentiment of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Well, I thought it was a Republican measure. The gentleman admits it is an administration measure and I understood it was a Republican administration, at least in name. If it is an administration measure of a Republican administration, it is a Republican measure; and the fact that many of those who are known as the stand-pat Republicans, who run the Republican machine in this House, opposed the bill simply means that reciprocity was a step in the interest of the people, as against the special interests which the stand-pat Republicans here in this House constantly defend, and that is the reason they fought it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will yield for a question, but I do not want the gentleman to make a speech in my time, as I am going to get through very soon.

Mr. FOCHT. Is it not a fact that the so-called insurgent element—the progressive element—stood solidly against reciprocity, or so-called reciprocity, and stand solidly against it in the Senate, and that the construction you would put upon this phase of the situation is not the correct one—that it was supported solely by the stand-pat Republicans?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Why, Mr. Chairman, I understand there is some division of opinion in reference to this matter. I understand the insurgents, so called, had been stirred up because it was claimed that the farmers in the West would not favor the bill unless they were protected; and yet, when the farmers' free-list bill was presented by a Democratic caucus, and by the Democrats of this House was passed, many of those gentlemen on the Republican side who had made such strenuous talk for the farmer talked against the bill which placed on the free list what the farmer has to buy. They said it would do the farmer no good; it was not just to anybody; it would deplete the revenues, and so forth; and yet we noticed that when it came to a vote on that bill the line of demarcation between the stand-pat Republicans and the brethren known as insurgents was much more marked.

The insurgents looked more with favor upon the bill. The reciprocity bill was forced on the administration by popular clamor for tariff reform. It was the best that could be done under the circumstances, the President thought, and was intended to allay popular clamor and thus avoid a general revision of the tariff. The champions of protectionism felt that the protection wall was in danger of serious injury and, perhaps,

total destruction by concessions contained in the reciprocity bill. They were fighting for protection, and not because the bill lacked merit.

Those who have devoted their lives to the service of the protected interests and know the sources of their predatory power oppose to a man any breach in the protection wall. The specially favored interests know that the beneficiaries of the system must stand together, or the graft of each will be lost by the downfall of the whole system. No revision of the tariff can be made by men of that mind. Hence, their desperate effort to arouse the distrust of the farmer and appeal to his selfishness and cupidity. If the agricultural interests can be combined with "predatory wealth," protectionism may get a new lease on life; otherwise the people will triumph and the fruits of labor will enrich the toiler. That fight was made in the name of labor, and in the name of the farmer, when, as a matter of fact, it was for the manufacturers and trust magnates, and them only.

It is claimed that this revision of the woolen schedule is not a Democratic bill. Some gentlemen of high standing on the other side of the aisle differ very much in their characterization of this measure. We are told by one, the floor leader on that side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that the protection in this bill is so high it is absolutely unconscionable as a revenue measure. And another gentleman, a former leader on the floor and former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who has just addressed the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], takes the position that the protection is so low that it will destroy the manufacturer in the woolen industry in this country if it should become a law. He sounds that alarm, hoping that the bill will not pass, and that his prophecy may stand as a terrorizing agent to those who are interested in the woolen industry. Why do those men of such high standing on that side of the House speak such opposite doctrine? Why is it that some of the best minds on that side, instead of saying that this bill is undemocratic, instead of saying that it is entirely lacking in any protective feature, instead of saying it is so high protection that it is unconscionable, admit that it is a great improvement on the present law, and they will have to vote for it on that account? If it is an improvement on the present law, then, why should we fight it and talk about deceiving people, talk about trying to deceive the public, and lying to the public? If the bill is an improvement it ought to be voted for by Democrats, Republicans, or any other Members of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not know that I am so specially concerned about whether this bill is a strictly Democratic measure or not. We have to do the best we can according to circumstances. The Democratic Party declared in favor of a gradual reduction of the tariff. What did it mean by that? Everybody understood it. A system had been built up under the high protection of the Republican tariff; conditions had arisen that we must deal with intelligently in the interest of the whole people; and it was not deemed best in revising the tariff to a revenue basis that we should do so in such a sudden manner as to cause any undue shock to the people or the business interests of the country, but that, with strong hands and clear minds, diligently considering the task, we endeavor to readjust the tariff so that the stilts should not break and inflated business suddenly topple and fall, but unnatural conditions should be corrected in a sensible, gradual way to a proper economic basis.

As to Schedule K, have not we reduced it, and considerably reduced it? And yet, I ask every candid man, no matter on which side of the House he may be, is it not a fact that an average of 40 per cent on woolen cloth is a tariff that the manufacturer has no right to complain about, even from the protection standpoint?

I am not here to say there is no protection in the bill. I could not candidly state that. The inequalities and defects have not all be removed. But from the standpoint of a tariff for revenue I would say that the bill is well framed for that result and at the same time with the view to a gradual reduction of the tariff to a proper revenue basis. If we desired to put the bill down to a Democratic basis at once, there would be somewhat of a shock, perhaps, to the woolen manufacturing industry. We, however, could have put raw wool on the free list and followed the Democratic doctrine for the last 50 years or longer, without any shock to the woolen industry, and have reduced the amount of the tariff on the finished product. By so doing under present conditions the amount of the revenue would be greatly decreased. The woolen industry, by having free wool, could afford to have the tariff reduced at least 10 per cent. In other words, if we put 25 per cent ad valorem on woolen cloth with free raw wool, the manufacturer would be in the same condition, practically, as with raw wool at 20 per cent and woolen cloth at 40 per cent, as in this bill. But anyone who is familiar with the statistics in reference to it will see, and will be bound to admit, that the amount of revenue would be greatly decreased. It is estimated that there will be about $13,000,000 derived from raw wool under this bill. That is less than raw wool brings in under the present law, but this tax is only 20 per cent ad valorem, while the present law of 11 cents a pound is from 40 to 60 per cent ad valorem. The manufacturer has claimed, and receives under the Payne bill, a "compensatory" duty of 44 cents a pound on account of the tariff on raw wool. Now, to remove the tariff from raw wool and to remove the compensatory duty would leave him where he would have all the protection that he claimed his industry was entitled to when the Payne-Aldrich law was written, to wit, from 50 to 55 per cent ad valorem.

We propose to strike out the specific duty of 44 cents per pound and to reduce the ad valorem duty 20 per cent. Gentlemen on that side find it bewildering their wits to decide whether to condemn the bill for the protection retained by it or to rave their bitter denunciation for its reduction of protection. The consumer evidently has reason to hope. This bill is denounced as being one of ad valorem duties. That fact is one of its chief virtues. The Payne-Aldrich bill in this very same wool schedule puts on ad valorem duties, specific duties, compensatory duties, every kind of combination duties you can name and mixes them up, so that no one can tell just what the tariffs paid by the people really are. Only experts can even estimate the amounts. It is a cunning device, combining the different kinds of duties, accentuating the evils of each, deceiving the people, robbing the consumer, cutting off revenue, and fostering monopoly.

We have only the one simple method—the ad valorem duties. Our plan is better for the woolgrower as well as the consumer. It works no injustice on anyone. It is easily understood and applied. As shown last night by the able argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], the sheep raiser can get more under a 20 per cent ad valorem duty than he had ever gotten under the specific duty of 11 cents a pound.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Do I understand that the gentleman says that a decrease of the duty by 60 per cent will increase the price of raw wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I think that while that may be a seeming paradox, it yet may really be the fact, and if the gentleman was not here last night and did not hear the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota, I would recommend that he get his speech when it appears in the RECORD and read it carefully and he will find it was very fully demonstrated.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then I will ask the gentleman if the duty on raw wool was reduced 60 per cent for the purpose of increasing its price?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It was reduced for the purpose of raising revenue in the amount named.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman says that the duty was formerly somewhere between 40 and 60 per cent, and that it is now reduced to 20 per cent.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is the average.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; the average. Now, I will ask the gentleman this: Whether he thinks by reducing the duty from 60 per cent to 20 per cent that will increase the price of raw wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], in a very carefully prepared and learned dissertation on this subject, showed it quite conclusively, and I think he would have convinced the gentleman from Ohio, if he had heard him, that under this law the wool producer, if he sees proper, can recover more profit under a 20 per cent ad valorem tariff than he has ever been able to get under a tariff of 11 cents a pound.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In other words, it will increase the price of raw wool? Will it? I would like to have the gentleman answer my question.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. He will get more for it. The wool producer will get more out of this bill than out of the Payne-Aldrich bill, but at the same time the price of the finished product to the people will be only 10 per cent higher, by reason of the tax on raw wool, whereas under the Payne-Aldrich bill it was 44 per cent higher.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, let me ask the gentleman this question: He states that if raw wool had been put on the free list you could have reduced the duty carried in this bill to the

manufacturer. Do I understand the gentleman to mean that if wool is placed on the free list it would have very much reduced the price?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Well, of course, all the wool that is imported into the country has to be paid for according to the rate fixed in the law, and all the imported wool would be taxed 20 per cent ad valorem under this bill. It is taxed now at 11 cents a pound.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I asked the gentleman a question that he can answer by "Yes" or "No." I asked him whether, in the event raw wool was placed on the free list, it would reduce its price?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It might do it temporarily, but I really believe the general result of it would be an increased price, by reason of the industry being on a better basis. In other words, I believe that all the tax on raw wool, so far as the protection standpoint is concerned, is a pure gratuity to the wool producer.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is it! And therefore he gets the higher price, does he not?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. All he gets is a pure gratuity.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why is it a gratuity?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I say all that he gets is a gratuity.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to know if the gentleman desires to go into the RECORD, as the ranking member of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. What I say will go into the RECORD, and I will stand by that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to know if the gentleman wants to go into the RECORD as saying that a reduction of the duty on raw wool will increase the price of raw wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I believe eventually it will, but temporarily it will not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to know.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is my candid answer.

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman will yield to me, I am interested also from the wool producer's standpoint. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that he indorses the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], which shows that the wool producer will have a more effective revenue protection—if I may use that term—under the new bill than he had under the old one?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I have just expressed myself along that line. I think he will be benefited by it.

Mr. SLOAN. Then, as a matter of fact, this bill raises the protection over what it has been heretofore to the wool producer?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not understand that every revenue item is protection, and I do not care to be led off into that sort of a discussion. Some gentlemen believe there is "protection" wherever you levy any tariff. I am not going into such abstruse questions as that. As a matter of fact, whatever protection this bill has in it is simply a necessary remnant of the protection in the present tariff law.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Is it not true that this bill, by wiping out the discrimination that now exists between the duties on first and second class wool, will to that extent redound to the benefit of the home wool producer?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Very much so. We do not produce the finest wool. Under the ad valorem duty the wool in this country will have a much better showing in the market than it would on the basis of so much a pound of specific duty. That has been argued, and I think it is correct; but I do not propose to take up the time to go through the same argument again, or to elaborate on that question.

This discussion is getting clear away from the range of my intended remarks. I do not desire to take all my time on these lines.

Mr. SLOAN. Has any wool producer in the United States asked for a change in the tariff on raw wool from what it is now to the basis in the proposed bill?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I understand a number of wool producers in the Middle West have written letters to their Members of Congress here, stating that they wanted free wool, but, to be candid with the gentleman, I do not know of any large producers who have asked it. I did not expect that they would. The miserable arrangement that was made by the Republican Party, of which it ought to be ashamed, the nefarious combination that was made between the woolgrower and the wool manufacturer, in connection with the Republican machine, to rob the public, has so blinded the sheepmen and enriched the manufacturers they still clamor for the schedule to stand untouched. They say leave Schedule K alone. There is no reason on earth why a man who owns a sheep should tax the balance of the people, and the poor people at that, in order to make his wool sell for a little more; he has no right to do it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman, as I understand, is arguing in favor of increasing that price?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Oh, the gentleman from Ohio does not understand my argument.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman said that this was an iniquitous duty to enable the sheep owner to tax the public, and now he comes in and says that this bill will increase the price of raw wool.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The gentleman from Ohio seems to have his mind at a different angle from mine. I say that the arrangement existed, and exists, and I also add that the wool producer, while he may imagine he is getting something—and some of them seem to think they are benefited by it—as a matter of fact he is robbed by the woolen manufacturer.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the gentleman just said he was robbing the public.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. They together are robbing the public, and the manufacturer is putting the money in his pocket.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman think the present price of raw wool too high?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not know whether it is too high or too low; that question has nothing to do with the argument I am making.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has everything to do with the argument the gentleman is making, unless the gentleman is frank enough to say that the purpose of the bill is to increase the price of wool.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The purpose of the bill is to raise revenue for the Treasury of the United States. I believe the effect of the bill will be good for the men that raise sheep. I have said that several times, and I think the gentleman from Ohio ought to understand it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to know what the gentleman's views are on the tariff—as to the effect of the tariff on the price. Now, I will take a parallel case. The present duty on iron ore——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would rather the gentleman would put his inquiry without putting a parallel case.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to know whether the gentleman considers the duty on iron ore affects the price to the consumer?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It may or it may not. I would rather talk about wool. I do not desire to go into the iron schedule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman does not care to be interrupted——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Oh, the gentleman may ask me any question about the wool matter. The gentleman's question is, Will the price of wool be raised—that is, will the tariff affect the price of wool? I suppose it does affect the price some; but, in my opinion, under the best light that I can get from those who know the most about it, the woolgrower gets about 2 cents a pound more than he would get if there were no tariff on it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman just said that the effect of this bill, which decreases the duty 60 per cent, will increase the price over the iniquitous price they are now getting.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I believe eventually the wool producer will profit by free wool. His idea to-day is that he can not raise sheep unless protected by law. Men do not desire to go into a business of that kind ordinarily; they do not know when the law might be changed and the business would fail. The president pro tempore of the Senate of Texas, who claims to be a Democrat, and who is candid enough to admit that he is a protectionist, is a woolgrower, and one of the largest in the State, and has been in the business over 20 years, attending to it himself. While here, during this session, he said that wool could be raised as cheaply in Texas, or cheaper, than anywhere else in the world if it was not for the scab and the wolves.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Now, let me ask the gentleman this question, in order to bring out clearly what his views are. I will ask the gentleman if the object of himself and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in bringing in this bill reducing the duty on wool is for the purpose of increasing the price of wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. No; it is not for that purpose. It is for revenue.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am speaking of the reduction.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have answered the question several times. How many times does the gentleman want it answered? I have answered the question several times, that that was not our purpose. Is that an answer or not?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; it is not.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then does the gentleman want me to say that such is our purpose? I will not make that answer.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas allow the gentleman from Ohio to ask the question and answer it also.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask the gentleman from New Jersey whether he thinks this bill will increase the price of raw wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I want to treat my colleague fairly, but——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, if the gentleman does not desire to be interrupted I shall not do it.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I want to treat the gentleman with every courtesy, but I submit he is asking a question of whether this tariff was fixed on wool for the purpose of raising the price. I say "no." I think that is an answer to the question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The reduction of the duty has reduced the revenue, has it not?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It will reduce it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It has, according to the gentleman's statement, reduced it about ten million.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. No; about eight; it would do it if this bill becomes a law—that is, reduce the revenue on raw wool.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman why, if this bill is in the interest of the consumer, you reduce the revenue, unless it is to depreciate the price of wool?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Wool being free, American wool would not sell for as much in the home market, perhaps, under normal conditions, as it would under tariff duty. The situation, however, is such, and the conditions have been and are such, that the producer does not get more than about 2 cents a pound on his raw wool by reason of the tariff and it does not pay nearly so much as the gentleman thinks it does.

The statement of this gentleman from Texas who, I believe, is the president of the Woolgrowers' Association in that State, is that they could raise wool in Texas at as small a cost as anywhere else in the world, except for the wolves and the scab. He further informed us that the State of Texas had already appropriated money to kill out the wolves, which will be exterminated in a very few years; not to exceed five years. He also said that the scab could be eradicated by dipping; that the trouble had been that men would neglect to dip; that he had succeeded in getting a law passed that required dipping for scab, and if the sheep owner did not do it, it would be done at his expense by the State. Not only that, but, he said, by dipping the sheep, and by having wire fences to protect them from the wolves, the wool could be produced as cheaply there now as anywhere else in the world, and he said he was for protection for the next five years. That was his statement.

The committee decided that for revenue it was necessary to put 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool. Other bills that we had passed would reduce the tariff receipts. The Treasury had been depleted, and was being depleted, under Republican extravagance. This bill was framed, and when we are taunted with having rejected the old Democratic policy of free raw wool it seems to me that the gentlemen who inveigh against misrepresentation should stop and consider. Take this bill and the resolution passed by the caucus together. What do they mean? They mean that the Democratic Party, which has stood for free raw wool for more than 50 years and never did as a policy stand for a tax on raw wool, presented this bill as an emergency measure, for the purpose of revenue and not as a rejection of Democratic principles nor a change of the established policy of the party.

In order that the country might fully understand the position of the party as to taxing raw wool, the Democratic caucus of this House, on June 1, at the time this bill was approved, passed, by a practically unanimous vote, this resolution:

Resolved, That the bill revising Schedule K, as presented to this caucus by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, is not to be construed as an abandonment of any Democratic policy; but in view of the Democratic platform demand for a gradual reduction of the tariff and of the depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury—a result of Republican extravagance—a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool is now proposed as a revenue necessity.

Now, my friends, is it a Democratic doctrine? The wiles of the sophist and the craftiness of deceit could not obscure the clearness of that declaration.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CULLOP. It was in keeping with that plank of the national platform of 1908 which provided that in the reduction of the tariff it should be made gradually until it reached a revenue basis solely.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly; the resolution stated that. Every Democratic platform since 1856 declared for free wool. In my individual opinion, a gradual reduction on raw wool is not necessary. Were it not for revenue necessities, wool could and would go upon the free list. The tax on manufactures, however, should be gradually reduced. Woolen mills have been builded on an artificial basis by reason of tariff protection; woolgrowing has not. Free wool would permit a greater reduction and a quicker riddance from discriminating rates on woolen manufactures. It would be cheaper to the consumer and better for the business.

Mr. GARNER. Will my colleague yield for a question right there?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Why would not my colleague be willing to allow the same duty on raw wool that he does on the finished article—the same rate of duty?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I might and I might not. It depends on circumstances. I am not one of those who believe that raw material must be taxed because the finished product is taxed, nor am I one who subscribes to the doctrine that as a matter of principle we should have free raw material——

Mr. GARNER. What is the objection, then, to levying the same rate——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will state my position.

Mr. GARNER. To levying the same rate on the raw material that you levy on the manufactured article?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That depends upon the situation entirely.

Mr. GARNER. Let us take it in reference to wool. What is the objection to levying the same rate on raw wool that you levy on the manufactured article?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. One reason is that in the wisdom of the caucus they did not decide to do it.

I think free wool would have been better, but the wisdom of the caucus, the wisdom of the party, dictated that, instead, there should be levied a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem. While I admit it is reasonable, from the standpoint of getting revenue, to put it at 20 per cent, and cloth at 40 per cent, yet I do not believe it was a necessity. The caucus thought so; I agreed to it.

Mr. GARNER. Now, Mr. Chairman, just one other question. Would my colleague be willing, then, to levy a 25 per cent duty on raw wool and 25 per cent duty on the manufactured article, which would raise the same amount of duty raised under the present rate in this bill?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would rather reduce the tariff on the manufactured article, giving free raw wool, because I know that when we place the lowest revenue rate on the finished article it will cost the consumer much less than a tax on both, and so I prefer to put the tax in this schedule on the manufactured product.

Mr. GARNER. Twenty-five per cent ad valorem would be the height that the manufacturer of this country could sell his article under a revenue duty. If we levy 25 per cent on the raw material and 25 per cent on the manufactured article would it cost the consumer one dime more?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It would not cost the consumer any more if the price of the manufactured article remained the same, but it would cost the consumer less if, instead of taxing raw wool, you lowered the tariff on manufactures to 20 per cent. If the manufacturer can stand 25 per cent tax on raw wool, we can, with free wool, greatly reduce both the tariff rate and the cost to the consumer. Thus imports would increase, holding prices to a reasonable figure, bringing in revenue, and opening the markets of the world to our people. If you put the tax on raw wool at 20 per cent, or any other rate, you would necessarily have to raise the tax on manufactures. I do not desire to go into that further.

Mr. GARNER. I want to understand it. The gentleman says it is necessary. Why is it necessary?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Everyone admits that, and if you calculate you will find it necessary. I believe that taxed raw wool is bad for the manufacturer—I mean the legitimate manufacturer who is not trying to rob anybody—and it is bad for the woolgrower. I believe with free raw wool and a low revenue tariff on woolen goods if our manufacturers, instead of giving us shoddy goods, instead of giving us poor quality, instead of manufacturing under high protection and combining for the purpose of exploiting the American market, would endeavor to compete in the great markets of the world as well as at home, they would be the greatest woolen manufacturers in all the world.

Under natural conditions every farm would have some sheep for mutton and for wool and as scavengers. It is estimated a sheep is worth about $2 per annum for increasing the fertility

of the farm. All of these items would count, and if our woolen manufacturers would take the proper position in the markets of the world it would be better for this country and better for the wool producers, although I do not believe sheep would be produced for wool alone.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact, now, if our American manufacturer for foreign consumption is permitted to use foreign raw material free of duty?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Nearly so.

Mr. GARNER. Ninety-nine per cent.

Mr. SIMS. Now, why is it that we think so much more of the foreigner than we do of our home people, and why do we not give the American manufacturer free raw material when he manufactures for home demands?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I think that is simply a situation which——

Mr. SIMS. Therefore the manufacturer does not pay the tax on goods now manufactured for foreigners?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. He pays the tariff, manufactures the wool for exportation, and then collects back 99 per cent of the tax. This is called his drawback. Of course, he would be out some time and trouble and interest, and so forth. That would amount to very little; but even that little considerably impedes him in getting into the foreign markets. The condition is this: The manufacturer is willing to combine with the wool producer—who ought to be ashamed of himself to be in such unholy combination—and the American consumer is compelled to pay exorbitant prices or do without woolen goods. Our manufacturers export very little and buy American-grown wool at their own price. We consume in round numbers about $420,000,000 worth of woolen goods in this country, $20,000,000 of which are imported. Five per cent are imported; and the woolen manufacturer is content to rob the people of his own country rather than compete here and in the markets of the world for his fair, just, and honest position among business men.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. I was going to say, apropos of the question asked by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], that I presume the gentleman from Texas knew that we did not export more than one-half of 1 per cent of the output of woolen and worsted manufactures in this country. It is so little it is absolutely negligible, and so I do not see any point in discussing that question.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I thought I had practically said that. They do not try to get into the markets of the world. They are content to stay here in this country and rob these people. Take a suit of clothes that is worth $8, say, in England, and we put a tariff of 50 per cent ad valorem on it.

The home man does not charge the $12 if the English merchant or manufacturer proposes to contest the market, but he can sell that at $10 and run the English manufacturer out, because the English manufacturer must pay the 50 per cent. He can sell at $8 in an open market. He must pay $4 to come into the market, making the suits cost $12. Hence he must sell the suit at $12, and then he is cutting just as close in competition as he was before in selling it at $8. He is soon run out of the market, and then the American manufacturer will charge the $12, and perhaps $13, or $14, or $15 in some places, but ordinarily, perhaps, he would not go over the amount of the tariff.

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

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Let me finish this illustration, and then I will. But he charges the $12. Now, suppose he had half the market before there was any tariff. If the English merchant kept the same trade he would pay $4 on the same suit, and that would go into the Treasury; so that if he maintained his trade, the American people would get into the Treasury 50 per cent ad valorem on half of the such woolen suits—those imported—and would be paying 50 per cent ad valorem also on those manufactured here, which would go into the pockets of the American manufacturers. But it does not work that way.

The foreigner is driven out of the market, and we pay $12 for the suit of clothes. But that is not all. Not a dollar of it goes into the Treasury. But that is not the worst of it. Having no competition from abroad, they simply combine. You say, "Oh, maybe they may not." But they have combined; and there has been no power yet found that can keep them from it. Certainly no Republican administration has ever kept them from it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, then, what is the result? They decrease the quality of the goods, and soon instead of two suits at $8 apiece, costing $16, the same man would have to buy three suits at $12 apiece, which would cost him $36. And yet the two good suits would last as long as the three inferior ones, and would look very much better; because a good suit looks very well as long as it lasts, whereas a poor suit does not even look well when it is new.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to give an illustration showing that where the tariff was 50 per cent it would keep out the Englishman from our market on clothing. Now, what is the rate of tariff in this bill on clothing?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Forty-five per cent.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman draw a very broad distinction between the 50 per cent of his illustration and the 45 per cent under this bill?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I did not say the Payne-Aldrich bill had a duty of 50 per cent. I only gave that figure for easy calculation.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's illustration was based on a tariff of 50 per cent?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That was as an illustration.

Mr. MANN. Yes. I say the gentleman's illustration was based on 50 per cent?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, by illustration, attempted to demonstrate—very likely correctly—that that would keep out the foreigner from our market.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I think it would, very largely.

Mr. MANN. Would the 45 per cent?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. With taxed wool it will be very much less objectionable. It will not keep it out nearly as much as the 93 per cent under the Payne-Aldrich bill. The gentleman must remember, Mr. Chairman, there are a great many things in this schedule—wool and cloth and suits of clothes, and various articles—that are manufactured abroad that have practically no competition here, because the manufacturers here do not produce a similar article, and, therefore, we get some importations into the country.

That is the way we get about 5 per cent of the woolen goods that are consumed here. But if the manufacturers of this country produced every class and kind of goods that the foreigner tries to bring in they could keep him out entirely. They do not try to keep him out on everything. They let him make some fancy or special goods and bring them in, thereby raising some revenue. The duty is so high that an importation of $20,000,000 worth of those goods brings in about $20,000,000 of revenue; or, to be more accurate, $23,000,000 of imports brought in last year $20,000,000 of revenue. The foreigner can not compete. Imported goods are of kinds not manufactured here, or such as the taste of the buyer prefers to the home manufacture. It is only in that way that we get any revenue out of it at all, and if, as I said, there were no woolen products imported except those that the American manufacturer commonly produces, he could, if he desired, keep every dollar's worth from coming into this country.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. WEEKS. I understood the gentleman to say that when these manufacturers get together, in some mysterious way they depreciate the value of their product.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I did not say that. I said that, competition being cut off, they have the market and fix the price on the consumer; that they can levy on him all that the consumer will pay for the goods, and when they have no competition they can reduce the quality.

Mr. WEEKS. Has that been the case?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I think there has been a great deal of complaint about it.

Mr. WEEKS. Does not the gentleman know that we use nearly 50 per cent more wool per capita in our clothing than any nation in the world?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I am not aware of that fact.

Mr. WEEKS. That is a fact; and the amount of cotton used in our clothing has diminished 50 per cent in the last 10 years.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the gentleman will hear me, I did not say that we do not have woolen manufactures that are fit to wear, but I do say that the quality in our woolen manufactures is not what it would be if there was competition which made it necessary.

Mr. WEEKS. You will admit that there is free competition in Great Britain.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes; and they make better goods there than our manufacturers make, too.

Mr. WEEKS. But we use nearly 50 per cent more wool per capita in our clothing in this country than they do in Great Britain, and we do not use half as much cotton in our clothing as we did 10 years ago.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not desire to prolong this unduly. Does the gentleman mean that we use more wool per capita——

Mr. WEEKS. In other words, the American people consume more woolen clothing.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly; and it is a rich market that the woolen manufacturer has been exploiting for nearly 50 years, and it is a shame on our civilization. It is a shame on the honor of this Government. It is a blot on the Republican Party; and if the party was not already so black, it would show up all over the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEEKS. I do not wish to take the gentleman's time; but I understood the impression was given that when these woolen manufacturers got together they depreciated the value of their product.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I did not say that.

Mr. WEEKS. I wanted to indicate to the gentleman that the value of the product is constantly increasing in this country, and has been for 20 years.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The ouput is greater.

Mr. WEEKS. I am talking about the per capita.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I am talking about the quality of the goods.

Mr. WEEKS. I am, too.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the people in one country use only one suit per capita of woolen goods every year, and the people in this country use three suits, they consume more per capita; but if those three suits are of inferior quality and not as well made as they would be under competition, as a matter of fact, our people are imposed upon, on account of the lack of quality in the goods. I am not going to take the time to discuss it with the gentleman, but I state that it is a matter of general notoriety, it is a matter that is stated by many men engaged in the business, that in this country the woolen manufacturer does not make a proper quality of goods, that the quality is inferior because of monopoly and, consequently, the lack of competition.

Mr. WEEKS. Let me add one comment.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then let us drop the subject.

Mr. WEEKS. If the gentleman will take the census report which was issued the 4th of last April he will find just the contrary to what he states.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. What report is that?

Mr. WEEKS. The census report.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Who furnished it?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know who furnished it. It was the preliminary report of the recent census on wool manufactures.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the gentleman will investigate he will find that the administration, the census, and all of them take the report that the woolen manufacturers furnish them in reference to this schedule. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is where the trouble comes when trying to get information, trying to find out how these things are. The majority members of the Ways and Means Committee were confronted with the same trouble; the information we got from the Government, that ought to be correct, simply comes from the interested woolen manufacturers.

Mr. WEEKS. Well, if the gentleman wants to fall back and leave it that way, I am willing.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. WEEKS. Absolutely, as far as I know.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Has the gentleman any knowledge on the subject?

Mr. WEEKS. I have no knowledge; but I assume that the Government employees do their duty.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Then, I hope the gentleman will not take up my time in talking about something about which he has no information. I say that is my understanding, that these figures and reports are furnished by the woolen manufacturers, and they are taken by the department, and that has been the case for some years. I do not care to discuss that any further. If the gentleman does not believe it, he may remain a doubting Thomas all his life, but if he will investigate he will find that it is true. The statistics published by the department are made up by the Woolen Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman from Texas will pardon me, if the gentleman making the cloth only makes 10 cents now with the tariff at the present rate, he will go out of business if this bill passes.

Mr. AMES. That is so. The only way to reduce the price of cloth and cheapen wool is to cut down labor.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is what they always do. Mr. Chairman, that is the way the manufacturer that wants to be upheld by the Government, that does not understand that men engaged in the manufacturing business ought to be men for all that, that they ought to stand and uphold their business by their own energy and industry, the manufacturers that propose to be hothoused by law always, as soon as circumstances begin to pinch a little financially, want to strike at the laborer every time instead of going to their accounts, inspecting their business methods, and seeing where the leak is.

Mr. AMES. On the contrary, we do not want to reduce the wages of the working people, and that is why we are opposed to this bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have never yet been able to find anyone that would say where the laborer ever got an increase by reason of a tax being placed on a commodity. If we were to let the woolen schedule stand like it is, how much protection would the laborer get? Why, the protection, as they call it, amounts to more than the cost of production in England. That is the fact about it.

Mr. AMES. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes.

Mr. AMES. I would like to inform the gentleman that without any pressure from the outside in the mills at home they have increased the wages 37½ per cent in the last 17 years.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not know how low they were to start with, but I hope justice may be done. But it does seem to me that when they talk about protection for the purpose of helping labor they ought to show the country how much of the protection labor gets. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The whole cost of production in England is not equal to the amount of protection you have in many of the items in this particular schedule.

Mr. Chairman, what excuse is there that the poor man should have to give for a blanket not only the value of the blanket but 180 per cent additional? Where is the justification? The tariff on blankets brings in no revenue because it is prohibitive. There are practically no importations. And yet the poor people, the old shivering people, the young, tender, and delicate infants, all must be a prey to the rapacity of the man who contends that Schedule K in the Payne bill ought to remain the law and that this bill ought not to pass in the interest of the country.

Mr. Chairman, frequent interruptions have drawn me far away from the intended course of my remarks. In this connection, however, I will here present opinions from high authority as to the effects on public health by reason of the cruelly exorbitant prices charged for woolen goods under Republican tariffs.

Dr. W. Shropshire, a physician and surgeon of Yoakum, Tex., situated in the wool-growing section, where he has practiced for 20 years, answering my inquiry, wrote, under date of June 15th instant:

> Without doubt the high prices of woolens has very materially curtailed the use of flannels and woolen goods, especially by the poor, and, in so doing, very materially affected the health of that class detrimentally. I can not say just how much, but that, with poor food, makes the death rate of the young of that class double that of the young of the middle class.
>
> The class which suffers most for want of woolen goods is, of course, the poor, and it is the very young babies, from birth to 4 or 5 years of age, that suffer greatest, because of the fact that nature has not had time to immune them to the extreme cold or sudden changes that take place as they go from near-fire to out-door atmosphere. Any amount of cotton or linen clothes can not serve their purpose, because those materials are conductors of heat while wool is a nonconductor.
>
> The difference of health and mortality that would come of cheap woolen goods would be very material.

I will read you a letter from Dr. Fly, of the firm of Fly, Lumpkin & Thomas, physicians and surgeons, of Amarillo, Tex., of date June 10, 1911. He says:

> I am a graduate of the Kentucky School of Medicine, Louisville, Ky., and have practiced medicine for 17 years—5 in Fort Worth and 12 in Amarillo.
>
> I am of the opinion that the higher price of woolen and flannel goods has curtailed the use of same, and, no doubt, the health and lives of many people have been affected to a greater or lesser degree because of their inability to afford these materials.
>
> The class of people mostly affected are the poor, in the very young and very old, for it is a fact that this class of individuals are more susceptible to atmospheric changes, and it is my opinion that if woolen and flannel goods could be materially reduced in price many more people would be able to use them as wearing apparel, and the class of people most benefited would be the debilitated, or, in other words, those suffering from any form of chronic diseases, by which their resisting forces and vitality are lowered.
>
> Yours, for suffering humanity, D. R. FLY.

These men stand high in their profession and are prominent in the State.

Is it not an appalling statement that among the young of the poor class the death rate should be double that of the young of the middle class? These letters show that sickness and death are the natural results of the wickedness engrafted into our revenue system by the Payne bill. No wonder that side is ashamed of it. What wonder you try to maintain it. Are your eyes closed to the pallor of dying infancy, and are your ears deaf to the groans of dispairing grief? The decreased use of woolens for the young, taken in connection with poor food, produces an increase of 100 per cent in the death rate over that of the middle class. That is appalling.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Under our present condition, is it not most probably the fact that while our total per capita consumption of wool may be no less than it was years ago, yet that that per capita consumption is largely by the wealthy, and that the poor are getting less and less of the woolen goods?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. There is no doubt of that. It goes to the wealthy and the middle classes, to those who are able to buy the comforts of life, no matter what they may cost. There are a great many people in this country able to buy the comforts of life, and they will buy them so as to make themselves and their family comfortable, even though the price may be outrageously high, even though they have to stint in other matters. But when it comes to the poor, it strikes hard, and it strikes on the death rate—doubles it—that and poor food. But they do not all die. The death rate is doubled; but of those who escape death how many thousands and tens of thousands are doomed to the life of the invalid; how many to rheumatism, consumption, and other chronic and fatal diseases, which are fruitful sources of degeneration, misery, and death? Think of it, every poor child in the land is subjected to the condition that has the effect of doubling the death rate!

Whether the child lives or dies, it is subject to that condition which is constant all over this country. It is not only in Texas, it is not merely in the South, but more intensified in the mountainous country of the West, throughout the great North; and all of your workmen and farmers, the people that you talk about so constantly and profess to love so much, are subjected to this outrage, and yet, with Schedule K staring you in the face, with testimony like this, to be obtained anywhere in the country, you are willing to have that condition stand and to let the death rate go on. Talk to me about "the shame and the glory!" You have the shame and there is no glory to it. You have the money. You have profited enough. It does look as though the manufacturer of woolens to-day ought to stay his hand, that he should listen to the cry of the poor and be willing to bring this schedule down to a basis where the poor man can at least buy at a fair and just rate those things that are necessary to the life and comfort of his family.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, sympathizing as I do with the desire to save the children, does the gentleman think it fair to impose a duty of 45 per cent on cloth for children's clothing and only 40 per cent on cloth for men's clothing?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is he in favor of this bill that imposes an average of 40 per cent on woolens as against the Payne-Aldrich bill, which imposes more than twice that rate?

Mr. MANN. I would be in favor of a protected measure, but as a revenue measure I would not be in favor of putting a higher tariff on children's clothing than on men's clothing.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Is the gentleman in favor of this bill, or against the other?

Mr. MANN. I am not in favor of this bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Very well; the gentleman is not in favor of this bill, hence he is not in favor of a reduction at all. The Payne-Aldrich bill has 55 per cent ad valorem and 43 per cent added, making 98 per cent, as against 45 per cent in this bill.

Mr. MANN. The question is whether we are doing right in this bill. Admitting that we were not doing right in the Payne-Aldrich bill, are we doing right in this bill? If you want to preserve the lives of the children, does the gentleman think we ought to put a higher tariff on children's clothing than on men's clothing?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman admits the Payne-Aldrich bill to be wrong, he should get right and vote for this bill to correct the evil of the present law. Forty-five per cent with 20 per cent on raw wool is a much better bill than 98 per cent on the finished product and practically 44 per cent on the raw wool.

Mr. GARNER. Will my colleague permit right there? Is not it less onerous on the children who have to pay 45 per cent duty than it is on the children under the present law, where they have to pay 103 per cent duty?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Why, certainly; that is what I stated; the average is about 98 per cent. As a matter of fact, the consumer, the parent, has to pay for it, whether the clothing is for his family or for himself. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. We are making up or have made up, either one you take it, a bill now. Does the gentleman himself, outside the Democratic caucus action, believe that it is wise to put a higher tax on cloth for children's clothes than it is on cloth for men's clothes?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is unnecessary for me to express myself on the proposition, but to be candid with the gentleman, and as he has expressed a curiosity to know, I will say that personally I should prefer not, but I do not think it lies in the mouth of any Republican who stands for the Payne-Aldrich bill, or Schedule K in it, and who is not going to vote for this bill, to criticize that item. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the tax on cloth, ready-made articles, wearing apparel, is 45 per cent ad valorem. That includes men's clothes, so there is no discrepancy which the gentleman attempts to make appear.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion? I just want to suggest that the distinction made by the gentleman from Illinois seems to me to be utterly without point, from the fact that the father of the family generally buys both the clothes for the women and for the children, and I do not see why it would make any difference to him whether he pays 40 per cent on one and 45 on the other or 45 on one and 40 per cent on the other. He buys the goods.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is an apt suggestion. In this bill 40 per cent is taken as an average. That is the rate on woolen cloth. Clothing is rated 45 per cent. I do not understand how the gentleman can criticize this bill for being too high when he will not vote for it because it is too low. It is a tweedledum and tweedledee that I can not understand. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, I will endeavor to enlighten the gentleman further as to why I am for the bill. I believe it is only a question of a short time when the people will intrust the Democratic Party with full power in the Government.

If the party is fortunate enough to be wholly Democratic, having no protectionists nor trust-employed Representatives in its ranks, thus free to carry out the people's will without the subtile influence of those who would frustrate its purpose, the Democratic Party will be able to make a tariff bill and raise the revenue necessary to come from this source, and it will not be necessary to tax raw wool. It may not be necessary to tax woolen goods. This idea that the industries of this country must live by taking from the masses of the people by law what they do not get by contract—to force, in other words, the consumers of this country to pay tribute to the business men—is a fetich that can not last among intelligent men in a free country. The feeling aroused by such a system inspires disgust and impels honest men to seek for a better and a more just administration. Honesty is one of the prime virtues. Equal rights to all men is the foundation principle of the Republic. Special privileges to none is the corollary of that proposition. It can not be misunderstood. When you say "equal rights to all and special privileges to none" you are at variance with the very method and purpose and object of the Payne tariff law and the purpose of those who framed it.

Protectionism has been built up by the Republican Party as a sectional as well as a class issue. Protectionism is wrong in itself. It is ruinous as a class measure, and as a sectional issue it has absolutely failed. Its discrimination has purposely favored the North and East as against the South and West. The average man North and East is in no better condition than the ordinary man in the Southern and Western States; and yet we in the South and West have benefited nothing from protection.

Not only that, those who have to live by their labor in protected industries are not so well off as the laboring man is who is engaged in a business where there is no protection. Not only that, but in the protected communities you will find a deplorable condition among the poor who depend on wages, a condition more deplorable than can be found in the South and West, where protection is practically unknown. It is a mistake. It

is a failure. It is a curse even to the protected barons themselves. They have degenerated morally and physically, and their families are inferior to those in moderate circumstances. Their ill-gotten money has not done them half the good that would have resulted to them had their intelligence and energy been employed in honest and straightforward business. Cupidity is degenerating—honest methods build up character as well as fortune. You say, "We want to keep our money at home." The beneficiaries of this very system, it is estimated, send abroad every year $300,000,000 to purchase titles and pleasures. Three hundred million dollars per annum amounts to $3,000,000,000 in 10 years. This would build 600,000 miles of graded macadamized road, at a cost of $5,000 per mile, an average of more than 12,000 miles for each State and Territory, giving employment to labor and keeping the money at home. The extravagance of the protective system is appalling. It is enervating as well. Men do not use the same industry, they do not use the same amount of intelligence to hold up the business. They understand it is secured by law and combination. Without a combination, why, of course it would be more trouble. They understand that, and they say, "How foolish it is for us to fight one another. Why not join together and uphold one another?" Thus protectionism and monopoly create and uphold a predatory class which control and sap the industries of the country and absorb its natural resources. Such conditions produce socialism. But the brazen impudence of this ilk is astounding. They propose to legalize these monopolistic combinations that even in the olden time would have been classed as crimes, and that in the present day are crimes under the statute laws of this country. Yet so powerful have these barons become that they smile at the law and defy the administration. They acquire all possible influence with the party in power. They find always some means of ingratiating themselves into every party. They care nothing for any particular party, it is for power that they look.

And they desire, by all means, to get as many into their employment, as many under obligation to them, as possible. By fair means and foul, by hook and by crook, by employing here and there, giving favors and fees, they secure a powerful support.

Men in public life, who never made a dollar above their expenses until they got to Congress, have grown rich. Not only one or two, but numbers of them are in the employment of these interests and roll in wealth.

And the Republican Party has for years—pardon this digression—lined up solidly against my antigraft bill that I have been trying to pass for a long while, the Democrats voting for it and the Republicans against it. The gist of the bill is this: That Senators and Representatives shall not during their term of service receive gifts, employment, fees, and compensation from public-service corporations and others directly interested in legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You stand against that reform. It is only an antibribery law up to date.

Mr. WEEKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Is that a part of the program that has been adopted by the Democratic caucus?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. It has not been presented to the House, but will be when we take up general legislation. I have introduced the bill, and I hope the gentleman may have had a change of heart, and that he will support it.

Mr. WEEKS. I have never had a chance to vote on it.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The gentleman may not have been in the House, but his party has lined up on it, notably in January, 1908, the Democrats on the one side and the Republicans on the other.

Now that bill is simply an antibribery bill. What is the use in having an antibribery law prohibiting direct bribery if they are permitted to give favors, franks, and other things of value, and, without violating law, can employ Members of Congress, paying them many times more than their salaries? Some of them get rich—acquire thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions—and nobody knows where they get it. If by accident it is found out upon some investigation it is brushed aside with the statement that no law has been violated.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is any worse for a Member of Congress to accept gifts or bribes, if you please, after the election than before the election, while he is a candidate?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not propose to discriminate between such rascality at any time. He is just a scoundrel of the deepest dye if he accepts a bribe at any time, either before election or after. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Has the gentleman any doubt about that matter?

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side if they will again, when opportunity offers, line up solidly against the amendment they once voted for and adopted here, to make public campaign contributions in primary elections?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not know what the gentleman is driving at. I am talking about a material matter.

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentleman will wait until I finish he will understand.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman. I do not think he can base his proofs on——

Mr. JACKSON. Did not the gentlemen on that side of the House line up against an amendment offered on this side of the House that would make public contributions in primary elections for Members of Congress?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri to answer that.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman has referred to the amendment proposed by himself to the publicity bill, I suppose?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that that amendment had any merit in it at all?

Mr. JACKSON. I certainly do, and I did when it was offered. Otherwise I would not have introduced it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that under his amendment any man seeking to be a candidate for Congress could have made his affidavit under the requirements as proposed in his amendment before one single dollar had been expended?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not desire to undertake at this moment to discuss the whole question with the gentleman from Missouri, but——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Oh, I do not care about that discussion going into my remarks. I am talking here, Mr. Chairman, about another question. If the gentleman from Kansas is opposed to my bill, he can remain so. That would be consistent with the action of his side of the House. If the gentleman is for my bill, I shall be very glad to have him help me put it through when it comes up.

Mr. JACKSON. And I will say to the gentleman that I shall be glad to have the gentleman help me put through my amendment providing for publicity of contributions made in primary elections, where, as everyone knows, the actual contest arises in the choice of Democratic Representatives from the South. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the gentleman will allow me, I will agree that I will be in favor of any bill that has any proper purpose in the way of reasonable regulations. But I know very well that the amendment which the gentleman offered is one that I would not support, because I believe it is one that is fundamentally wrong. I hate to take up all this time outside of the main subject of my argument, but one of my objections to it is that it would give the Federal Government an opportunity to interfere with the local primary elections in my State, and I do not propose to do that if I can help it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. JACKSON. Do I understand the gentlemen on that side of the House to——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not propose to take up my time in the discussion of the amendment offered by the gentleman. I am against it, and I have told the gentleman why. I do not want the gentleman to take up my time. I am not at all out of humor, but I simply mean what I say. I would rather go on. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, returning to my antigraft bill, there is no use in saying that we have a law against bribery, since, when a party is found out, he can say, "This was a gift, this was a fee, this was employment and compensation." So my bill is an antibribery bill up to date, and I tell you now that you will never get the influence of the trust magnates removed from this Congress until you make it a felony for them to attempt to employ one of the servants of the people. That is the only way to do it; and, furthermore, to make it a penal offense for any servant of the people to receive such employment or gift after he comes here with a commission from the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SLOAN. I am a new Member. Has that occurred frequently in the House or in another body? I thought they were all honorable men.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Does the gentleman mean to inquire whether my bill has been up frequently?

Mr. SLOAN. No; the gentleman referred to a number of men, or a great many men, who came here——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Oh, I understand the gentleman's question. He wants to know whether such gifts and employment are frequent.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not know of my own knowledge just how frequent they are, but I have it from Republican authority——

Mr. SLOAN. Which usually is the best on earth.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That that side of the House was honeycombed with that sort of employment.

Mr. SLOAN. Any of it from Texas?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. There is no one on that side from Texas. All the Members of the Texas delegation are on this side of the aisle. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SIMS. Let me make a statement for the gentleman's encouragement. I introduced a bill and sent it to the Committee on the District of Columbia to make it unlawful for a Member of the House or Senate to own stock in any public-service corporation doing business in the District of Columbia, and it could not even get backdoor notice.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. That is a good proposition.

Mr. SIMS. I want to encourage the gentleman about his bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have occupied the time of the committee much longer than I intended. Many things I intended to discuss must be omitted on account of many interruptions and consequent digressions. I want to thank the gentlemen who have listened so long and patiently and who have given me such courteous hearing—gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. If I have not yielded to each as much as he desired, I call attention to the lateness of the hour.

I have not had an opportunity to explain all the changes in this bill. Suffice it to say that the bill reduces to the consumer very materially the cost of woolen goods. I believe with the committee that this bill will raise nearly the revenue that the present tariff does, with less than half the tax upon the people. I myself do not believe that it will produce $40,000,000 of revenue; but those who are competent to judge say that it will. I think it will produce probably about $35,000,000 or $36,000,000. No man can tell with certainty.

Mr. WEEKS. Under this bill there will necessarily be more wool imported than there has been in the past, will there not?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I do not know, but I think so. It is so very late, Mr. Chairman, that I would not like to go into a discussion of the details of that. I believe there will be an increased consumption of wool. I believe the people who can scarcely afford to buy these high-priced woolen goods will go into the market, at a reasonable price, and that the consumption of woolen goods will be greater than it has ever been known in this country.

The population of the country is increasing. We have a wonderfully wealthy country, and I believe that the consumption of wool will be greater and that the imports of the manufactured article will be greatly increased, and by that means the amount of the tariff we shall get will be considerable. It may be as much as $40,000,000. The Democrats in the House are, step by step, redeeming the party pledges.

Before I take my seat, Mr. Chairman, I will say there is one thing I should not overlook. The frequent allusion by gentlemen on that side to a gentleman for whom I am not a spokesman or mouthpiece, but for whom I have the highest respect, challenges my attention. From time to time I have heard slurring remarks come across the aisle in reference to the most distinguished Democrat in this country, and it has grated on my nerves. No matter how we may differ in reference to our political views, all men should recognize true manhood and merit wherever they see it. And if there ever was a man in this country who stood out fairly and openly for what he believed, and who expressed clearly the views on each side of every question he discussed, and who stated with clearness and fairness the arguments for and against, that man is W. J. Bryan. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Yet he is abused and hated. I know nothing like it since, in ancient times, Aristides was banished from Athens by a popular vote. His ability and probity stood preeminent. He was called "the Just." But he was banished. If the protectionists and grafters could have their way, Mr. Bryan would have to seek some foreign clime.

Mr. Bryan is a devoted Democrat, he is a patriot, he is a Christian gentleman, and he stands high in the United States and in all the civilized world. Why any man should speak slightingly of him I do not know, and I can not understand why gentlemen on that side should refer to him with unfriendly slurs. I suppose that is the price men have to pay for greatness. As Byron expressed it:

He who ascends to mountain tops shall find
The loftiest peaks most wrapped in clouds and snow;
He who surpasses or subdues mankind
Must look down on the hate of those below.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, in the future vicissitudes of this Nation, in the calm and in the storm, when reason rules or passion sways, this same man Bryan will, in all the days to come, stand as a tower of Democratic strength, an impersonation of civic righteousness.

Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm;
Though round his breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on his head.

[Loud and prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

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. RUSSELL, 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. 11019) to reduce the duty on wools and woolen manufactures, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WARBURTON, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for four weeks, on account of important business.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. That is simply for debate this evening?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And nothing else.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman intend to make a request for closing debate on the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would be glad to make a request if it will be agreed to. I intended to move to close debate on Tuesday morning. The session of Monday will be devoted to the Discharge Calendar. However, I will make the request that when the House adjourns to-day general debate on H. R. 11019 be closed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is fair to the House to have some understanding. I think myself it is fair to say that we will close debate to-night if that is the intention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the intention.

Mr. MANN. And to commence reading the bill on Tuesday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Immediately after the reading of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wools and woolen manufactures close with to-night's session. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that we take the recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening, so as to give half an hour more for debate. I therefore modify my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House take a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening, the night session to be devoted to debate on the bill.

The motion was considered and agreed to.

The SPEAKER designated Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas as Speaker pro tempore for the evening session.

Accordingly, at 5.30 o'clock, the House took a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas].

THE WOOL SCHEDULE.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11019, to revise the wool schedule.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the wool-schedule bill, with Mr. BOOHER in the chair.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, down here in Congress the Democrats are being abused by the Republicans for selling out to we fellows from the sheep States, and out home we fellows from the sheep States are being abused because the sell out was not complete, so it seems to be a case of "be damned if you do and be damned if you don't." Some people seem to be particularly hard to satisfy in the making up of this schedule, but the more I listen to the lamentations arising from the Republican side of the House over the "gross betrayal" of Democratic principles involved in this 20 per cent ad valorem duty on wool, the more I am beginning to suspect that this duty on wool is not such an awfully bad thing after all for we fellows from the sheep States. Indeed, I have a suspicion that if it was such a bad thing for us, there would not be so much lamentation from that side of the House about the betrayal of Democratic principles, but, in that event, it would be the principles themselves that would get the lambasting.

Mr. Chairman, at home I have a little daughter, and she is all the daughter that I have got. She constitutes my family. I have not seen her since the 22d day of last November. This last week she attained her eighteenth year, which in Colorado makes her not only a woman, but also a man, gives her all of the rights that her father ever possessed under the laws of that State, and some that he does not. In addition to that, she graduated and completed her school studies. In addition to that, she had the honor of the leading rôle in the commencement play, and while I never even had the pleasure of hearing her recite, "Twinkle, twinkle, little star," I passed up all of those things and stayed down here in Washington watching and participating in these debates—all for the final purpose of discussing Schedule K for 30 minutes to a vast quantity of furniture. [Laughter.] I felt if I were to be out in Colorado while the Democrats were down here taking the tariff off wool the Republicans would be taking the hide off me. But, as I stated in the opening, I perhaps had practically as well be there because our friends the enemy seem to have made up their minds not to be satisfied with this schedule anyway. Whether it carries no tariff, whether it carries 20 per cent or 30 per cent or whatever it carries, it is going to be a Democratic wool tariff, and that will be sufficient to condemn it in their eyes.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to have this cup pass from me—the responsibility of putting anything in the RECORD on this subject, under the probability that I can not please anybody. I never before appreciated the advantage of a seat over here on the Cherokee strip, when I have to make a speech that can not possibly please anybody, because, under the circumstances existing now, there are few on this side to resent the flings and arrows I may direct against them, and the other side of the House, where I really belong, is too far away for them to return any flings and arrows that may be sent in that direction.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that when I made my first campaign for Congress there was then on in this country the tariff agitation that resulted in the Payne bill, and when I made my second campaign for Congress one of the leading issues in that campaign was a revision of the Payne bill itself, and yet I never made a speech on the tariff, either in or out of Congress. I did not become a Democrat, Mr. Chairman, because of the tariff policy of the Democratic Party.

I became a Democrat because I believed that party in its makeup, in its leadership, in its sympathies, and in its principles was nearer than the Republican Party to the great toiling and producing masses of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is why I became a Democrat, and Mr. Chairman, I have never had any cause to regret my action or to revise or change my opinion. It is quite a practice with Democrats, and I suppose with Republicans since that party has taken on age, to launch out in campaign speeches and in conventions with the assertion that they have always been Democrats. But I am not able to say that, and if there can be credit due a party in augmenting its numbers by accession rather than by birth, I think it is worth something to the party and something of which it may more properly boast, that here and there is a man who was not born a Democrat, but who, after obtaining his maturity and such judgment as it may have pleased nature to bestow upon him, elected to cast his fortune and affiliate with the party because he believed that of the two great parties it was closer to the masses of the people from which he sprang. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is true that I subscribe generally to the tariff theories of the Democratic Party, but I came to this body as nearly open-minded and nonpartisan upon this subject as could well be, and without having in mind any theory of tariff taxation into which all facts must fit or any hard-and-fast rule which must apply in all cases. I came rather in that state of mind where a man might favor a protective tariff, a revenue tariff, or free trade, as the case might be, and while this state of mind might not be in accord with the traditional policies of either of the two great political parties, as declared in their successive platforms, it is my observation that it has been to some extent in accord with the performance of the two great parties and to a still greater extent in accord with the individual actions of a very respectable number of the representatives in Congress of these parties.

THE REPUBLICAN TARIFF POLICY.

In the first place, neither of the parties has consistently adhered to its declared tariff policy. In its last declaration upon this subject, the Republican Party in its platform of 1908 said:

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

I can find no place in such a declaration for the proposal of a Republican President to place upon the free list the products of the farm and throw open the markets of this country to the only present and prospective competitor of the American farmer. I can find no place in a policy of protection thus specifically defined—for absolute free trade under the guise of reciprocity.

I heartily supported and voted for Canadian reciprocity, and would be equally glad to support absolute free trade with Canada. Not because I believe that reciprocity with Canada will appreciably reduce the cost of living to the people of this country, but because of the closer and better trade relations that will be thereby established between them; because there are no natural barriers, and, therefore, should be no artificial barriers between the two countries. But the Republican Party has been steeping the American farmer in the belief that his prosperity is almost wholly dependent upon a high protective tariff, and is even now filling those of the American farmers who raise sheep and produce wool with the false fear that the Democratic Party is about to wantonly destroy that industry through a reduction of the tariff; and I am unable to see where free wheat has any more place than free wool in such a doctrine. All these years the Republican Party has been giving the farmer a tariff of 25 cents per bushel upon his wheat. It now tells him that this duty was of no benefit. How is he to know that it will not next negotiate reciprocity treaties with South America, wherein wool will play the part now being played by lumber and its products in Canadian reciprocity? All American products, whether of the mine or the mill or the farm, are produced under the same economic conditions in every material respect, and a free list upon any American product, by whatever name that free list may be called, has no place in the policy of protection.

THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF POLICY.

But little less difficulty has been experienced by the Democratic Party in its policy of a tariff for revenue only, in which a free list has no more logical place than in the policy of protection, and which must result in heavier duties upon those things taxed for revenue purposes. It is conceded that any duty levied upon a competitive product is to that extent protective, and there is no escape from this proposition. About one-third of the total revenues of the Government is derived through tariff taxation, and if it is the purpose of the Democratic Party, as it seems, to maintain this source of revenue and the tax necessary to derive this revenue is to be laid principally upon things produced in this country, it follows that the amount of incidental protection will approximate the direct protection contemplated by the Republicans. Such incidental protection, I maintain, ought to be equitably distributed, if not for the avowed purpose of protection, at least for the purpose of equity and to prevent one competitive article from receiving much incidental protection because another receives none. A free list of noncompetitive articles may be consistent with the theory of protection to American products, but a free list strikes me as inconsistent with any theory of a tariff for revenue, which, to be equitable, must be uniformly distributed over every subject of taxation. I do not mean this in any spirit of criticism of either party, but merely as showing what necessarily and inevitably happens to a theory when confronted with a condition.

INDIVIDUAL INCONSISTENCY.

When you consider the action of individual representatives of the two parties, you find no less inconsistency. During the passage of the Payne bill, the views of the individual Representative might be more safely forecasted by the products of his locality than by his party affiliations. New England protectionists were solidly for free hides and Texas tariff reformers were as solidly against it. Kansas wanted free lumber and protected wheat. Republicans from the prairie States wanted $1 per thousand on rough lumber for protection, and Democrats from the timber States wanted $2 per thousand for revenue.

And so it went. In many cases it was a question as to whose ox was gored. In this session of Congress we have witnessed that splendid fighting body of independent Republicans go to pieces on the rock of reciprocity, disorganized among themselves, and fallen from the grace of the agency of publicity which was their chief source of support; all because reciprocity proposed to give them free wheat, of which they produce much, along with free lumber, of which they produce none.

NEW ENGLAND TARIFF REFORM—FREE RAW MATERIAL.

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to the flaw, if such it be, in my own armor. I am not a New England tariff reformer. The doctrine of the New England tariff reformer has been made perfectly clear in tariff legislation. It is free trade in raw materials and protection upon manufactures. From a tariff standpoint, there is no such thing as raw material. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Raw material is a manufacturing, not a tariff, term. Used as a tariff term, raw material is an absolutely misleading misnomer. The moment labor or capital is applied to the resources of nature, that moment the yields of nature cease to be raw material, so far as the tariff is concerned. This proposition is so obvious and elementary to me that discussion of it would be wasted upon me.

I am not now arguing for a revenue tariff or for a tariff for protection, but I am simply stating what has become to my mind a transparent, obvious fact, and that is from a revenue or tariff standpoint there is and can be no such thing as raw material, but that the term is solely and only a manufacturing term.

FREE HIDES—IRON ORE—COAL.

The only result heretofore, if any, of free raw materials in tariff legislation has been to increase the margin of protection and swell the profits of the manufacturer. Take the case of hides. In the Payne bill we placed hides on the free list and reduced boots and shoes correspondingly, and hides have gone down and boots and shoes have gone up. Nobody can dispute this. I will insert here in my remarks the provisions of the Dingley law and of the Payne bill upon hides, boots, and shoes as these items appeared in the various stages of the bill from its introduction to its final passage:

HIDES OF CATTLE—BOOTS AND SHOES—DINGLEY LAW.

HIDES OF CATTLE.

SEC. 437. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

SEC. 438. Boots and shoes made of leather, 25 per cent ad valorem; provided that leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles shall be classified as manufactures of leather and pay duty accordingly.

THE PAYNE BILL AS INTRODUCED.

HIDES OF CATTLE—FREE LIST.

SEC. 581. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

SEC. 448. Boots and shoes made of leather, and leather shoe laces, finished or unfinished, 15 per cent ad valorem, provided that leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles (and Gauffre leather) shall be classified as manufactures of leather and pay duty accordingly.

This shows that the Payne bill as introduced proposed to remove hides from the dutiable list of 15 per cent ad valorem and place them on the free list, and to reduce boots and shoes from 25 to 15 per cent ad valorem.

THE PAYNE BILL AS AMENDED IN THE SENATE.

HIDES OF CATTLE.

SEC. 447½. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

SEC. 448. Boots and shoes made of leather, 20 per cent ad valorem, provided that leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles (and Gauffre leather) shall pay a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem in addition to the duty imposed by this paragraph on leather of the same character as that from which they are cut.

This shows that the Senate proposed to retain the 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides and reduce boots and shoes from 25 to 20 per cent ad valorem, with an additional duty of 15 per cent ad valorem on the forms of leather mentioned in the proviso, instead of taxing such forms as "manufactures of leather."

THE PAYNE BILL AS AGREED TO BY THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE.

HIDES OF CATTLE.

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

BOOTS AND SHOES.

SEC. 451. Boots and shoes made of leather, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles (and gauffre leather) shall pay a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem in addition to the duty imposed by this paragraph on leather of the same character as that from which they are cut.

THE PAYNE BILL AS FINALLY ENACTED.

HIDES OF CATTLE—FREE LIST.

SEC. 581. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry salted or pickled.

BOOTS AND SHOES.

SEC. 448. Boots and shoes made of leather, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles (and gauffre leather) shall be classified as manufactures of leather and pay duty accordingly.

This shows that the Payne bill on hides of cattle, boots, and shoes became a law just as originally introduced, placing hides on the free list and reducing boots and shoes from 25 to 15 per cent ad valorem, and only changing the Dingley law by the insertion into the proviso of the words "and gauffre leather."

The Government lost about $2,000,000 annually in tariff revenues by removing the 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides, and no consumer of the manufactures of leather has been benefited one cent. Where did the tariff go? What has become of the $2,000,000 of which the Treasury of the United States was deprived? In the Payne bill we lowered the duties on coal and iron ore and rough lumber. I do not know what losses the Treasury sustained by the reductions, but I do know what gains the consumer of the finished products made. He gained nothing. There is one theory, and only one, upon which the doctrine of free raw materials can be justified, and that is that the Government shall follow up by some action to see that the consumer and not the trust gets the benefit.

It has been said in a sort of joking way here, Mr. Chairman, that the Representatives from Colorado are between the devil and the deep blue sea because we have got a lot of sheep in our State and have been "steam rollered" into supporting this bill; but, Mr. Chairman, the most dangerous issue that can come out of this legislation would not be, in my judgment, a reduction of the price of raw wool. The most dangerous issue would be that wool should depreciate, and the Treasury be deprived of the revenue, which was the case with placing hides upon the free list, not by a Democratic but by a Republican Congress at the instance of a Republican President; and then, as in the case of boots and shoes, for clothing, I will not say go up, but to even remain stationary; that, in my judgment, would be the most disastrous outcome that could overtake this legislation.

THE TARIFF AS AN ISSUE.

Mr. Chairman, this brings me to a personal view of the tariff which I have hesitated in my own mind to state. The tariff is the piece de resistance of American politics. It is the perennial issue. In the minds of many it is the paramount issue, but to my mind it has become the paramount humbug. So far as affording the relief expected of tariff legislation, it is an ignis fatuus, and only serves to distract and divert public attention from the really great and vital issues crying for solution. It holds the boards and is kicked back and forth while the great trusts, both protected and unprotected, grow and grow. It was an issue when this country was a poverty-stricken handful of States along the Atlantic seacoast, given almost wholly to pastoral pursuits and able to compete with no nation anywhere; it is an issue when we have become the greatest industrial power in the world, able to compete with all nations everywhere, and it is no nearer solution now than then. It is a very corpse of an issue, and I favor a substantial tariff reduction, in large part upon the ground that the people, seeing no substantial relief, will give it burial and turn their attention to the great living issues ripening now for solution, but unborn when the tariff had become hoary with age.

Mr. Chairman, this country has recently produced a great school of reformers, born out of the industrial evolution of this generation, but not one of them has won the attention of the country or made any contribution to progress upon the tariff. Production of wealth has become a science, but the distribution of wealth remains an enigma. The great captains of industry, through combination and invention, have brought production to an almost perfect standard of system, efficiency, and economy, but all for their own profit. The father who worked in the mills at Pittsburg 40 years ago got a little plain food for his belly, a little plain clothes for his back, a little plain shelter over his head, and his employer counted his wealth by hundreds of thousands; the son working there to-day gets just what the father got, but the employer counts his wealth by hundreds of millions. And that employer has come before the great committee of this Congress and has told this Congress that it could take all the tariff off his industry; that he did not need it.

Mr. Chairman, I presume I am in as close touch with the men in the ranks as any man in this body and that I have spent as much time—12 years at hard manual labor—as any other Member. When I was in the ranks I did not talk tariff and the men in the ranks with me did not talk tariff. We did not measure public men by their tariff views, of which views there appears to be nearly as many varieties as there are public men. Some of the great labor organizations of the country have headquarters here in Washington. These organizations are not petitioning Congress about the tariff. Neither are the others. They are not particularly interested by what method you raise $40,000,000 annually on Schedule K. They are operating the great industrial enginery of the country and no solution of the tariff will settle one single issue which has brought about and built up these great combinations of workingmen.

The great issue in this country is to harness the great engines of production, so that they shall work for all instead of for a few, and the men who are making an impress upon the thought of this country are the men who, in city, State, and Nation, have made some contribution to the solution of this question.

TAKE THE TARIFF OUT OF POLITICS.

I have said no solution of the tariff will solve the issues of the wage earner. There is a possible solution that may incidentally help him. Mr. Chairman, the views to which I have given expression impel me in the direction of action which will remove the tariff as far as possible from politics. It is a subject so complex and intricate that it can never be understood by the masses of the people save in a general and vague way; and even their Representatives can not get that thorough and practical knowledge of it to insure intelligent action.

I was reading the other day the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee of the last House of a statesman of national repute who was the especial advocate of wool in Congress for many years. He brushed aside the first question about manufactured wool by saying he knew nothing about the subject. He next admitted that he knew nothing about foreign raw wools. All he knew was a little about sheep raising in this country, and probably the most of that was paper knowledge. But he was no more ignorant of the details of the subject than many more of us—not so ignorant as some of us.

I am inclined, therefore, toward the establishment of a permanent body specially qualified to study this question and shall favor some practical form of tariff board. But my main reason for favoring this reform will be that Congress and the country may be permitted greater opportunity to study and act upon subjects that I consider much more vital than the tariff to the permanent well-being of the people.

FREE RAW WOOL AND PROTECTED MANUFACTURES.

Some views, however, of the tariff generally and of wool in particular have been expressed by Members on both sides of the House to which I can not subscribe and the logic of which I can not follow, even though I am supporting this bill.

Several members of the Ways and Means Committee favor free raw wool. These same gentlemen stand for a duty on manufactures of wool, and explain this apparent discrimination by saying that as to manufactured wool we must have the revenue, but none of these gentlemen has put forward the claim that the woolen mills in this country could operate under free trade, and not one of them, were he given the power and responsibility, would bring in a bill at once transferring all woolen manufactures to the free list, regardless of the question of revenue. Confronted with such responsibility, he would say that the Democratic policy was a gradual reduction to a revenue basis, and that the woolen industry, having been built upon and adjusted to present tariff rates, its sudden transition to the free list would be disastrous to business.

My logic teaches me that a duty is needed on both or neither, as both are produced under identical conditions in every particular. And right here I apply—and I believe the majority of the people apply—the rule of treating each case on its own merits and according to the needs and conditions of the particular product. We have high rates of duty on manufactures of steel and upon everything entering into the composition of steel manufactures, and yet we are competing in the markets of the world on nearly all manufactures of steel, whether locomotives or sewing machines, whether steam threshers or hoes, whether rails or nails, whether stoves or watches; and this fact indicates that we might entirely dispense with the duty on this class of manufactures and upon these schedules.

But nobody will claim that we have at any time, under any conditions, competed with the world in the manufacture of cloth; nor can it be claimed that the removal of the small duty, entering into the raw wool of cloth, will enable our manufacturers to enter into the world competition now enjoyed by the steel industry. Furthermore, it has been pointed out that while this bill carries 20 per cent ad valorem duty on raw wool and 42½ per cent on manufactures of wool, the Wilson bill carried free raw wool and duties of 48 per cent ad valorem on manufactures of wool, or more than twice the actual protection on manufactured wool carried in this bill, thereby clearly indicating the belief of the Democatic Party at that time that fairly high rates of duty must be maintained on woolen manufactures, even with free raw materials. I am, therefore, willing, both on account of raw wool and manufactured wool, to take into consideration the state of the industry itself, here and abroad, and to make allowance for the difference found to exist in the conditions affecting it.

THE PEOPLE WILL REGARD THE HOME INDUSTRY.

And let me say that the people will consider these things; they will regard the home industry. I do not at all follow—and the majority of the people will not follow—those who in the making of a tariff bill place the woolen industry of this country in the same category with rubber and silk, as has been suggested. It has been suggested that the duty to be realized from raw wool might be realized from raw rubber and raw silk, of which we import large quantities, and of which we produce none. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand the statesmanship which does not take into account an established industry which is a substantial item in our list of national assets and a component part of our resources. If there are two sources from which I may derive revenue, one of which we do not produce and the other of which we produce in competition with much cheaper conditions of production elsewhere, and the placing of the tax wholly upon the noncompetitive source will seriously injure the home product, I will at least levy the tax upon the home product up to the point which still leaves it open to foreign competition. And this is exactly the case with raw wool, of which we produce 55 per cent and import 45 per cent, showing conclusively that raw wool is on a competitive basis. And I may add that if every article of consumption in this country was upon the same competitive basis as raw wool there would not be any serious tariff-reform issue and there would not be any extra session of Congress. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen who represent a practical people, a people who are interested in results and not theories, should go slowly in saying that in framing a tariff bill they leave wholly out of their calculations the American industry, because the people will consider these things; and they should be considered. No sane man would want to destroy an American industry, even though the argument as to dollars and cents was on that side of the ledger. The future welfare, unforeseen emergencies here and abroad—these and many other considerations would move for its preservation; and I for one am in favor of preserving it.

WOOL A PRECARIOUS INDUSTRY.

Nor do I follow those gentlemen who want free wool on the ground that wool is the gift of God; that the production of wool is largely the act of God. I know little about the sheep industry in this country, but I know more than that. And if you were to tell the herdsman in the mountain wastes, struggling with his flock through storms, fighting drouth and snow and wild beasts and disease, that the clip from the backs of his herd was the gift of God, you would better tell him by mail; it would be safer. And yet I have heard free wool argued for as the gift of God, like water, air, and sunshine. It would be more in consonance with the facts, Mr. Chairman, to argue for free wool on the ground that its production in this country is so precarious and uncertain of profitable returns and so unable to compete with South America and Australia, that it ought to be let go by the board; but since the advocates of free wool have seen fit to take the other position, we shall not only let them maintain it, but shall insist upon its maintenance by them, knowing full well that it has no basis in fact and that our salvation lies rather in the direction of the facts as I have suggested them.

THE UNRELIABILITY OF STATISTICS.

All tariff speeches are replete with figures and statistics, and I observe that it requires tables of statistics to round out any properly proportioned speech on the wool schedule. During this debate I have asked some questions, which in some instances have generated a little heat, with a view to establishing the unreliability of statistics, as well as with a view, in case the figures should prove reliable, to arrive at a conclusion in my own mind. And I think, perhaps, I could make no more serviceable contribution to this debate than to instance some statistics which I believe go at least to raise a substantial doubt as to whether gentlemen upon either side of this Chamber or upon either side of the pending measure can, with even measurable accuracy, forecast the effect of this legislation upon the wool and woolen industries of this country.

I may add that in making these inquiries from the time this measure was presented to the Democratic caucus, I have not confined myself to those gentlemen who have taken some particular side of this subject, but have indiscriminately questioned those who favor the proposed rate of 20 per cent ad valorem upon raw wool, those who favor the present specific duty of 11 cents per pound, and those who favor free raw wool.

The other day the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the able and well-informed minority leader, was quoting some figures to show that in order to raise the revenue upon Schedule K, estimated by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, it would be necessary to increase the imports of wool into this country some 202,000,000 pounds, taking both the raw wool necessary to raise $13,000,000 and the wool in the manufactures necessary to raise $27,000,000, or the total of $40,000,000 contemplated in Schedule K. Prior to that time I had done some figuring myself upon the estimates made in the minority report on the pending bill going to show that imports of raw and manufactured wool must increase nearly 190,000,000 pounds in order to realize the amount of revenue estimated by the majority. Now, in the fiscal year 1910 we consumed in this country, in round numbers, 581,000,000 pounds of wool, of which, in round numbers, we produced 321,000,000 pounds and imported 264,000,000 pounds, a production of 55 per cent and an importation of 45 per cent of the total consumption for that year.

Assuming that the consumption during the first year under the proposed law would be practically the same and that the increased importations would displace a like quantity of domestic wool, I found that instead of producing 55 per cent of the total consumption we would produce but 22½ per cent, and if the figures of the gentleman from Illinois are correct, it would force the domestic production down to about 20 per cent.

I said at the time, and I repeat, that it would be safe to go upon record with the prediction that no such decrease in the production of American wool will occur under this bill, nor will the reduction sufficiently approximate the estimated displacement to give any weight whatever to mere tables of figures indicating that this result will be brought about. On the other hand, in so far as the increase in importations fall short of the figures given, to that extent will the new Schedule K fail to realize the revenues produced by the present schedule.

This, in my judgment, is what will actually occur: Domestic wool will lose its place in the percentage column by reason of increased importations, but these increased importations will be in a substantial measure taken up by increased consumption and the decrease in the quantity of domestic wool will be relative rather than actual. And if, as asserted by the advocates of free wool, the manufacturers of this country are given access to wool supplies which are now practically denied them and which may be advantageously mixed with the domestic wools, thereby stimulating American manufacture, the depressive result upon domestic raw wool will be still less noticeable.

And here is another element that should not be overlooked. The world's wool supply is fairly fixed. There is not sufficient wool in the world to supply the demand; at least there is not a surplus; at least it may be said of wool as of other textiles and of food products that the marvelous growth of a greater use of these things has caused the price of them to increase everywhere, with demand ever more closely treading upon the heels of supply. The world's wool production is about 2,854,000,000 pounds per annum. This country consumes about 600,000,000 pounds of that total. Does anyone imagine that the wool manufacturers of Europe will sit by and permit the diversion into this country of 200,000,000 pounds of wool per annum now going into those countries, or even of the 103,000,000 pounds of raw wool estimated by the minority, without bidding in the markets for their share of it? Would not such a falling off of the supply of raw wool in the manufacturing centers of Europe inevitably tend to sustain prices? Then, if these increased importations are to have the effect of reducing the domestic source of supply, it must work a reduction of the total raw-wool supply of the world and an inevitable sharpening of demand and increase of prices.

I believe we are going to have increased importations of both raw and manufactured wools under this schedule; otherwise it would be useless to enact it, and our producers of both raw and manufactured wools are going to be brought into sharper competition with the woolgrowers and manufacturers of the world, and I mention the foregoing considerations for the purpose of suggesting not only that you can not spell the ruin of the wool industry in this country out of a table of figures, but as suggesting that there are compensating benefits which will in a very large measure counterbalance on one side of the ledger the losses to be noted on the other, to say nothing of the millions who must benefit by better if not by cheaper clothing and of increased commerce with the world at large.

THE TARIFF AND WOOL PRICES.

There are other figures from which it is just as difficult as those I have given to predicate the effect of a tariff rate. The other day I sought to interrupt the gentleman from Wyoming when he was taking the position that the production of wool required stable conditions, and that conditions were stable except in the face of Democratic tariff revision, and I shall insert in my remarks what I then wished to call to his attention, namely, the testimony of one J. M. Wilson, of Douglas, Wyo., who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee during the framing of the Payne bill and stated that he represented the National Woolgrowers' Association. Mr. Wilson said, at page 5035 of the hearings, that in 1907 their wool brought 22¾ cents per pound and in 1908 15⅝ cents per pound, a slump of fully one-third in the market price of wool within a period of 12 months.

Mr. Peter G. Johnson, a representative of the Idaho woolgrowers, testified at the same hearings, and at page 5074 gave the following prices for Idaho raw wool:

	Cents per pound.
1903	12½
1904	15
1905	18½
1906	18½
1907	20
1908	15

Mr. J. A. Delfelder, of Wyoming, a woolgrower, testified, at page 5109, to the following prices of raw wool:

	Cents per pound.
1905	13½
1906	17
1907	18
1908	15

I do not believe that, leaving partisanship aside, any man can fairly contend that the fear of free raw wool in 1908, with the Republican Party overwhelmingly in power in every branch of the National Government, with the United States Senate two to one Republican, had anything whatever to do with the slump in wool. The slump in wool in 1908, in my judgment, was more likely due to the panic of 1907, although I am somewhat perplexed in attributing it in part to that cause by the fact that even during and long after the panic of 1907, there was a continued advance in prices upon all commodities and upon all necessaries of life.

I notice also that some of our western woolgrowers placed a very low valuation on wool for the year 1903, indicating that it received little benefit from the present duty. Mr. Johnson, whose figures I have already stated, placed it at 12½ cents per pound, and he was corroborated by Mr. E. S. Erickson, of Salt Lake City, who said that he represented the Utah Woolgrowers' Association, and stated, at page 5062, that Utah wool in 1903 was worth 12 cents per pound. This, by the way, was six years after the Wilson law had been replaced by the Dingley law, giving ample time for clearing the American markets of any stored importations under the Wilson law.

Mr. Chairman, when I scanned the testimony in the hearings upon the Payne bill, showing the low prices of wool which prevailed throughout the Rocky Mountain States during the years the Dingley law has been in force, the question naturally arose in my mind as to what extent our woolgrowers were being benefited by the specific duty of 11 cents per pound upon raw wool. I have not exhausted the testimony upon this subject. One of the principal woolgrowers in my State testified that he sold his wool in 1908 for 12 cents. The largest woolgrower in New Mexico gave his sale prices over a period of years in the nineteen hundreds, and these prices ranged from 11 cents to 13 cents. A Member of this House from one of the Coast States, a very large producer of wool, says that he sold his clip last year for 13 cents per pound. I remember hearing Colorado woolgrowers, in the campaign of 1908, complaining bitterly that their wool and sheep market was the lowest and poorest it had been for years. Indeed, I heard general reports to the effect that it was the worst it had ever been. Arguments as to causes may be as many as there are those to argue, but one fact stands out clearly and above dispute, and that is that the duty of 11 cents per pound upon domestic raw wool has not been worth 11 cents per pound to the wool producers and it has not been worth half of 11 cents per pound, and I have heard men who assumed to speak with knowledge estimate the actual benefit of this duty in market prices to the domestic wool producer as low as 2 cents per pound. Another Member of this body is advised by woolgrowers in his State that they receive no benefit whatever from the specific duty, and they base this claim on the ground of the great difference in shrinkage between our western wools and many imported wools, and they

explain it in this way: They say that whereas our western wools shrink on an average two-thirds and even as much as three-fourths in being reduced from the unwashed to the scoured state, much of this foreign wool shrinks only from one-fourth to one-third in the scouring process, and these foreign woolgrowers take advantage of the specific duty of 11 cents per pound upon unwashed wools by bringing their wool in in this condition and scouring it afterwards.

If the foreign wool shrinks only 25 per cent in the scouring process, it will be seen that the importer after scouring his pound of unwashed wool has left three-quarters of a pound of scoured wool, upon which he has paid a duty of 11 cents; whereas had he imported his wool in the scoured state under the 33 cents per pound rate for scoured wool as fixed in the Dingley law, he would have paid for that quantity of wool three-fourths of 33 cents, or practically 25 cents, a net saving of 14 cents upon his three-quarters of a pound of wool, which would mean a net saving of practically 20 cents per pound; and this is the sort of competition the domestic woolgrower with his great shrinkage is called upon to meet under the Dingley law. The scoured-wool rate of 33 cents per pound in the Dingley law therefore is not a protection to the American woolgrower, but a delusion and a snare, just as much so as the exorbitant compound duties upon all manufactures containing even a shred of wool in their composition. It is said there is such an infinite variety of wools as to make the ad valorem duty difficult of application, and that the ideal method would be the fixing of raw-wool duties upon a scoured basis, but I believe the ad valorem method to be much more nearly fair to the American producer than the specific duty, and I therefore favor this method as against the specific rate.

Another item in the list of uncertainties as to the effect of a given tariff rate upon the domestic product is the fact that while the number of sheep in the United States in 1903, when there was no Democratic tariff agitation, is given as approximately 64,000,000, the number had fallen in 1905 to 45,000,000, a loss of 19,000,000, or more than one-fourth of the total number of sheep in this country. A wool-tariff expert could devote an entire speech to the explanation of this slump in sheep production. He could attribute it in part to the demand for sheep as mutton and he could attribute it to a great many other things, but if he were a high protectionist and a Democratic tariff law was in operation or was even threatened, he would attribute it to that fact. And if a Democratic Congress had been elected in 1907, that fact would be charged with the fall in wool in 1908. With a Democratic tariff, either actual or prospective, every reverse in every industry is charged to it. With a Republican tariff act in operation, no reverse in any industry is charged to it. No wonder with such gross misrepresentation the American people cry, lo here, and lo there, and know not what the truth is.

THE WILSON BILL.

This brings me properly to a brief consideration of the Wilson bill. It is amazing how a fallacy can persist in the minds of the people if it only has behind it a great political party. The panic occurred in June, 1893, and the Wilson bill became a law in August, 1894, fully 14 months afterwards, and yet statesmen, leaders of the people, are heard to say that the Wilson bill was responsible for that era of hard times. During the Harrison administration I was raising corn on the prairies of Kansas, and we burned it for fuel because it was not worth hauling to town; corn selling at 9, 10, and 11 cents per bushel, and the more corn a farmer had the poorer he was; wheat selling down at 45 and 50 cents per bushel; hogs worth nothing; cattle worth nothing; the whole country during that administration, and owing to causes for which it was not responsible—and I will say that as a Democrat—working into the throes of universal industrial depression, finally culminating in the panic of 1893, a panic that was turned over full-fledged and ready to burst in all its fury by the Harrison administration to the administration of Cleveland, a condition which had progressed to the point that in February of 1893 a bond issue was determined upon and the bonds actually lithographed, whereupon the Republicans determined that it would be better to pass that situation on to the Cleveland administration.

Some day, when we are far enough removed in point of time, history will do justice to the panic of 1893, and when it does all that has been said in charging it up to the Wilson bill will read as the merest twaddle, if it is read at all. I read the other day the statement of the recent Republican candidate for governor of Texas with reference to free raw wool under the Wilson law, and he said with a fine sarcasm that we came within 4 cents a pound of having free raw cotton. Since the great bulk of our raw cotton has always been exported and its price fixed in the foreign markets, he seemed to overlook the fact that what he really succeeded in doing was to draw an indictment against the general industrial and financial conditions existing throughout the world and not against the Wilson bill. That cotton of all things produced in this country was worth nothing during that period of depression is to my mind the most convincing argument that the tariff act of 1894 was the victim rather than the cause of hard times. When I say this I say it not in defense of the wool rates in the Wilson bill, but in the interest of mere justice.

I do not recognize the doctrine of free raw material as the test of Democracy. It has been mentioned in but one national Democratic platform, that of 1892, in the whole century of the party's existence, and then only in the way of legislation "in the direction of free raw materials." If free raw material is a cardinal tenet of Democracy, it seems strange that it should be mentioned in but one of some 20 national platforms, and then only suggestively, when during all this time, beginning with 1816, we have had a tariff on raw wool, except during the three years of the Wilson law.

But it is not so singular, in view of the fact that the great Walker tariff, whose author is always quoted with approval by Democratic tariff reformers, carried a 30 per cent ad valorem duty upon raw wool. I wish this bill carried the same rate. I would not ask to go beyond the rate fixed by the author of the greatest Democratic tariff law ever enacted and what is conceded to have been the most successful. Ah, gentlemen say, that rate was fixed in the light of conditions then existing, and conditions are different now. How different? I have heard one of the greatest Democratic students of the tariff now living say that, in his opinion, the wool tariff was an actual benefit to the American farmer. In view of the actual competition to which he is subjected even now, it can only be a benefit because it saves him from even greater and sharper competition with the more cheaply produced wools of other parts of the world.

NO WOOL TRUST.

Mr. Chairman, there is no raw-wool trust. There is no combination in the production of wool. There are no millionaire sheep men. There may be millionaire lumbermen and millionaire cattle men and millionaire wheat men and millionaire cotton men, but I have never heard of any millionaire sheep men. It is very largely a small man's industry, a poor man's industry, and added to that, in this country, as shown by the following figures of the Agricultural Department, it is an almost universal industry. Nearly every State in the Union and nearly every county in every State has its flocks. According to these statistics for 1910, 32 of the 48 States and Territories each produced more than 1,000,000 pounds of raw wool. I give only the round numbers, as follows:

	Pounds raw wool.
Wyoming	36,000,000
Montana	33,600,000
New Mexico	19,200,000
Idaho	19,000,000
Ohio	16,900,000
Oregon	14,400,000
Utah	14,200,000
California	13,300,000
Michigan	11,475,000
COLORADO	9,100,000
Texas	8,950,000
Pennsylvania	6,300,000
Wisconsin	6,075,000
Missouri	6,020,000
Nevada	5,950,000
Indiana	5,850,000
Iowa	5,400,000
Arizona	4,950,000
New York	4,950,000
Illinois	4,900,000
South Dakota	4,060,000
Washington	4,050,000
Kentucky	3,800,000
West Virginia	3,450,000
Minnesota	2,550,000
North Dakota	1,750,000
Virginia	1,640,000
Nebraska	1,625,000
Kansas	1,310,000
Maine	1,260,000
Tennessee	1,240,000
Vermont	1,170,000

It is an important industry in these 32 States and Territories, but, as I shall show by other figures, it is a leading industry in some of them. Agricultural Graphics show that for the period of 10 years, from 1899 to 1908, inclusive, the average of sheep in the United States was slightly over 52,000,000, of which approximately 25,000,000, or nearly one-half, were to be found in the Rocky Mountain division of States and Territories comprising Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, Nevada, and Arizona.

I give them in their order, as follows:

	Number of sheep.
Montana	5,813,000
Wyoming	4,565,000
New Mexico	4,338,000
Idaho	3,440,000
Utah	2,842,000
Colorado	1,926,000
Nevada	1,101,000
Arizona	961,000
Total	24,986,000

Some idea of the importance of the sheep industry in many States may be gained from the following table, showing the number of sheep in proportion to population:

States.	Population.	Number of sheep.	Per capita.
Wyoming	146,000	4,565,000	31
Montana	376,000	5,813,000	15½
Nevada	82,000	1,101,000	13½
New Mexico	327,000	1,338,000	13
Idaho	325,000	3,440,000	10½
Utah	373,000	2,842,000	7½
Arizona	204,000	961,000	4¼
Oregon	672,000	2,799,000	4
Colorado	799,000	1,926,000	2½
California	2,377,000	2,290,000	1

In order to emphasize the importance of the industry in the foregoing States, it may be of interest to note the relative unimportance of the industry in other States, to which, however, much attention has been given during the debates:

States.	Population.	Number of sheep.	Per capita.
Michigan	2,810,000	2,830,000	1
Ohio	4,767,000	3,125,000	⅔
Texas	3,896,000	1,891,000	½
Indiana	2,700,000	1,163,000	⅖
Pennsylvania	7,665,000	1,035,000	⅐
New York	9,113,000	1,151,000	⅛

And so on down the list.

My own State, Colorado, is tenth in the production of both sheep and wool in the United States and eighth in proportion to population. There are half as many sheep in the district I represent as there are in the entire State of Ohio. There are twice as many sheep in that district as in the entire State of Indiana. I doubt if there is a single Democratic Representative from the States of Ohio and Indiana who would say that in the framing of a tariff bill the sheep industry was not to be considered, or who would subscribe to that view, either publicly or privately, and its consideration must grow in the estimation of the Representative in proportion to its importance, and it should grow in proportion to its importance in the estimation of those who are not directly affected. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] furnished me with the following table, showing the rise and fall by decades of the sheep industry of this country by sections, beginning with 1840 and showing that with the exception of the mountain division of eight States and Territories it has reached its climax and declined:

Growth and decline of sheep industry in the United States since 1840.

NEW ENGLAND STATES.

1840	3,750,000
1850	2,500,000
1860	1,750,000
1870	1,500,000
1880	1,500,000
1890	1,000,000
1900	500,000

MIDDLE ATLANTIC STATES, INCLUDING NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA.

1840	7,500,000
1850	5,500,000
1860	4,500,000
1870	4,000,000
1880	3,750,000
1890	3,250,000
1900	2,000,000

NORTH CENTRAL STATES, INCLUDING OHIO AND MICHIGAN.

1840	3,250,000
1850	6,750,000
1860	7,000,000
1870	11,250,000
1880	10,500,000
1890	9,500,000
1900	7,000,000

MIDDLE WESTERN STATES, INCLUDING KANSAS AND NEBRASKA.

1840	500,000
1850	1,000,000
1860	1,500,000
1870	2,500,000
1880	3,750,000
1890	2,500,000
1900	2,250,000

SOUTHERN STATES.

1840	4,500,000
1850	5,750,000
1860	6,000,000
1870	5,000,000
1880	7,000,000
1890	9,500,000
1900	4,750,000

PACIFIC COAST STATES.

1860	1,000,000
1870	3,000,000
1880	7,000,000
1890	5,500,000
1900	4,250,000

ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES.

1860	750,000
1870	750,000
1880	8,000,000
1890	10,000,000
1900	18,000,000

The figures end with the year 1900, giving the Rocky Mountain States at that time but 18,000,000, whereas now, as I have shown, they number about 25,000,000; and the gentleman from Kansas goes on to say that if we are to have a shepherd race in this country it will probably be in the Rocky Mountains. But, Mr. Chairman, even these figures and this surmise as to the future, taking them to be true, are not sufficient to justify the conclusion that the industry is not worth sustaining, and surely no one will contend that the matter of locality should have anything whatever to do with the fixing of tariff rates. The whole country is interested in the sheep of the Rocky Mountain States as it is in the mills of the New England States. And all that the whole country can fairly ask of any section of the country is that it shall not be given a monopoly of its resources, so as to prosper at the expense of the remainder of the country. And my complaint against the proposed rate upon raw wool is that it is admitted to be below both a revenue and a competitive rate. It is admitted that the present tariff rates on raw wool are absolutely competitive, and that, notwithstanding this fact, these rates produce approximately one-third more revenue, or about $20,000,000 as against $13,000,000, than will be realized under the proposed rates, showing conclusively a substantial loss of revenue and also its reduction below the present competing point; although even here, in order to be perfectly fair, I will say that our failure to produce sufficient raw wool would lead to its importation in large quantities, even though the duty were higher than it is now.

But, Mr. Chairman, we may eliminate speculation and we may eliminate, to a large extent, the figures which seem to be capable of as variable conclusions as the theologian may read from his scriptural text, and we have left the substantial fact that we have here a great American industry which, during the 20-year period from 1891 to 1910, produced 5,899,520,518 pounds of raw wool as against 3,590,838,114 pounds imported, or nearly two-thirds of all the wool consumed in this country; one of the leading industries of a great section of the country and diffused among nearly all sections and among the producing class of people; that this industry is entirely worth preserving as a part of the national economy, an industry which it would be national folly to attempt to eliminate or to seriously injure, but which, under conditions as they now exist, can not produce as cheaply as in some other parts of the world. It being conceded that it is in part benefited and sustained by the tariff, and having been in part benefited and sustained by the tariff practically throughout the entire history of the industry in this country, so that we have no reliable criterion to guide us or to indicate with any degree of certainty the result of its transition to the free list, it will be the part of wisdom to go slowly, and, in the new order of things, to resolve the doubt in its favor by giving it a little more rather than a little less than half of the tariff rates it has been enjoying.

And, therefore, Mr. Chairman, while I believe that our Committee on Ways and Means have labored faithfully and honestly to bring about a solution of this most vexed question which will be fair to all interests involved, and while I would retire from public life before I would stultify myself through fear of consequences to me personally by bolting the party action under these conditions, I should feel entitled to reserve the right in the event the rate of duty upon raw wool should be increased elsewhere to 30 per cent ad valorem to vote to concur in that action.

REPUBLICAN PAPERS PREACHING CALAMITY.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have displeased some gentlemen on this side of the House by my attitude toward the rate of duty proposed upon raw wool in the pending bill, because I indicated that it ought to carry a somewhat higher rate. At home I have been denounced by Republican papers as a traitor to the interests of my State by agreeing to be bound by the caucus action

on this bill. This bill, according to these Republican papers, is going to absolutely destroy woolgrowing in Colorado. The production of wool in Colorado owes nothing to nature; it owes nothing to the air and sunshine and water; it owes nothing to the natural herbage on the great mountain slopes and in the vast mountain parks; it owes nothing to the law of supply and demand; it owes nothing to the fact that the mills of this country will keep on weaving all the wool they can get and the men, women, and children of this country will keep on wearing that weave; it owes nothing to all these elements, but all is owing to a specific duty of 11 cents per pound on wool, the reduction of which to a 20 per cent ad valorem duty is to absolutely destroy the wool industry of that State.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that whether the action of the Democrats in Congress in leaving a duty on raw wool is consistent or otherwise, the attitude of the Republican press of my State is thoroughly consistent with the doctrine and teaching of the Republican Party. A duty of 25 cents per bushel on wheat has built up a great, splendid, triumphant civilization in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Minnesota; free wheat from Canada is about to restore the primeval waste whence sprang these great Commonwealths. [Applause on the Democratic side.] A specific duty of 11 cents per pound on wool gave that magnificent galaxy of mountain States to the Nation; now through the medium of a 20 per cent ad valorem duty on wool the mountain pines in all their primeval solitude will sigh a requiem over their desolate ruins. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The genius of the world's most imperial people and the world demand, growing by leaps and bounds and theatening to outrun supply, have nothing to do with the life of agriculture and of industry in this country; this life flows and ebbs with the ebb and flow of the tariff, and now with the tariff ebb they are to be swept out completely into the vortex of a common ruin.

Mr. Chairman, I despise the source of these dire but false prophecies and I am not disturbed by them, and I only want to observe here that giving ear to such echoes of its own teachings in the making of its last tariff bill brought the Republican Party into its present low estate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I want the Democratic Party, now in its hour of opportunity, to do its duty and to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may, only asking that they be fair as well as firm. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If anything in the way of tariff legislation was an issue in the last campaign and was settled by that campaign, it was a substantial revision of Schedule K [applause on the Democratic side], characterized by a Republican President as indefensible, and which is shown by its own operation to be not only highly protective of the wool manufacturing industry in this country, but practically prohibitive of imports of manufactured wool. For the Democratic Party to fail under these conditions to undertake a substantial downward revision of this schedule would unquestionably and properly cost it the confidence of the people, and no Representative whose vision outruns the bounds of his own district, no man who is fit to represent the people, will ask that the cup which he must press to the lips of others shall pass wholly from him. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the history of this Democratic bill, H. R. 11019, began on June 1, so far as we have any knowledge, with a caucus of the Democratic Members of this House. That information came to us through a resolution presented to this House by the chairman of that caucus, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], on June 2, who asked for the privilege of inserting it in the RECORD. It is to be found on page 1683 of the RECORD, and is as follows:

Resolved, That the bill revising Schedule K, as presented to this caucus by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, is not to be construed as an abandonment of any Democratic policy—

[Applause on the Republican side.]

But in view of the Democratic platform demand for a "gradual reduction" of the tariff, and of the depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury—

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

a result of Republican extravagance—

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool is now proposed as a revenue necessity.

In that same RECORD, Mr. Chairman, on page 1684, appears the following:

Statement of the United States Treasury at close of business, May 31, 1911.

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS, MAY 31, 1911.

(Exclusive of postal revenues and disbursements, except postal deficiency.)

	This day.	This month.	This month last fiscal year.	This fiscal year ending June 30, 1911.	To this date last fiscal year.
Ordinary receipts and disbursements:					
Receipts—					
Customs	$983,099.20	$24,073,286.02	$23,010,989.23	$289,487,993.87	$305,124,965.02
Internal revenue—					
Ordinary	466,275.00	21,855,740.91	21,702,565.15	261,823,939.58	242,413,127.31
Corporation tax	17,934.55	895,285.59	489,271.80	8,241,127.92	696,705.30
Miscellaneous	5,293,818.70	14,408,131.21	6,405,557.74	54,830,384.44	44,158,960.23
Total	6,761,127.45	61,232,443.73	51,608,383.92	614,383,445.81	592,393,757.86
Disbursements—					
Civil and miscellaneous	594,897.49	15,320,967.29	13,584,595.46	162,505,710.32	156,777,391.38
War	729,628.19	11,864,109.81	10,598,514.30	148,049,425.97	144,672,844.18
Navy	331,953.35	9,475,439.56	8,679,309.11	109,821,849.78	112,382,674.25
Indians	4,736,441.49	5,836,319.97	4,017,313.53	19,286,313.63	16,497,113.72
Pensions	.....	14,367,455.64	14,309,208.56	146,245,224.61	148,838,544.75
Postal deficiency	.....	1,035,192.00	.....	1,040,004.74	9,495,628.45
Interest on public debt	.....	1,976,867.94	1,954,760.31	21,210,627.55	21,207,544.19
	6,392,920.52	59,876,352.21	53,143,701.27	608,159,156.60	609,871,740.92
Less repayment of unexpended balances	3,129,455.82	3,967,998.33	4,964,030.07	651,625.16	4,202,872.71
Total	3,263,464.70	55,908,353.88	48,179,671.20	607,507,531.44	605,668,868.21
Excess of ordinary receipts over ordinary disbursements	3,497,662.75	5,324,089.85	3,428,712.72	6,875,914.37	[1] 13,275,110.35

[1] Excess of disbursements over receipts.

Surplus (as above) May 31, 1911	$6,875,914.37
Deficit (as above) May 31, 1910	13,275,110.35
	20,151,024.72

And this was the document or the information on which this resolution was drawn, as to the "depleted and depleting condition of the Treasury," and was inserted at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] to show that there was no "depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury."

On the opening of the debate in this House on June 7 the distinguished and able chairman of the Ways and Means Committee addressed the House. He called attention to this financial statement of the Public Treasury of the United States, a copy of which is inserted above, to further attempt to show a "depleted and depleting condition of the Treasury." But since the insertion of this report into the RECORD by the gentleman from New York, and by statements and addresses by Members on this side of the House, we have not heard anything further from the gentlemen on that side about the necessity of this bill because of a "depleted and depleting" Treasury. So that argument, which they attempted to make, of the "depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury" miserably failed as the reason for the 20 per cent ad valorem. The finances of the Government are to-day in most excellent condition. The United States Treasury will have a surplus of approximately $25,000,000 when the fiscal year of 1911 ends June 30. For 1910 the surplus was $15,000,000. The two years preceding that, to wit, 1909 and 1908, show deficits. The whole truth is it was done to pacify the Members from the woolgrowing States and to keep them in line for next year's election. They

need those States to help elect a Democrat for President and a Democratic Congress next year. Therefore we come to the proposition, which, in my mind, is the real proposition in this bill, and that is that the Democratic Party are to-day, as they were under the administration of Cleveland, in favor of free raw wool. And from the statements of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and from this resolution presented by the chairman of the Democratic caucus, as well as from the addresses made upon this floor by members of that committee and of the majority of this House, it is well understood by the country that they are yet in favor of free raw wool and only await an opportunity to again saddle it upon the people.

So I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the question before this House—at least, it is the question before the American people, and a question that will have to be met by the Democratic Party in the next campaign—is one of whether or not the American people are in favor of free raw wool or in favor of protection as now provided under the law. And that question will have to be met. You gentlemen have made the issue, and you can not deny that that is your position before the country.

The sheep industry has had a hard enough struggle in America to be let alone. It was not until the beginning of the eighteenth century that any success was achieved in raising sheep in this country. The difficulties at first were the climate and the inability of the colonists to understand the proper methods to pursue and the care to take in raising sheep. Then the wolves came along and destroyed them. Another hindrance to sheep raising in this country followed rapidly along, and that was the British woolen manufacturers. They discouraged the sheep industry among the colonists because they wanted to sell to the colonists the woolens manufactured in England. Then the industry was again attacked, not by climate, because the colonists had learned to take care of the sheep; not by the wolves, because they had been killed off in places where sheep were herded, but by the dogs, and they destroyed many of the flocks. So, with the climate, the wolves, the dogs, and the British woolen manufacturers, the sheep industry did not for many years make much headway in America. It was a losing proposition financially. Some wealthy planters pursued the novelty, however, and at much expense brought some fine stock from Spain and other places, especially merinos, and finally there was some splendid flocks in this country. One of the early wealthy citizens to take an interest in sheep raising was George Washington Parke Custis, grandson of Martha Washington, at his Arlington estate. Custis took a great interest in the matter of sheep for stock breeding and domestic manufacture, and he saw in the advent of the merinos a promise of the opening in America of woolen-cloth making. At that time all the cloth of this character used in this country was imported from England, and could only be obtained at considerable cost.

The importance of the matter, because of the success of the manufacture of cotton cloth by the Southern States, was occupying then the thoughts of a number of public-spirited men. To foster improvements in sheep and to encourage woolen manufacture at home, Mr. Custis, in 1803, called a convention of those interested in sheep husbandry and wool manufacture. It met at Arlington House, and really marked the beginning of the woolen-manufacturing interests of the country. It is not known whether or not this convention recommended the imposition by Congress of a tariff on woolen goods, but from the views held at that time regarding and the actual needs of an infant industry, it is presumed it did. The convention also led to the adoption by Mr. Custis of a custom which rendered his fine estate and himself famous throughout the country. He entered into sheep raising with considerable ardor, and in succeeding years the annual sheepshearing at Arlington Spring brought together from all parts of the country an assemblage of men interested in the industry and others distinguished by their ability in public life. All were the guests of Mr. Custis, and the occasion became almost an annual festival.

The spring at which the gatherings took place was at the foot of a wooded slope, near the bank of the river, and not far from where stood the old Alexander mansion. It was a pure and copious fountain, gushing out from the roots of a huge and venerable oak tree, which doubtless stood there when the Indians of a former age came thither to slake their thirst. Around the spring a beautiful grassy lawn, shaded by a variety of trees, extended, affording a magnificent resort for such meetings. Mr. Custis always presided. Toasts were drunk, speeches were made, and prizes were awarded by Mr. Custis to the persons bringing, for purposes of exhibition, the finest specimens of sheep. Generally these ceremonies took place under the shelter of Washington's war tent, which was brought out for the occasion from among the treasured relics of the first President that Mr. Custis possessed. The host usually made a stirring address, and in one of his speeches delivered while wool manufacturers were yet unknown in America, he said prophetically:

> America shall be great and free and minister to her own wants by the employment of her own resources. The citizens of my country will proudly appear when clothed in the produce of their own native soil.

The efforts Mr. Custis was making in behalf of the sheep-raising industry attracted general attention, and among his letters of that time we find several from James Madison, then Secretary of State and afterwards President of the United States. In one of these Mr. Custis is informed that Mr. Madison—

> offers for himself the thanks to which Mr. Custis is entitled from his fellow citizens for his laudable and encouraging efforts to increase and improve an animal which contributes a material so precious to the independent comfort and prosperity of our country. Mr. Madison wishes that Mr. Custis may be amply gratified in the success of his improving experiments, and that his patriotic example may find as many followers as it merits.

In another letter on the same subject Mr. Madison says:

> It gives me pleasure to find your attention to this interesting subject does not relax and that you are successfully inviting to it other public-spirited gentlemen.

In this matter, however, like in a good many others, Mr. Custis understood the theory of sheep raising and of arousing interest in the subject better than he did the practice. His own efforts met with very poor success. He established a large flock of Merinos on the hills of Arlington, but they were gradually killed off by thieves and dogs, until but two animals remained to show that Mr. Custis was still true to his principles. The absence of the sheep somewhat interfered with the successful continuation of the annual sheepshearing gatherings at the Custis Spring, and they were eventually abandoned. Mr. Custis retained his interest in sheep raising, however, and before his own flock became extinct he had the satisfaction of seeing the manufacture of American woolens grow into an important industry.

Beginning with the year 1708, weaving came to be a fixture in many of the homes of the colonists, and by 1719 there was scarcely a New Englander who was not "clad in his own manufacture." Woolen goods for the use of colonists, however, was mostly exported from England. Prior to the Revolutionary War exportations of woolen goods from England to the colonists was of considerable value to England, amounting to several million dollars a year. With the beginning of the Revolutionary War there was increased demand for domestic wool, which stimulated that industry, and for several years there was very little imported from England to this country. After the close of the war, however, importations of British woolens amounted to considerable, and for the years 1790 to 1794 the importations averaged again several million dollars' worth a year, and running as high for the years 1795 to 1799 as $10,000,000 a year. From 1800 to 1807 efforts were made to establish American woolen factories with modern machinery and power. The chief obstacle to their success, however, was the importations of woolens from abroad.

The tariff on woolens was small at this period and was of little benefit to the home industry until 1812, when the tariff was fixed at 35 per cent ad valorem. From 1808 to 1815 woolen manufacture, partially due to the increased raising of sheep, took on great impetus, and a great deal of the woolen goods used by Americans was manufactured at home. In 1810 there were 24 woolen mills in this country. A great hindrance to domestic manufacture at this time was the lack of proper quality of domestic wool. There was little profit in the manufacture of woolen goods at this time and up to 1828, because of competition from abroad. The tariff act of 1828 provided for a mixed duty of 4 cents a pound and 40 per cent, which was afterwards increased to 45 and 50 per cent, ad valorem. Importations still continued very large and amounted at this time (about 1830) to $11,819,000 a year. The number of sheep in this country during this period was about twelve or thirteen million.

From 1830 to 1840 was a period of great growth for the woolgrowing industry, because of protection of American wool. Improvements continued in the supply of wool and the manufacture thereof under protective tariffs until the passage of the tariff act of 1883, which somewhat retarded the industry. The McKinley tariff act of October 6, 1890, gave protection to the woolgrowers substantially as of 1867, under which act the flocks had so rapidly increased.

The prosperity of the woolgrowing industry was not to be let alone, however, for very long, and on August 1, 1894, the Wilson bill was enacted, which took off the protection to wool entirely. This caused almost the ruination of that great industry in this country because of the foreign competition. On July 24, 1897, the Dingley tariff became a law, which restored the duties on wool and revived the American sheep industry. This protection has continued substantially as of that date, and, under that law and the protection of to-day, as unchanged by the last tariff act of the Congress of the United

States, has given to the wool industry the protection that it must have to be successful. These constant changes, however, in the tariff, as well as the threats of the Democratic Party to take that protection away, have kept this industry in turmoil.

Farmers and sheep raisers, remembering the last Democratic administration under President Cleveland and free wool, have hesitated to increase their flocks and develop this industry to its full capacity, as the following facts and figures show, to wit:

Number of farms reporting sheep and lambs, and number of sheep and lambs reported as on farms and ranges, by States and Territories—1910 and 1900.

[Dates of enumeration: 1910, Apr. 15; 1900, June 1.]

States.	Farms reporting sheep and lambs.		Total sheep and lambs.		Ewes.		Rams and wethers.		Lambs.[1]		Unclassified by age or sex.	Wool-producing sheep.	
	(1) 1910	(1a) 1900	(2) 1910	(2a) 1900	(3) 1910	(3a) 1900	(4) 1910	(4a) 1900	(5) 1910	(5a) 1900	(6) 1910	(Columns 3, 4, and 6) 1910	(Columns 3a and 4a) 1900
Alabama	6,631	17,962	142,914	317,053	75,340	157,830	27,060	71,468	31,731	87,755	8,783	111,183	229,298
Arizona	621	602	1,061,363	924,761	537,262	452,271	115,883	216,187	217,980	256,303	190,238	843,383	668,458
Arkansas	8,432	18,302	144,190	256,929	78,976	130,700	15,958	38,061	46,908	88,168	2,348	97,282	168,761
California	3,893	3,616	2,234,125	2,563,353	1,075,313	1,335,390	256,201	389,578	793,593	838,385	109,018	1,440,532	1,724,968
Colorado	1,794	1,255	1,424,187	2,044,814	1,022,834	1,089,680	178,923	263,143	111,139	691,991	111,291	1,313,048	1,352,823
Connecticut	741	1,258	22,418	36,987	12,781	20,655	1,262	2,366	8,375	13,966	.....	14,043	23,021
Delaware	266	466	7,806	11,765	3,924	6,360	491	604	3,391	4,801	.....	4,415	6,964
Florida	660	864	113,631	124,520	55,044	55,881	30,568	46,828	16,729	21,811	11,290	96,902	102,709
Georgia	5,180	10,891	187,589	336,278	101,239	162,704	46,474	96,190	33,147	77,384	6,729	154,442	258,894
Idaho	2,996	1,936	2,950,534	3,121,532	1,598,734	1,611,090	259,800	354,377	790,505	1,156,065	301,495	2,160,029	1,965,467
Illinois	26,262	25,422	1,062,846	1,030,581	586,487	548,853	74,997	80,297	401,362	401,431	.....	661,484	629,150
Indiana	38,191	48,046	1,336,967	1,742,002	742,576	940,387	69,851	70,261	524,540	731,354	.....	812,427	1,010,648
Iowa	21,810	18,788	1,145,549	1,056,718	676,687	576,104	93,230	81,764	375,632	398,850	.....	769,917	657,868
Kansas	3,143	2,095	272,472	262,013	160,681	133,825	35,323	46,082	65,974	82,106	10,494	206,498	179,907
Kentucky	45,707	50,835	1,360,004	1,297,343	719,591	647,838	54,343	68,320	583,110	581,185	2,960	776,894	716,158
Louisiana	3,677	5,740	178,217	219,844	97,923	114,414	37,828	54,820	37,975	50,610	4,491	140,242	169,234
Maine	11,060	18,361	206,434	420,116	143,738	240,717	6,196	11,496	56,500	167,903	.....	149,934	252,213
Maryland	6,228	6,339	237,137	191,101	119,806	101,006	6,445	10,514	110,886	79,581	.....	126,251	111,520
Massachusetts	1,027	1,447	32,669	52,559	20,062	30,441	1,785	3,423	9,997	18,690	825	22,672	33,869
Michigan	54,865	63,339	2,306,476	2,747,609	1,433,263	1,508,503	111,978	117,427	761,235	1,121,679	.....	1,545,241	1,625,930
Minnesota	24,564	28,056	637,551	589,878	417,626	329,984	34,417	29,344	185,508	230,550	.....	452,043	359,328
Mississippi	5,723	14,430	194,285	312,632	105,315	162,188	45,518	74,282	37,779	76,162	5,673	156,506	236,470
Missouri	44,010	38,013	1,808,038	1,087,213	1,012,543	587,757	101,673	75,946	693,822	423,510	.....	1,114,216	663,703
Montana	2,269	1,481	5,372,639	6,170,483	3,050,239	2,995,795	1,602,658	1,219,419	393,676	1,955,269	326,066	4,978,963	4,215,214
Nebraska	3,043	2,764	293,496	511,273	160,955	279,073	56,317	56,877	48,301	175,323	27,923	245,195	335,950
Nevada	316	255	1,103,889	887,039	602,780	434,574	125,906	133,677	292,916	318,788	82,287	810,973	568,251
New Hampshire	2,236	4,202	43,772	105,113	29,075	61,295	2,126	4,023	12,571	39,795	.....	31,201	65,318
New Jersey	875	1,561	30,446	47,730	15,539	24,744	1,054	1,619	13,853	21,367	.....	16,593	26,363
New Mexico	1,848	2,504	3,286,285	4,899,487	1,847,908	2,850,876	424,100	482,867	355,084	1,565,744	659,193	2,931,201	3,333,743
New York	24,830	40,625	929,547	1,745,746	568,414	938,315	37,241	46,201	323,892	761,230	.....	605,655	984,516
North Carolina	14,697	28,941	214,176	301,941	120,315	164,105	19,249	44,707	74,292	93,129	320	139,884	208,812
North Dakota	3,723	4,957	289,354	681,952	178,973	340,273	52,617	111,164	50,240	230,515	7,524	239,114	451,437
Ohio	71,523	73,636	3,907,055	4,020,628	2,178,544	2,090,093	697,693	558,157	1,014,783	1,372,378	16,035	2,892,272	2,648,250
Oklahoma [2]	877	804	62,282	88,363	40,561	45,959	7,189	15,224	13,516	27,180	1,016	48,766	61,183
Oregon	6,394	6,696	2,696,779	3,040,291	1,394,472	1,480,282	491,982	481,073	714,227	1,078,936	96,098	1,982,552	1,961,355
Pennsylvania	25,426	44,057	882,852	1,531,066	473,193	769,463	164,176	190,020	245,483	571,583	.....	637,369	959,483
Rhode Island	242	333	6,789	11,207	3,952	5,901	254	728	2,583	4,578	.....	4,206	6,629
South Carolina	1,732	3,921	37,434	71,538	21,844	40,478	5,425	11,958	9,410	19,102	755	28,024	52,436
South Dakota	5,155	6,392	610,728	775,236	405,308	422,042	86,876	85,296	108,223	267,898	10,321	502,505	507,338
Tennessee	29,978	37,905	794,063	496,011	428,229	256,032	40,320	51,772	323,585	188,207	1,929	470,478	307,804
Texas	6,929	6,416	1,757,963	1,889,298	851,371	924,174	404,391	515,766	393,409	449,358	108,792	1,364,554	1,439,940
Utah	2,419	3,544	1,827,180	3,818,423	1,340,595	1,893,802	330,295	659,332	156,290	1,265,289	.....	1,670,890	2,553,134
Vermont	5,033	8,533	118,551	296,576	78,996	168,292	5,364	13,875	34,191	114,409	.....	84,360	182,167
Virginia	21,497	24,732	803,552	692,929	412,606	353,549	25,382	38,576	365,564	300,804	.....	437,988	392,125
Washington	2,116	2,793	471,521	929,873	206,160	459,158	60,960	98,864	162,659	371,851	41,742	308,862	558,022
West Virginia	26,014	30,266	906,093	968,843	496,623	497,247	67,755	75,492	341,715	396,104	.....	564,378	572,739
Wisconsin	30,040	47,061	929,783	1,675,453	588,628	918,638	39,911	67,574	301,244	689,241	.....	628,539	986,212
Wyoming	1,670	1,076	5,194,959	5,099,613	3,413,975	2,498,914	792,921	828,271	518,753	1,772,428	469,310	4,676,206	3,327,185
The United States	608,363	763,518	51,638,590	61,503,713	29,707,000	31,857,652	7,148,366	7,995,315	12,168,278	21,650,746	2,614,946	39,470,312	39,852,967

[1] Includes for 1910 lambs born between January 1 and April 15; for 1900, lambs under 1 year old June 1.

[2] Includes Indian Territory for 1900.

Owing to the different date of enumeration in 1900 and 1910, the numbers of lambs are not comparable for the two periods, and the only figures that are comparable are the aggregates of ewes, rams, and wethers, and those that are unclassified by ages or sex. The supplemental tabulation not completed will add about 100,000 to the aggregate of the ewes, rams, and wethers. Taken as a whole, the figures indicate a marked falling off in the number of farms having sheep. The number of those farms has decreased in 10 years from 763,518 to 608,363; a decrease of substantially 20 per cent. This decrease in the number of farms keeping sheep is not accompanied by any corresponding decrease in the number of sheep, the number of wool-bearing sheep being substantially the same in 1910 as in 1900. The increase in the average flock offsets the decrease in the number of farms keeping sheep.

The total number of wool-producing sheep on farms and ranges in 1900 was 39,852,967; the number shown in the tabulation for 1910 is 39,470,312. Later tabulation will doubtless increase this number to 39,570,000, which differs from the figures of 1900 by less than 1 per cent.

The number of wool-bearing sheep in barns and inclosures, not on farms, in 1900 was 179,600. The tabulation so far completed indicates a probable number of the same class in 1910 of 255,600. Allowing this number, and further allowing an average weight of fleece of 7.4 pounds, the average indicated by tabulations thus far made, it is probable that the final report of the census will indicate a wool clip in the United States of sheep on farms and not on farms of 40,000,000 fleeces of an aggregate weight of 296,000,000 pounds, as compared with a wool clip in 1900 of 276,992,000 pounds.

The enumerators of 1900 reported an average value for the wool clip of that year of a little more than 17 cents per pound, or an aggregate value of $45,723,739. The tabulation so far completed indicates an average value of 24 cents a pound. If this average is realized for all the wool on the farms of the country, the wool clip of 1910 would have a value of approximately $71,000,000, or over 50 per cent greater than 10 years ago.

My great and prosperous State, Missouri, which has shaken off the shackles of Democracy, and for the last dozen years stood for advancement and protection to her industries, has gone forward also as a woolgrowing and sheep-raising State, as the table below indicates. I call your special attention to the figures regarding Missouri.

Missouri.	1910	1900
1. Farms reporting sheep and lambs	44,010	38,013
2. Total sheep and lambs (number)	1,808,038	1,087,213
3. Ewes (number)	1,012,543	587,757
4. Rams and wethers (number)	101,673	75,946
5. Lambs (number) [1]	693,822	423,510
6. Unclassified by age or sex (number)	.....	.....
7. Wool-producing sheep (lines 3, 4, and 6)	1,114,216	663,703

[1] Includes for 1910 lambs born between Jan. 1 and Apr. 15; for 1900, lambs under 1 year old June 1.

Missouri's annual production of wool to-day amounts to 8,245,000 pounds, with a valuation of $1,978,800. Should even this bill become a law, this industry would be almost ruined in that State. Free wool would be complete destruction.

The following letter from one of the largest woolen importers, located at St. Louis, gives an unprejudiced opinion of this bill. He writes as follows:

ST. LOUIS, *June 12, 1911.*

HON. L. C. DYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of June 9, as distributors as well as importers of woolens, we naturally favor a lower tariff on woolens. The proposed bill H. R. 11019, however, would, in our judgment, be destructive to the woolen-manufacturing interests in this country as well as impair the quality of woolens offered for consumption. If there was any possible chance of the bill becoming a law, everybody, from the

sheep raiser to the last man manufacturing or distributing woolens, would oppose the bill, as it can only be beneficial to foreign manufacturers.

The price of woolen goods in this country now is not based upon what goods cost to import under the present tariff. In fact, more goods can be produced in the United States than can be consumed; therefore, the competition is between home manufacturers and the values not much higher than they are on the other side. From observation, I believe a better suit of clothes can be purchased in this country for $15 than can be bought in England for £3. The reason of this is not because the goods and making of garments cost less, but on account of the competition among the retail and wholesale dealers in clothing.

An ad valorem duty on woolens would not keep out fraudulent invoices, and the omission of a weight duty would promote the importation of low-class, heavy-weight goods, upon which the ad valorem duty would be small. We went through an experience similar under the Wilson bill, which was very disastrous to the woolen-manufacturing as well as the sheep interests.

Please understand we are not manufacturers, only distributors; hence you can rely upon the statements herein made being impartial.

Yours, truly,

JOS. M. HAYES WOOLEN CO.
JOS. M. HAYES.

Mr. Chairman, 47,701 sheep were received in the markets of St. Louis last week. What does that mean? It means, to my mind, that already the unrest and the threats of free wool have reached the farmers of that State and of that section of the country, and they are beginning already to deplete their flocks because of this, as they believe, impending danger.

The Democratic majority of this House should realize and understand that they are striking, in my judgment, a death blow to one of the great industries of that imperial State. There are 44,000 and more farmers in that State whose livelihood is in great part maintained by the raising of sheep and lambs and the production of wool. These farmers, by raising this wool and these sheep, are doing it not only for their own benefit and for the purpose of making a livelihood, but they are also helping to supply the American manufacturers with wool for the making of woolen clothes and woolen goods, thereby enabling Americans to wear homemade clothes, as well as to give employment to nearly 200,000 American workers engaged in that industry.

Mr. Chairman, Missouri is in favor, not of this policy, indicated in this bill, but she is in favor of that policy of protection that the Republican Party has fostered—protection to American industries, the farm industries, the home industries, the wool industry, and the sheep industry—and ever since Missouri has been a protection State she has progressed in all things, material and otherwise. I can not begin to tell of all the advances she has made since she enlisted under the Republican banner of protection and advancement; but let me for a minute call your attention to one or two things in her principal city, which show how she has progressed under Republican policies and under the laws of protection which that party has caused to be placed upon the statute books. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The business of St. Louis has doubled in the last 10 years. The St. Louis bank clearings for 1900 were $1,688,849,494. In 10 years that amount has nearly trebled. The St. Louis bank clearings for 1910 were $3,727,949,379.

In 1900 the tonnage of St. Louis was 25,313,330 tons. In 1910 the tonnage had increased to nearly 52,000,000.

The post office cash receipts of St. Louis in 1900 were $2,031,664. In 1910 they were $4,539,185.

In 1900 the value of the factory product of St. Louis was $193,783,000. In 1910 it had increased to $327,676,000; and this, Mr. Chairman, under the policies of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And I might say to my colleagues from that great State, that they will have a splendid opportunity in the next campaign to tell the farmers of that State about the great benefits that will accrue to them by having free wool.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these historical and undisputed facts before us, and recalling the prosperity of the sheep industry under the tariff act of 1867, under which the number of sheep increased to about 50,000,000; then the reduction of duties on wool and woolen goods in 1883, causing the number of sheep to decrease over 7,000,000; then the Republican tariff act of 1890 improving the conditions, and then in 1893 the sheep had increased to 47,000,000; then (1894) the Wilson bill, placing wool on the free list, reducing the number of sheep over 11,000,000 in four years; then the Dingley Act, giving protection as now, and the flocks increasing to their present number of about 51,000,000, with an annual wool clip of 321,000,000 pounds, and, after detailing the hardships and difficulties of the farmers of this country to establish and to make profitable the woolgrowing business, we are now met with another effort by the Democratic Party, which, in my judgment, will destroy and annihilate this splendid American industry. In the words of the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], this bill proposes to substitute for the specific and ad valorem duties on wool and woolen goods in the Payne Tariff Act a system of ad valorem duties exclusively. In lieu of the present specific duty of 11 cents per pound on wool of class 1, to wit, fine wools, such as constitute about 75 per cent of the wools grown in the United States, and practically all the wool of the intermountain States; 12 cents a pound on wool of class 2, being long-fibered combing, such as Cotswold and Lincolnshire; and 3 to 7 cents a pound on coarse wool and hair, they propose an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent of the foreign price on wools of all classes.

The specific duties of 11, 12, 3, and 7 cents per pound on wool contained in the Payne tariff were equivalent in 1910, on the basis of the valuations given by importers on the importations of that year, to 47.60 per cent for class 1, 46.54 per cent for class 2 wools, both of which compete directly with domestic wools, and 38.79 per cent for class 3 wools, or an average of 44.31 per cent. So that, assuming that the values were correct and that the protection is in proportion to the ad valorem equivalent of the duties levied, the present bill reduces the duty, and hence the protection, on wools considerably more than half. The reduction on wools partly manufactured is still greater, so that the amount of protection afforded the American woolgrower under the present bill, assuming, for the sake of argument, that an ad valorem duty on wool can be collected without serious undervaluations, probably amounts to about one-third of the protection under the present law.

To get at the true situation, however, and as to the position of the Democratic Party upon the wool industry, we must go beyond this bill, because, as heretofore stated, it has been admitted by Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee upon the floor of this House that this duty is put upon wool for the simple purpose of bringing in some revenue and not with the idea of protecting the wool industry from the foreign importations, and that as soon as possible they would take that duty off and we will have free wool, as we did under the Wilson Act during the administration of President Cleveland. During the debate upon this bill in this Chamber on June 9, and when the distinguished Member from Massachusetts of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. PETERS] was addressing the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER], also a member of the Democratic Party, asked of the gentleman from Massachusetts the following question:

> Why is it that since the Wilson Act went out and the Dingley Act came in there has been a constantly growing increase in the price of wool as well as in the production of wool?

The RECORD will show that no satisfactory answer was given to this question. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] further in that debate stated that he believed that every pound of wool that is brought in here from abroad tends to decrease the price of wool here, because every pound of wool that is brought into this country will displace a pound of wool grown in this country, and, further, that under this bill the American woolgrower could not compete with a foreign grower of wool. These statements are from a Member of this House, a Democrat, who is from a woolgrowing State, and he knows something about the conditions, and what he speaks is the truth, which in substance is that if this bill should become a law the woolgrowing industry in America would be ruined.

They admit that the duty is lowered upon wool so as to encourage importations from other countries, which means of course that every pound of wool imported into this country from foreign countries displaces American-grown wool and will compel the woolgrowers in this country to sell their wool at about half to a third of what they now receive. Statistics and experience already show that American woolgrowers can not do this, and therefore the result would be that the sheep industry in this country would be ruined, and the 44,000 and more farmers in my State who raise sheep and produce wool, as well as the 608,000 and more farmers in the United States, would have to give up the business of sheep raising and the growing of wool because of no home market. The present duty of 11 cents a pound is as low as we can possibly put it and give the wool industry in this country an opporunity to exist, for let me call your attention to the fact that last year with this present tariff duty of 11 cents a pound on wool there was imported into this country 250,000,000 pounds of wool in the grease, which is almost one-half of the wool consumed in this country. If foreigners could import almost one-half of the wool used in this country last year with the present tariff of 11 cents, what could they be able to do with this tariff reduced to about 4 cents, as it is admitted it would be under this proposed Democratic bill. The answer is plain. They would import practically all of it. It is claimed by the framers of this bill that the importations of wool would increase if this bill should be enacted into a law. This means also that this increase importation will lower the price of wool raised in this country. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

PETERS], Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means, said in this House on June 9:

It is expected the price of raw wool will be lower, if this bill passes, than if the present duty of 11 cents a pound should remain on it.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not go into a detailed discussion of this bill as it relates to manufactures of wool, preferring to wait until the next regular session of this Congress in December, when we will have the best possible information gathered for our information and action. I refer to the Tariff Board, created by the last Congress of the United States, and which was given authority and the means for making a complete study, examination, and report on the woolen schedule. This Tariff Board is composed of experts of both political parties and their report will be based upon the best possible information, data, and figures concerning the growth of wool and the manufacture of woolen articles.

Gentlemen of this House who are advocating this present bill voted to create this Tariff Board for the purpose of getting the best possible information, and reporting it to Congress, concerning Schedule K, the woolen schedule; but now they have grown so wise, because of victory at the polls in the last election, that they think they are well able to legislate upon this most important schedule without further information. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to suspend action upon this bill till next December, when we will have this additional, important, and nonpartisan but scientific information, upon which we can then act with intelligence. I do not know whether this schedule is perfect, but I do know that if this bill is enacted into law it would make this portion of the tariff laws much more imperfect and cause wide disaster to wool and to the woolen manufacturing industries; and if this schedule is not perfect, then the only way we can make it perfect is by having this reliable information from the Tariff Board to enable us to intelligently change it. I thoroughly believe in a protective tariff, which will enable our manufacturers to pay American wages to American workmen. There was received by this Government as customs receipts for the last fiscal year the amount of $41,900,692 on imports of wool and manufactures of wool. When foreign countries can ship into this country wool and woolen products, on which they pay a tariff of that amount, it does not appear to me that the manufacturers and sheep growers of this country have any exorbitant protection. Is it not much better that this country should raise the sheep to furnish the wool for the manufacture of these goods, so that the manufacturers can make these goods here in America by the employment of American capital and American labor, instead of buying these goods from foreign manufacturers, made out of foreign-grown wool and manufactured with foreign labor? The American wage scale and standard of living are much different than in any foreign country. Everybody admits that the wages paid American workmen are higher than in any other country, and the only way the continued employment for American workmen can be had in this country is to give sufficient protection to our industries to make up for the difference in the goods manufactured in foreign countries with cheap labor and goods manufactured in this country with decent wage paid labor.

Mr. W. C. Jager, of St. Louis, an expert on wool and the woolen industry, writes me under date of June 12 to this effect: That the enactment of this bill into law would cause many mills to shut down, especially those in the Central West, as they would have extra expense in getting any foreign raw stock over the far eastern manufacturers. Besides, he says, the foreign manufacturers would swamp this country with their goods for the reason it does not give to our manufacturers protection sufficient to equalize the cost of production at home and abroad. After 24 years of business in this industry, says Mr. Jager, and knowing of the effects of the Wilson bill with free wool and the great disaster that followed its enactment into law, I should think the lesson should have been so well learned that no effort would be made again to repeat that experience, but protection would be given to our western mills so that they would have a chance at business. The western mills need this protection even more than do the New England mills. This gentleman's opinion of this bill and its effect upon the woolen industry is practically the same as that of all others in that section of the country who understand and know the truth about it.

To show the relative cost of the production of woolen goods at home and abroad and for the necessity of maintaining our standard of wages and living in this country, as opposed to that in the foreign countries, I call your attention to the following tables, prepared by Mr. Julius Forstmann, president of the Forstmann & Huffmann Co., located at Passaic, N. J. Mr. Forstmann is an expert on these matters and was formerly a member of the German Tariff Commission, and from my examination of the statistics and facts covered in these tables I am able to vouch for their substantial accuracy.

Comparative wages paid in woolen and worsted mills in the eastern part of the United States and in Germany.

[Figures for Germany represent in each case the average wage paid by leading firms in six of the principal woolen centers. The actual wages differ in each locality, but the amounts given below represent the average weekly wage.]

	Average wage per week of 56 working hours.		Ratio of United States wages to German.
	Eastern United States.	Germany.	
Worsted spinning (French system):[1]			*Per cent.*
Head wool sorter	$26.00	$9.60	271
Wool sorter	[2] 15.50	3.75	413
Wash-house overseer	22.00	6.10	361
Card-room overseer	22.00	6.35	341
Combing-room overseer	23.75	8.30	286
Drawing-room overseer	23.50	9.45	249
Mule-spinning overseer	21.00	9.05	232
Ring spinning overseer	22.00	8.95	246
Twisting and reeling overseer	21.00	8.50	247
Wool washers	8.20	4.90	167
Card strippers	8.20	5.10	161
Card feeders	7.60	4.35	175
Combs	7.25	2.90	250
Backwashers	5.90	2.80	211
Gill boxes	5.40	2.90	186
Drawing gills	5.70	3.00	190
Drawing frames	6.35	2.85	223
Roving frames	5.95	3.20	186
Mule spinners	13.00	6.40	203
Mule spinners' helpers	6.60	3.55	186
Ring spinners	5.85	3.25	180
Twisters	6.20	3.25	191
Winders and reelers	6.10	3.05	200
Cylinder-room overseers	11.20	5.90	190
Cylinder-room overseers' helpers	6.20	3.40	182
Needle setter overseers	11.20	4.35	257
Needle setter overseers' helpers	7.85	3.35	234
Engineer	20.00	10.40	192
Engineer helpers	11.20	6.40	175
Firemen overseer	12.60	7.30	173
Firemen overseer helpers	11.50	6.60	174
Yard laborers' overseer	16.00	7.75	206
Laborers, all around	8.80	4.70	187
Woolen spinning:			
Boss spinner	32.00	11.50	279
Foreman	18.00	5.50	327
Spinner	14.00	5.60	250
Spinner's helper	6.00	2.75	218
Card cleaner	8.50	4.20	202
Carder	8.50	3.70	230
Laborers for various kinds of work	8.00	3.60	222
Weaving:			
Boss weaver	25.00	10.15	246
Loom fixer	17.30	6.70	258
Warping-room foreman	18.30	7.00	261
Sizing-room foreman	17.00	6.30	270
Drawing-in foreman	15.30	6.30	243
Examining-room foreman	16.30	6.50	251
Weaver	9.20	4.65	198
Warper	8.30	5.05	164
Spooler	4.55	2.30	198
Sizer	8.00	4.60	174
Sizer's helper	7.45	3.60	207
Drawer in	9.40	5.00	188
Hander in	4.95	3.00	165
Warp twister	8.55	6.25	137
Examiner	9.50	6.00	158
Laborers	7.55	4.00	189
Dyeing:			
Head dyer	52.00	19.25	270
Dyehouse foreman	15.00	7.20	208
Dye-tub man	9.60	4.30	223
Rinsing-machine man	8.40	4.05	207
Finishing:			
Burling—			
Head overseer	23.00	8.30	277
Assistant overseer	17.00	6.50	262
Operatives	6.50	3.00	217
Scouring—			
Head overseer	18.00	9.20	196
Assistant overseer	12.00	6.40	188
Operatives	8.00	4.10	195
Carbonizing—			
Overseer	13.00	7.40	176
Operatives	8.00	3.90	205
Fulling—			
Overseer	23.00	8.75	263
Operatives	8.35	4.05	206
Teazling—			
Head overseer	22.00	9.45	233
Assistant overseer	18.00	6.35	283
Operatives	8.25	4.80	172
Steaming—			
Overseer	13.00	4.85	268
Operatives	9.90	4.45	222

[1] The Bradford system of worsted spinning is not used in Germany at all.
[2] The wool sorting in the United States is done principally by men and in Germany by women.

Comparative wages paid in woolen and worsted mills, etc.—Continued.

	Average wage per week of 56 working hours.		Ratio of United States wages to German.
	Eastern United States.	Germany.	
Drying:			*Per cent.*
Head overseer	$18.00	$6.65	271
Assistant overseer	13.00	4.45	292
Operatives	7.50	4.05	185
Shearing:			
Head overseer	23.00	8.50	271
Assistant overseer	20.00	6.75	296
Operatives	7.60	4.05	188
Pressing and glossing:			
Head overseer	21.00	7.20	292
Assistant overseer	13.00	6.70	194
Operatives	9.70	4.70	206
Examining:			
Head examiner	15.00	6.85	219
Examiners	12.00	5.20	231
Putting up:			
Overseer	16.00	5.50	291
Operatives	9.50	4.20	226

Development of woolen and worsted manufacturing in the United States, 1889–1909.

[Compiled from reports of United States Census Bureau.]

Years.	Total number of employees.	Total salaries and wages paid.	Average annual wages paid.	Value of products.	Remarks.
1889...	122,944	$44,359,114	$361	$212,772,629	Tariff law of 1883; McKinley bill 1890; Wilson bill 1894; Dingley bill 1897.
1899...	129,516	50,126,000	387	238,745,000	Dingley bill 1897.
1904...	146,322	61,433,000	419	307,942,000	Do.
1909[1].	168,239	79,214,000	478	419,826,000	Payne-Aldrich bill 1909.

[1] Preliminary figures issued by Census Bureau.

Increase in value of products 1904-1909 was greater than in any 10 years prior to 1900.

From these figures and facts it would appear that every thinking man would want to learn all possible about the woolen industry and await the report of the Tariff Board in December next before passing judgment upon the changes needed in this schedule. Mr. William W. Wood, a large manufacturer of woolen goods, in an address delivered before the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at Washington on February 1, 1911, said, in part, as follows:

Surely Schedule K ought to be regarded favorably by the American people. It protects the labor of the employees in the woolen industry; it contributes largely to the revenues of the country—its proper share—and it admits foreign manufactures of wool. What more could be hoped for?

Are these manufacturers so protected that they become creatures of inordinate wealth? You can count upon the fingers of one hand the wealthy woolen manufacturers of America. I know of no one in the woolen business who has retired because of wealth. The margins of profit are so close in this business that the conduct of the business might be compared with farming in New England as against that in the West. A successful farmer in New England must make his living right from the rocky, sterile soil with his knuckles, whereas the great fertile West produces abundantly and easily. The woolen manufacturer's competition at home is so great and the risks of the business are so great that his margin is as that of the New England farmer.

A suit of clothes bought for the President of the United States yields a profit to the man who made the cloth of not over 38 cents on that suit, and these figures have been challenged by manufacturers from Pennsylvania, who have stated to me that their profit was less than half of that. I have seen overcoats made from the cloth of my own mills, overcoats for boys, on which the net profit to us was less than 9 cents. I merely mention these figures to show you how closely fought the woolen manufacturing business is, and that the high price of clothing is not due to the tariff, nor yet to the manufacturer, but to the middle man, whose expenses are very great, and to the retailer, who also has large expenses to meet in the way of rentals and much advertising in the newspapers of the country. If the newspapers appreciated that feature, I doubt if they would raise a single letter against Schedule K.

After all, should we not give some attention to the retailer and find out what he pays the manufacturer for the woolen goods and what he sells them to the consumers for? I think we will find that that is where a great part of our money for woolen goods goes, and that we will find the facts to be similar to a Chicago man who paid $4 for a barrel of apples, and found tucked away among the apples the following note signed and addressed:

DEAR CONSUMER: I received 75 cents for this barrel of apples. Will you kindly let me know what you paid for them?

I take the following from the RECORD of the Sixty-first Congree, of date March 4, 1911, as bearing further on this point:

Mr. GAINES said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Gaines] is recognized.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Speaker, I have several times called the attention of the House to the fact that there is in this country no relation between the prices received by the original producers of articles and the prices which are paid by the purchasers—retail purchasers.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the leader of the minority, is not present in the Chamber at this time. I have on my desk a piece of blue serge sufficient to make a suit of the kind which usually costs the ultimate consumer from $40 to $60. I desire to present it to the leader of the minority [Mr. CLARK of Missouri], with the request—not upon any condition, but with the request—that he wear it while making some of his free-trade speeches. [Laughter and applause.]

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to read two letters which I have received in connection with this piece of cloth and the receipted bill for it.

BRISTOL, PA., *February 28, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH H. GAINES,
The House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR Mr. GAINES: The American Woolen Co. advises me by telephone that they have sent you from their New York offices 3½ yards of standard serge, at $1.28¼ per yard. This is the net mill price they receive for these goods. The weight per yard is 16 ounces. Receipted bill for this merchandise accompanies invoice.

I have taken up with them also the average price of this weight and quality of serge in the years 1905, 1906, and 1907, and they tell me the price was $1.35 on the same basis of figuring as $1.28¼ to-day; so you see that these goods are selling lower than during the three latter years of the Dingley bill period.

Very truly, yours,

JOSEPH R. GRUNDY,
Per H. M. C.

Then I have the following letter from the American Woolen Co.:

AMERICAN WOOLEN CO.,
New York, February 28, 1911.

Hon. JOSEPH H. GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Following instructions given us by Mr. Joseph R. Grundy, I beg to say that we are forwarding to you to-day by Adams Express, charges prepaid, 3½ yards of our 16-ounce serge made from half-blood stock, which we have billed at $1.28¼ per yard, the net price at which we are selling these goods to-day to the wholesale trade of the United States.

I beg also to send herewith receipted bills covering this purchase, which I understand was at your request.

Yours, very truly,

FRANCIS R. MASTERS,
Associate Selling Agent.

[Sold on condition that goods shall not be returned nor allowances made for any cause after 30 days from delivery nor after goods are sponged or cut. Address all claims and correspondence (except remittances) to American Woolen Co., of New York. Post-office box 100, Station D, New York City. Cable address, Wolenco, New York. A. B. C. code used. Remit only in New York or Boston funds to American Woolen Co., of Sew York, post-office box 381, Boston, Mass. Department 1A. Bill No. A6418. New York packing No. SD 10605. Season F 11.]

AMERICAN WOOLEN CO.,
New York, February 28, 1911.

Sold to Hon. Joseph H. Gaines, the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Shipped via Adams Express (paid), from New York. Terms: Net cash. Style, 716–5; color, M B; yards, 3½; price, $1.28¼; total, $4.49.

Paid American Woolen Co., of New York, February 28, 1911.

J. CLIFFORD WOODHULL, *Agent,*
Per C. P. LINDBLUM, *Cashier.*

I wish to make merely a few comments upon these facts: I repeat that the kind of woolen goods that the manufacturers of the country are receiving $1.28¼ for is the kind that enters into a suit of clothes for which the retail purchaser pays from $40 to $60, depending upon the reputation of the tailor.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GAINES. I will yield to the gentleman in due time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly called the attention of this House and endeavored, although ineffectually, to challenge the attention of the American people to the fact that the prices paid by retail purchasers throughout the country are in no case received by the protected manufacturers of the country. And that statement is true not alone with respect to the goods covered by Schedule K, the woolen schedule in the tariff law, but also with respect to agricultural products as well.

I shall content myself with one fact illustrating the truth of the latter fact. Directly beneath me, in the restaurant of this building, one may buy a Grimes's Golden apple from West Virginia, which, in my judgment, is the best apple grown in America—grown within 50 miles of this city, in Berkeley County. He must pay 5 cents for it; but the farmers of Berkeley County do not average 1 cent apiece for those apples. So that when we consider the relation between producers' price and retail price of commodities, whether farm products or manufactured articles, we find that the final price is always from 5 to 10 or even more times greater than the original price received by the producer.

Mr. FORNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAINES. Yes. Now I will yield and answer any question propounded by the gentleman.

Mr. FORNES. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the serge which he presents here from the American Woolen Manufacturing Co. sells at $1.28 a yard? Is that correct?

Mr. GAINES. One dollar and twenty-eight and a quarter cents is received by the mill.

Mr. FORNES. And does the gentleman say that the merchant tailors ask their customers, for making up that serge, anywhere from $40 to $50?

Mr. GAINES. From $40 to $60, depending upon the reputation of the tailor and where one makes the purchase.

Mr. FORNES. Is it not a fact, though, that the merchant tailors, as a rule, do not ask more than $25 for that price serge when made up into a suit?

Mr. GAINES. It is not a fact. The truth is that this sort of a suit would cost more than $25 at the ready-made clothing stores.

Mr. FORNES. I beg to differ with the gentleman on that point. Furthermore, is it not a fact that the same class of serge in 1905 sold at $1.10 net?

Mr. GAINES. I have just read the gentleman the information which shows that the price then was higher than now; that in 1905, 1906, and 1907 it was $1.35 a yard.

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

Mr. FORNES. Is it not a fact——

Mr. GAINES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the gentleman any information as to what the foreign price would be?

I ask purely for information. Has the gentleman any information as to what the foreign price for that same article would be?

Mr. GAINES. I have no information as to what the foreign price for this article is. My point is that the high prices paid by retail purchasers of the country do not in any case bear any relation to the prices received by the original producer, either the protected or the unprotected producer, in this country. The producers of manufactured articles and the farm producers do not receive the high prices paid at retail in this country. And the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the way to get relief for the ultimate consumers of this country is not to strike at the very small prices received by the producers, but to encourage the producers of America until there shall be a sufficient supply in the markets of the United States to reduce the price to the ultimate consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.]

So, Mr. Chairman, there are evidently other things than the tariff that contribute to the high cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, over 90,000,000 American people are interested in wool and the woolen schedule. The welfare of many thousands is affected by the adjustment of that schedule. Millions of dollars are involved in the woolen industry from the raising of the sheep to the placing of the wool upon the backs and in the homes of the American people. The present schedule and rates have been substantially in existence since the Dingley Act of 1897, and, while there appears to be some needed changes in this schedule, we can well afford to wait until we have the complete report of the Tariff Board, created by the last Congress, before taking action. The time is not far off and we ought to settle this schedule on a scientific and economic basis and thereby give stability and peace for years to come to this great American industry, and not let politics, political supremacy, and ambition for public office, sway our minds and judgments against the honest and fair discharge of our duties as public servants of 93,000,000 American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP].

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Chairman, it has been with a great deal of pleasure during this debate that we have listened to the great solicitude expressed by the membership of the Republican Party in this House for that great commoner in the Democratic Party, William J. Bryan. Let me say to our Republican friends that whenever and wherever the Democratic Party gathers around the council table for conference his seat will be in the future, as it has been in the past, at the head of the table. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He has not only converted to his policies seven and one-half million Democrats who follow him as their idol, but from the tone of this debate it seems that he has converted the leaders of the Republican Party as well. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was somewhat surprised to-day at the speech of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], late chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It is true that he expressed his sentiments in language a little more emphatic than parliamentary, but we must remember that in the great solitude which surrounded him he was the only Republican, the only Member on that side of this Chamber, who dared to defend the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill throughout this entire debate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was also somewhat surprised at the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] yesterday, who came to the defense of the Woolen Trust, as he did to the defense of the Boot and Shoe Trust two or three weeks ago.

I want to call your attention for a moment to what he said, and if there is any man upon that side of the House who doubts there is a Woolen Trust which ought to be dealt with by legislation on this floor, I should like him to take the time after I am through to make his defense. The gentleman from Massachusetts said this:

The amount of capital in the year 1909 invested in the woolen and worsted manufacturing industry was $419,000,000. The capital at that time of the American Woolen Co. consisted of $35,000,000 of preferred stock and $29,000,000 of common stock. When the company was organized there was issued $20,000,000 of preferred stock and $29,000,000 of common stock. It was the customary method of organizing corporations of that kind 10 years ago. The estimated value of the plants was submitted to the auditors and a report was made as to the condition of those plants and their value. It was estimated at that time that the plants and machinery and real estate and other things that went to make up the property of that company had a value of $25,000,000.

Ten years ago worth $25,000,000, and with that amount of property it capitalized for $49,000,000; $20,000,000 of which was preferred stock and $29,000,000 was common stock, the latter of which, we are informed by the gentleman, was sold at from 25 to 35 cents on the dollar. That such stock never had paid a dividend and was never intended to pay one. For one, I attack such business methods as unjust and unfair to the general public. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How much influence this organization had on the entire industry of the country, and what influence it had in fixing the price on all the production of the country is a matter to be considered in determining the ethics of the transaction.

When he made his defense I said to him, and I repeat it now, that if that is the kind of finance you justify, the difference between you and myself is that you justify it and I condemn it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, why, I ask, should any corporation, trust, or other organization be permitted to sell stock which is never to be remunerative and, when sold, never intended to be? And how such conduct can be defended as legitimate is something I can not understand. It is indefensible. It is one of the many creations of high finance which has been exploiting the unsuspecting public and making a golden reward by plundering the frugality of an innocent people. It was capitalized at the beginning, according to the distinguished gentleman's statement, for $24,000,000 more than the estimated value of its property. It played both ends against the middle by first selling $24,000,000 worth of capital stock more than the estimated value of its property at a net profit; and, second, it was enabled to sell its product under the protective tariff at a larger price than it otherwise could have done. How, under such methods of financiering, could anyone be surprised at its rapid and sudden rise in wealth? It turned nothing into wealth, and on inflated values derived fabulous incomes. It has from the day of its organization controlled the woolen and worsted industry, and now in 10 years the value of the property invested in those lines of industry amounts to $419,000,000. This is an evidence, when properly managed, of what the tariff, the trusts, and high financiering can do, and the poor consumer and the unsuspecting investor must foot the bill. Is not this indefensible? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Such methods of dealing with the innocent public deserve censure, and should be prohibited by proper legislation, strictly enforced, to the end that integrity in business affairs may be upheld and confidence maintained. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I was much astonished at the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] who has just preceded me, who has prophesied all kinds of disaster, if this bill passes, to the sheep and woolen industry in this country. In the light of past experiences he surely has no foundation for his prophetic visions. I ask him if conditions could possibly be worse, be more disastrous, in the sheep and wool industries than they have been under the McKinley, Dingley, and Payne tariff laws, the highest ever known in the history of tariff legislation? It has suffered more and witnessed harder times than it ever did under any other, as the statistics of the trade conclusively show. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is well sometimes to consult statistics in order that facts may be correctly stated. From the statistics furnished by the Commerce and Labor Department of this Government, we had in 1910, in round numbers, 7,000,000 less sheep in this country than we had in 1904. For six years the number dwindled at the rate of more than a million a year, and during all this time the Dingley bill was in force with the highest tariff on wool the country ever had. If a high tariff encourages this industry, as gentlemen insist, upon what hypothesis do they explain the existing conditions, as the facts show them to be? The truth is they can furnish no explanation consistent with the position they take. The two are irreconcilable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] What is true of the sheep industry is also true of the price of wool. The Wilson bill which put wool on the free list was not passed until August 24, 1894, and the woolen schedule did not take effect until January, 1895, and yet, in 1893, when the tariff on wool was the highest ever known up to the time of the passage of the Dingley law in 1897, wool was the lowest it had ever been known in the last 40 years. It sold that year for 14 cents a pound, and again under the Dingley law a still higher tariff on wool, the producer in 1908 sold it for 13 cents a pound, the lowest ever known. I challenge any Republican on this floor to show during the existence of the Wilson bill, from 1895 to 1897, while wool was on the free list, a time when wool sold as low as it has under the McKinley and Dingley tariff laws. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He will search the market reports in vain for a single instance.

By the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], I hold in my hand a letter from R. A. Beatty, of Huron County, Ohio, in which he states, as a wool producer, that he sold his wool in 1893 for 14 cents a pound, and three years ago, in 1908, he sold it for 13 cents a pound. He erroneously states, however, it was on the free list in 1893. It was then sold under the high-tariff duties of the McKinley law. It never while on the free list sold for such low figures as these. He, an Ohio farmer, fears no lower prices than these, he says, if it is free of all duty; and further says, if a tariff would increase the price of raw wool to the farmer, he loses it all, and more, too, on the increased price of clothing. And so he does. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]—the minority leader—at the beginning of this debate turned to the Democratic Members and said, in a dramatic manner, "Are you going to tax men's clothing, women's dresses, and children's hats?" By such a question addressed to us I am unable to understand what he means. An answer sufficient to him is: The extravagance of his party during its 16 years of power has made it necessary for us to meet the public expenditures under his party's appropriations; that we tax these articles of necessity, as much as we regret to do so. The two billion-dollar Congresses under the administration of the Republican Party, which exploited the public Treasury and depleted its revenues by unnecessary expenditures, makes such a course unavoidable. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But let me say further in reply, we are going to reduce the tax on all these articles more than one-half what his party two years ago fixed it; and I want to know if he has enough concern in their welfare to vote with us on the adoption of this measure? If he is as much interested as he professes, he should vote accordingly, and show his interest by his actions as well as by his words. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again our answer to him is in behalf of these people; we are going to reduce the tax his party fixed on their wearing apparel so they will understand the Democratic Party legislates in their interest and the Republican Party against it; we are going to reduce the tax on cloth, out of which the poor man's clothing is made, from 160 per cent to from 25 to 40 per cent; on women's dress goods from 150 per cent to from 30 to 45 per cent; on blankets from 160 per cent to 30 per cent. We are going to reduce the tax on all the woolen schedule—the odious Schedule K, the schedule denounced by President Taft as indefensible—from 90 per cent to 42 per cent. We are going to revise it downward and keep our promise to the people and not violate it as did the Republican Party when it passed the Payne bill. Will the gentleman from Illinois assist in this humanitarian work or will he continue his tactics of obstruction? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We say to him that for 14 years his party has been, at the behest of the Woolen Trust, taxing cloth at from 80 to 160 per cent, women's dress goods at from 78 to 150 per cent, blankets at from 85 to 166 per cent, flannels from 90 to 150 per cent, and that he then exhibits the courage to ask of us such a question is beyond our comprehension. During this time he has seen the farmers' wool go down in price, the cost of his clothing go up, and the quality of his goods yearly get poorer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me ask, Are the Republicans in this standing with the President for a revision of this schedule downward—he has said it is indefensible—or are they against him? The people would like to know. What is the answer? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Again, others in this debate have asserted with an air of confidence that the present high tariff duties should be maintained in order to enable the operators to pay the high wages now paid employees in these industries, and then ask, Are you going to reduce the American wage earner in these industries to the level of the foreign employee? I answer that that has already been done, and we are striving to raise it to higher levels. Let us see what the facts are on this important matter and expose the fallacy of the Republicans on this subject.

In the woolen and worsted industry William Whitman, one of the greatest manufacturers of this line, recently testified that the American male weavers received 21 cents an hour, or for a day of 10 hours $2.10, or $12.60 per week; spinners, 12 cents an hour, or $1.20 per day, or $7.20 per week; dyers get $9 per week; loom fixers, $15 per week; combers, $7.20 per week; card strippers, $7.80 per week; and burlers, $6.60 per week. Are these the princely wages for which the Republicans levied an average duty of 90 per cent for owners of the woolen industry to pay their employees? How do these look under the conditions of the high cost of living brought under the rule of the Republican Party to a man who has a family to support and educate? And yet the high tariff, according to the Republican position, is levied solely for the benefit of the laboring man's wages. How they can have the audacity to make such a claim in view of the facts is beyond the comprehension of any reasonable mind. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What do foreign wage earners receive in this line of industry? In Bulletin No. 86, of date January 10, 1910, issued by the Department of Commerce and Labor, we find our department gives the following facts, which is a complete answer on the subject: Workshop wage earners in dress goods in England average $12.39 a week; shirt makers, $7.26 a week; ready-made clothing, $8.15 per week; boots and shoes, $6.98 per week; silk goods, $8.33 per week; straw goods, $8.90 per week; dyeing, $7.18; 26 per cent of those engaged in making clothing made $14.60 per week; 28 per cent made from $12.17 to $14.60 per week; 15 per cent from $9.73 to $12.17 per week. From these incontestable figures it clearly appears that the English laborer is fully as well, if not better, paid than our American laborer. England in this branch of industry is our greatest and most formidable competitor. In view of these facts, does the manufacturer in this country need a high tariff to enable him in this industry to compete with his foreign competitor? Who would dare say he does?

Now, in these comparisons we have not taken into account the efficiency of our labor, which produces almost three times as much daily as the foreign labor, and yet receives just about the same wages. No distinction is made in price and no reward is given for its great superiority in this respect. The truth is we can and do produce more in the same length of time and for less than any other country in the world. Labor knows it and labor can not be flimflammed longer on the levy of the tariff for its benefit. Labor in this country has never been benefited by protection, but the American manufacturers have grown rich under it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the other day the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] inquired, "Are you going to place our high-priced labor on a par with the labor of free-trade England and shut down our industries and turn our high-priced labor out of employment?" A sufficient answer to that question is to reply that England is not a free-trade country; it is a tariff for revenue only, and it levies its tariff on noncompetitive articles, while our country levies its tariff on competitive articles, and the difference is it can change its tariff policy without interrupting business for this reason, while we can not. This marks the distinction. Again, let me say to him, as a further answer to that part of his inquiry about shutting down the industries and turning high-paid labor out of employment, it is a stereotyped expression coined for the specific use of high-protection advocates in every country in the world. In the recent election for the House of Commons in England, the paramount issue was the tariff question, and the advocates of high protection advocated a change in their tariff policy, and as a reason gave that is was necessary in order to prevent the cheap-labor-made products of the United States of America from being imported and shutting down their industries and turning their high-paid labor out of employment. This argument is used everywhere by the advocates of a tariff for protection, as a means to sustain a system, that its beneficiaries may plunder and extort from the consumers unearned profits, and multiply predatory wealth. It has served its time, its unrighteous purpose; and intelligent people, whether in this or any other country, will soon expose its fallacy and repudiate its hypocrisy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the advocates of a tariff for protection's sake have most earnestly asserted on this floor the proposition that without a protective tariff our manufacturing industries, because of the difference between the wages here and abroad, can not compete with foreign manufacturers and will shut down our industries and turn our labor out of employment because of the importation of foreign-made products. This contention, if it be true, presents a serious proposition, and one demanding serious consideration. To all who assert such a doctrine I deny its truth, and assert the facts show there is no foundation for such a charge. On the contrary, I affirm there is no danger of such a result and that the statistics abundantly sustain my position. We are now competing abroad, and if we can pay the freight on our products across continents and oceans and sell them at the doors of foreign factories and in the homes of foreign labor as we are now doing, then there is no danger but that we can do so at home. It does not cheapen the cost to the consumer of an article to pay the freight on it thousands of miles. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is the familiar plea of the great captains of industry and their satellites, but we meet and refute it with the facts as published from department records.

The Leather Trust tells us if the tariff on its products is removed it can no longer operate, but must close down its

plants and turn its labor out of employment, because conditions in other countries are more favorable than here, and for this reason, without a duty for protection, it can not compete with them. For answer to this contention, the customhouse reports conclusively show we are now successfully competing with foreign countries in leather goods. Take the year 1910 as a fair example. We imported $114,053 worth of boots and shoes and exported $12,408,575 worth. We imported no harness, but exported $650,000 worth. We imported uppers of the value of $3,000,000 and exported $20,000,000 worth. We imported band and sole leather of the value of $49,000 and exported $6,887,000 worth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is clearly shown by these statistics that we are competing abroad and selling there cheaper than the same products are sold here at home. The conclusion necessarily is that to remove the duty will not shut down any industry, nor turn labor out of employment, nor reduce wages. Again, the same assertion has been made here, and apparently repeated with confidence in its correctness, with reference to the manufacture of agricultural implements, which is also refuted by the statistics. Last year we manufactured $92,000,000 worth of these products. We imported none and exported $25,000,000 worth, the same going to every civilized country in the world, and after paying the transportation charges abroad, sold them there for less than they were sold to our people at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Meat Trust, a giant monopoly, asserts unless a high tariff is maintained on its products, because of conditions in other countries, it can not operate here, and yet last year we imported no canned beef and exported $1,645,000 worth; in meat and its products we imported none and exported $160,000,000 worth.

The lumber kings are industrious in their zeal for a high duty on lumber, and yet last year the report of the revenue officials shows that we imported lumber of the value of $22,000,000 and exported $60,000,000 worth, exhausting the depleted supply in this country, and against which the protectionist has opposed all efforts of public conservation that this valuable product may not be exhausted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, the great iron and steel operators say that without a high tariff to protect their productions they can not operate and must surrender the business to foreign producers, and yet last year the revenue officials report that we imported $22,000,000 worth of these products and exported to foreign countries $144,000,000 worth. Notice some of the items of this industry. Steel rails, imports, $133,000; exports, $8,324,000. Structural iron and steel, imports, $335,000; exports, $6,954,000. Wire, round iron and steel, imports, $872,000; exports, $8,482,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The miller who fears that cheap foreign-mill products will injure his business appeals to Congress to levy a high duty on flour, and yet last year the revenue office shows that we imported $446,000 worth of flour and exported $51,000,000 worth to be sold in foreign countries in competition with all the world.

The coal operator tells the miner it is necessary to have a high duty on bituminous coal, or foreign mines will drive them out of business, yet last year we imported coal of this quality valued at $3,498,000 and exported $23,000,000 worth and sold it in competition with the coal of all the world.

Sir, we can safely appeal to the customhouse reports for an answer which will refute every contention made by the advocates of a high protective system, save the indefensible one that it creates a monopoly and enables it to extort unearned profits from the consumer, which is a self-evident fact.

The "captains of industry" demand protection because they assert that the conditions of other countries as to labor and raw materials are such that we can not compete, and because of these advantages, without protection, they are able to close down our industries and turn our labor out of employment. Our statistics show that last year our manufacturers exported products of the value of $671,000,000, an enormous amount, and sold them in the markets of every civilized country in the world. We produced sufficient to supply our wants, and this vast surplus we sent abroad to the doors of foreign plants, paid the freight, and sold them in the homes of foreign labor cheaper than they were sold at home. It will not do to say in the face of these irrefutable facts that we can not compete at home with foreign goods made by foreign labor. We can not only do so at home but we are paying the freight on our goods across the continents and oceans and are competing with them in their homes, selling as cheap or cheaper than they sell their own products. If we can do so abroad, as we are doing every year, we surely can do it here at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a familiar plea of all protectionists that a high tariff should be levied for the benefit of labor as a shield from competition with the product of the cheap labor of other countries, and for 20 years this has been the slogan of their battle cry, until it is worn threadbare. The employer everywhere seeks labor as cheap as he can procure it. He pays no more than he is compelled to; he reduces wages on the slightest provocation and upon the flimsiest pretense. It is not the importation of cheap labor-made goods that menaces the wages of American labor, but the importation of this labor itself, supplanting our labor in our factories at home, which is yearly turning our laborers out of employment. For more than a decade foreign labor, under the direction of giant monopolies, has been pouring into our country at the rate of a million a year, taking the places of our laborers at less wages, gathering American wage remuneration and sending it back to their native country in large sums, annually diminishing the circulating capital of this country, all for the enhancement of the trusts, combines, and monopolies, under the management of the great "captains of industry." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, the beneficiaries of the system have appealed to the people to sustain its high duties because it would open the mills and create a home consumption for our surplus production. The theory that we should produce all we consume and consume all we produce is a fallacy, and if continually practiced would forever bar the way to the enrichment of our people and Nation.

If an individual, throughout his entire life, would produce all he consumed and consume all he produced he would be no better off when life ended than when it began. He had lived and that was all. What is true of the individual is true of the Nation. The wealth of both is only increased when a people produce enough to supply themselves and have a surplus left to sell to other individuals or nations, and this surplus registers the net profit for the period it covers. It is what makes them better off, increases their wealth, expands their commerce, and multiplies their prosperity. There was a time in the early period of protection when it drew capital to the country and multiplied wealth, encouraged commerce, and inspired thrift; but that time has passed. It was invoked to sustain infant industries; its advocates championed it for no other purpose and promised when that mission was fulfilled it should be abandoned, as its purpose would be completed.

But greed seized and usurped the reason, dethroned the conscience, and it was turned into a machine of oppression against the consuming masses of the most-favored country in all the world. It was converted into an instrument for extorting unearned profits and for founding combines, trusts, and monopolies, to suppress competition and paralyze development. Our factories are turning out yearly $15,000,000,000 worth of wares, produced by the brawn and brain of a progressive and intelligent people. They are made from $8,000,000,000 of raw material, with $3,000,000,000 of labor. Labor is remunerated by only one-fifth of what it produces. Four billion dollars is the net profit on an $11,000,000,000 investment. This is attractive. The division is unequal, it is unfair, and it is no wonder there is discontent. Under this distribution labor and capital are not sharing equally. Capital is protected, labor is not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The former is spared competition, while the latter is open to the competition of the world. It is for the equality of both we plead in order that contentment may prevail and prosperity abide. Sir, an unshackled commerce encourages all and stimulates the growth of each. Protection which denies the markets to all must necessarily discourage expansion of trade. The period of exclusiveness is passed if we are to find markets abroad for our surplus. Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Act less than two years ago more than one-half billion dollars of American capital has been withdrawn from the marts of our home trade and been taken to foreign countries by our manufacturers to build plants abroad, because our high-tariff wall excluded foreign goods from our markets; the foreigner retaliated and refused to buy our goods, and hence our people withdrew their capital from their business here and invested it in business abroad. Protection is doing this daily. Under the protective policy of the Republican Party as now enforced the trend of capital is to flow abroad instead of accumulating and multiplying the wealth of the people here at home who created it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has been asserted by some during the course of this debate that an increase of tariff duties on any given article does not increase the price of the article to the consumer. If this be true, then the levying of protective tariff duties is of no benefit whatever to the producer. Its sole and only purpose is to enable the producer to increase the price and avoid competition from the producers of other countries. If it is added to the laborer's wage, as some contend, then it increases the cost of production, which is added to the selling price which the consumer has

to pay for it. If it does not increase the price, then it is without justification, and there is no tenable ground for its defense.

Again, some have asserted the higher the duty on any article, the cheaper the article. It can be safely said that nobody ever made such an argument for the purpose of convincing any person of its truth. It contradicts itself. With propriety, we might ask how high it would be necessary to fix the duty on an article in order that consumers might procure it free of charge. One proposition is no more absurd than the other; one is equally as preposterous as the other. [Great applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, my time is rapidly passing, and I can not let this occasion pass without paying some attention to some charges preferred during the course of this debate about some familiar matters of current history. I have heard it asserted by some overenthusiastic friends of protection that the panic of 1893 was produced by Democratic legislation and Democratic policies. Will anyone point out the enactment of a single line of Democratic legislation prior to the panic of 1893 for the basis of such a charge? I pause for some one to tell this House what legislation of the Democratic Party, which came into power March 4, 1893, caused the terrible panic of that year, paralizing business, shutting down industries, turning labor out of employment, and spreading desolation from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf. There was none. The McKinley tariff law was in force then, which levied the highest duties ever known up to that time. The Wilson bill was not passed until the latter part of August, 1894, and did not become effective until October of that year. Now, how could a law not passed until August, 1894, and taking effect October, 1894, produce a panic in April, 1893? Will some wiseacre tell us?

The panic came under the high McKinley tariff law, under the enforcement of Republican policies, just as the panic of 1908 came under the Dingley law and Republican policies. Just as every panic has occurred in this country, under Republican policies and high protection, and in both, the Democratic Party was called into power to relieve the country of the business situation into which the policies of the Republican Party had plunged it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sir, I was amused to hear my colleague [Mr. CRUMPACKER] say on the floor of this House a short time ago that the panic of 1908 was of such little consequence that it did not affect to any considerable extent the business of the country. How woefully mistaken any man is when he flatters himself with such a thought. The commercial agencies by their reports show that the business failures for the first 18 months in the panic of 1908 exceeded those for the first 18 months in the panic of 1893—$146,000,000 in amount, laying desolation throughout the length and breadth of the land, wrecking enterprise, stifling trade, and paralyzing business in every commercial mart of the country.

In 1893, while the panic raged with its most frightful consequences, there was no time but what an individual could go to his bank and draw out his own money, but not so in 1908. All over the country banks were compelled to lay an embargo on this right and refused to let the people withdraw their own funds and deposits from banks.

The public were compelled to establish soup houses in every metropolitan city in the land, and the laborers lined the public highways in quest of employment, but found it not.

Four hundred and fifty thousand freight cars stood idle on the numerous sidetracks of the various railroads of the country with their wheels rusting on the rails—a sufficient number which, if coupled together in one train, would have made a line reaching the entire distance from New York City to the city of St. Louis.

These are some of the features of the panic of 1908. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The foundations were razed from under fortunes and the wealthy became poor, and the poor made more desolate. [Applause.] But we have been told here that the success of the Democratic Party in 1892 at the election frightened the business of the country and this caused the panic of 1893. I deny it. No man of all the great men who have occupied the White House was held in as high esteem by the business men and business interests as was Grover Cleveland. The business men of the country supported him as a candidate, voted for him, and by their votes he was elected. They stood by him loyally, and if you will examine the vote of the country that year you will find the gains were made from the business sections and were made from the business men of the country. These are the facts and I challenge any man to successfully deny them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why should business, I mean legitimate business, fear the Democratic Party and its policies? The Democratic Party and its policies are now and always have been for the encouragement of every legitimate business, favoring safe and sound business principles which foster and stimulate genuine prosperity—a prosperity for all, and not a prosperity for a few, at the expense of the many. It favors a prosperity which like the dews of a generous heaven fall on all alike. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Again, we have been told here by the apostles of protection that business fears the action of this Democratic House. I deny it. From whence do men who so speak get their information? The public press, the independent magazines, the people approve our course, are commending our action, and are sending encouraging messages indorsing our progress and bidding us God speed in our good work. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are responding to their wishes by diligent action and conservative work, and it is meeting their approval. Tell me that business does not approve our policy, and I ask all such where did the majority in this House come from if not from the great business sections of the country? Can you point to a business center in the whole country but what made some changes from a Republican to a Democratic Member of this House. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us examine and see how the matter stands. Maine is a great business State, she had a solid Republican membership in the Sixty-first Congress; in this, the Sixty-second Congress, her delegation is equally divided in both the Senate and the House. It now has its first Democrat in the Senate since 1853. So much for that. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Rhode Island with a solid Republican representation in the last Congress comes here now in this with a divided delegation, half and half in this House. Does any one deny it to be a business State? [Applause.] In the last Congress Connecticut had a solid Republican delegation, but in this House a Democrat responds to the roll when it is called. That is a business State, too. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The great Empire State of New York, a business State, in the last Congress had 11 Democrats and 26 Republicans. The representation in this House is reversed; it stands 22 Democrats, 1 Independent, and 14 Republicans. Greater New York City, the greatest business metropolis in the country, if not in the world, sends one lonely Republican of all its membership. Who elected them if it were not the business men? And the business men of that State took a Republican out of the Senate and sent a Democrat in his place. [Great applause.] Now, who would dare say business was afraid of the Democratic Party? The great city of Buffalo had a divided delegation in the last House, but it is solidly Democratic now. Does this look like business was afraid of Democratic policies? I think not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The State of New Jersey comes next. It is the home of more big business institutions than any other State in the Union, and it has a membership of 10 in this House. In the last Congress it had 3 Democrats and 7 Republicans; it reversed exactly its representation, and now has 7 true and loyal Democrats and 3 Republicans. It also sent into retirement from the Senate a Republican and put in his place as true and loyal a Democrat as ever lived, the Hon. JAMES E. MARTINE. Does this indicate that business is afraid of the Democratic Party? [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

West Virginia is a great business State. In the last Congress it had a solid Republican delegation; to-day it has four good and true Democrats and only one lonely Republican to answer the roll call. It also sent two Democrats to the Senate. Business interests in that State it seems are not afraid of the Democratic Party. [Applause.] Ohio, the home of the President, is one of the greatest business States in the Union. In the last Congress it had 8 Democrats and 13 Republicans, and both Senators were Republicans. In this Congress it has 1 Democratic Senator, 16 Democrats in the House and only 5 Republicans. Does anyone believe that the business men of Ohio fear the Democratic Party? I do not. [Great applause.]

Pennsylvania and Illinois, both great business States, and from their business centers have increased their Democratic representation as an indorsement of their faith in Democratic policies. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A MEMBER. How about Indiana?

Mr. CULLOP. Indiana is all right. Just keep your eye on it. Two Democratic Senators are credited now to Indiana and 12 out of the 13 Members of this House are Democrats, and we expect to have a solid delegation in the next House. We will sweep the Republican Party off of the map at the next election, and we are anxious for the contest. [Great applause on the Democratic side.] Do we need more or better proof than this that business indorses our policies, inaugurated them, and approves their adoption? We are opposed by a hostile Senate

and Executive, and can not carry them fully into complete execution. However, we should not falter, but adopt Democratic policies as far as we can and give the people as much relief as possible from the burdens imposed on them by 14 years of unbroken rule by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Since this Democratic House convened business conditions all over the country have improved, as evidence of confidence in our ability to solve correctly the great business questions with which we are to deal. Since this bill was presented to this House the price of raw wool has advanced 5 cents a pound. What better evidence could be produced for the approval of our course by the business interests of the country? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, my Democratic brethren, we must falter not, but proceed to perform the duty for which we were commissioned by the people at the last election. We are on trial, and thus far the verdict of popular approval commends our course. Greater responsibilities will fall to us if we but do our duty well. The final battle is to be fought next year, and if we but follow the mandate of the people in the prosecution of our work a sweeping victory will be the reward. A united party can accomplish much, but divided we can never succeed; harmony of forces and harmony of action will assure a complete triumph. The time and opportunity are both present and let us seize and use them, for it would be cruel to waste either. The enemy is on the retreat, its ranks are broken, its fortifications are down, its legions are scattered and fighting each other, and certain victory is assured us if we will enter the approaching contest with a determination which the occasion inspires. Choose for the leadership in the great contest of 1912 any of the great men whose names illumine our party's history; adopt a platform of principles which shall declare the true Democratic doctrine, free of all alliances with special interests, and no power on earth can the opposition invoke which will disturb or embarrass our march to certain victory or the triumph of our cause. The marshaled hosts of Democracy are in the field ready for the contest, and impatiently await the command to engage in the conflict for the triumph of our cause—the people's cause—the application of Democratic principles to the administration of national affairs and the restoration of business to a safe and sound basis, in order that prosperity may be restored to all the people. In such a contest three-fourths of the States in this Union will indorse our conduct by giving their electoral vote to the Democratic candidates. [Loud and prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak upon this bill. I intended merely to content myself with voting for it. I am not a partisan upon tariff questions, and in my optimism I had hoped that the Democracy, as you say, fresh from the people, with the mandate of that people in their hands, would at least leave out of this bill that timeworn and threadbare provision, "made wholly or in part of wool," a provision which makes the schedule applicable to everything with even the slightest part of wool in it, from wool-lined rubber boots to wool-upholstered furniture, from all-wool worsted clothing to mercerized cotton with wool polka dots. But I recognize how futile it is to say anything in the face of a militant but caucus-tied and gagged majority, pledged to vote down any amendment, however meritorious.

I recognize that nothing that I could say or that any man can say will change by the addition or subtraction of 1 per cent any of the schedules of this bill; and I rise now only for the purpose of presenting certain tables, which I have prepared with some labor and burning of the midnight oil, and which I am optimistic enough to think will prove of interest to the Members of this House and to the country.

In preparing these tables I have taken as a basis the statistical tables prepared by Samuel S. Dale, editor of the Textile World Record, and which were presented by the late Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, as the basis of his remarks upon the wool schedule in the tariff debate of two years ago in the United States Senate. Dolliver was a star among the actors in the drama of life. His light has gone out. But the radiance of his intellect still sheds its brilliance upon this subject. [Applause.] Time dulls the enthusiasm for ideals and dims the luster of the memory of man, but Dolliver's contributions to tariff knowledge, perpetuated in the morocco-bound volumes of the RECORD, still shed a light upon the pathway of him who would travel the intricate mazes of the wool schedule. [Applause.] So I feel that I need make no apology in basing the tables which I present upon the analysis and statistics presented by Senator Dolliver in the debate of two years ago.

Mr. Dale, who made the analysis of the cloth which are the foundation of my figures, was for many years the manager of a woolen mill, and for many more has been intimately connected with the woolen industry. The accuracy of his figures has not and, I think, can not be successfully contested. For the purpose of ascertaining the exact relation between the compensatory and protective duty under the Dingley and Payne bills he made an analysis of 11 different woolen cloths, determining by that analysis the exact proportion of grease wool, shoddy, and cotton in each. With this exact knowledge of the contents of the cloth in wool, shoddy, and cotton he was able to determine the exact proportion of compensatory and protective duty provided by the tariffs of the wool schedule of the Dingley and Payne laws. I will print the analysis made by Mr. Dale, together with his conclusions as to the amount of compensatory and protective duty upon each of these woolen cloths provided by the Payne and Dingley laws.

Taking Mr. Dale's analysis of each of these cloths as a basis, I have prepared some tables showing the amount of compensatory and protective duties upon each, applying thereto the duties provided by the pending bill. In order to conform to the change in the pending bill from the specific basis provided by the Payne law to the ad valorem basis provided by the pending bill, it was necessary to determine upon some basis of value for the grease wool and shoddy contained in the cloth. In ascertaining that basis I thought it was fair to take the average import price of wool in the grease and have taken as that basis 24 cents a pound, the average import price of raw wool in the year 1909; and as a basis of value for the shoddy I have taken 12 cents per pound which I believe is slightly in excess of the average foreign price of shoddy. It is, of course, true that there would be some slight deviation from this value in the cloth by reason of the fact that in making the cloth the price of the wool might be slightly more or less than these figures. But taking an average of the results of these figures upon 11 different pieces of cloth necessarily results in a fairly accurate conclusion as to the actual compensatory and protective duties provided by the various tariffs levied by this bill. Now, I do not intend to make an explanation in detail of the analysis of these tables as they speak very largely for themselves, but I do desire to make a brief explanation of one of them as a demonstration that will apply to all.

I refer now to piece A207 cotton warp casket cloth. This piece runs 15½ ounces per yard, 68 inches wide; 10,000 yards at 50 cents per yard; 9,688 pounds of cloth. This cloth will require in its manufacture 2,375 pounds of cotton warp, 1,600 pounds of grease wool, 1,125 pounds of raw cotton, and 9,563 pounds of shoddy. The Dingley duty upon this cloth, figured upon the basis of 4 pounds of grease wool, at a tariff duty of 11 cents a pound, to 1 pound of cloth was 44 cents per pound on the cloth and 50 per cent ad valorem.

Applying this basis to the cloth mentioned, we have 9,688 pounds of cloth at 44 cents duty per pound, amounting to $4,262.72, or an equivalent ad valorem of 85.2 per cent, and in addition a duty of 50 per cent on $5,000, the value of the cloth, or $2,500, making a total compensatory and protective duty of $6,672.72, equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 135.2. Now, applying the Dingley duty to the actual amount of compensatory duty required by the contents of the cloth in grease wool and shoddy gives the following result:

One thousand six hundred pounds of grease wool at 11 cents per pound—the Dingley tariff—amounts to $1,760, and, adding a compensatory duty of 5 cents per pound upon the 9,563 pounds of shoddy contained in the cloth, amounting to $478.15, gives us an actual required compensatory duty amounting to $2,238.15, equivalent to 44.8 per cent ad valorem; leaving an actual protection upon the cloth, valued at $5,000, of $4,524.57, equivalent to 90.4 per cent ad valorem.

Now, I propose to take the same piece of cloth and apply to its dutiable contents the rates of duty provided by this bill. Figuring the dutiable contents of the cloth, 1,600 pounds of grease wool at 24 cents a pound, gives the grease wool value in the cloth at $384; taking 9,563 pounds of shoddy at 12 cents per pound gives us the value of the shoddy contents of the cloth at $1,147.56; then, applying a 20 per cent ad valorem rate provided in this bill to the $1,531.56 in value of its dutiable contents, gives us an actual required compensatory duty amounting to $306.20, or an ad valorem equivalent on the value of the cloth of 6.12. The duty of 40 per cent on the value of the cloth at $5,000 amounts to $2,000, leaving an actual protection under this bill of $1,693.80, equivalent to an ad valorem of 33.88 per cent.

I submit that this is a very generous and healthy protection upon a piece of cloth 36 per cent of which in weight is cotton produced in this country and upon which there is no duty whatever. I ask leave at this point to print the tables prepared by Mr. Dale and by myself.

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

A207—COTTON WARP, CASKET CLOTH, COTTON, WOOL, AND SHODDY.

[15½ ounces per yard, 68 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 50 cents, $5,000; 9,688 pounds cloth. This will require 2,375 pounds cotton warp, 1,600 pounds grease wool, 1,125 pounds raw cotton, 9,563 pounds shoddy.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
9,688 pounds cloth, 44 cents		$4,262.72	85.2
50 per cent of $5,000		2,500.00	50.0
Total duty		6,762.72	135.2
Actual compensatory required:			
1,600 pounds, 11 cents	$1,760.00		
9,563 pounds, 5 cents	478.15		
		2,238.15	44.8
Actual protection		4,524.57	90.4

PENDING BILL.

A207—COTTON WARP, CASKET CLOTH, COTTON, WOOL, AND SHODDY.

[10,000 yards, at 50 cents, $5,000; 1,600 pounds of grease wool, at 24 cents, $384; 9,563 pounds shoddy, at 12 cents, $1,147.56.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $5,000, at 40 per cent		$2,000.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool, valued at $384, at 20 per cent	$76.80		
Compensatory duty on shoddy, valued at $1,147.56, at 20 per cent	229.40		
Total compensatory		306.20	6.12
Actual protection		1,693.80	33.88

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

A96—COTTON-WARP DRESS GOODS.

[6.7 ounces per yard, 50 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 25 cents, $2,500; 4,187 pounds cloth. This requires 4,515 pounds of grease wool.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:		
4,187 pounds cloth, 44 cents	$1,842.28	73.7
50 per cent of $2,500	1,250.00	50
Total duty	3,092.28	123.7
Actual compensatory required:		
4,515 pounds grease wool, 11 cents	496.65	19.9
Actual protection	2,595.63	103.8

PENDING BILL.

A96—COTTON-WARP DRESS GOODS.

[10,000 yards, at 25 cents, $2,500; 4,515 pounds grease wool, at 25 cents, $1,083.60.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth, $2,500, at 45 per cent	$1,125.00	45
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $1,083.60, at 20 per cent	216.72	8.66
Actual protection	908.28	36.34

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

C96—WORSTED DRESS GOODS.

[6.7 ounces per yard, 50 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 40 cents, $4,000; 4,187 pounds cloth. This will require 9,760 pounds of grease wool.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:		
4,187 pounds cloth, 44 cents	$1,842.28	46
55 per cent of $4,000	2,200.00	55
Total duty	4,042.28	101
Actual compensatory required:		
9,760 pounds grease wool, 11 cents	1,073.60	26.8
Actual protection	2,968.68	74.2

PENDING BILL.

C96—WORSTED DRESS GOODS.

[10,000 yards, at 40 cents, $4,000; 9,760 pounds grease wool, at 24 cents, $2,342.40.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $4,000, at 45 per cent	$1,800.00	45
Compensatory duty on grease wool, valued at $2,342.40, at 20 per cent ad valorem	468.48	11.71
Actual protection	1,331.52	33.29

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

E119—WORSTED SERGE, PIECE DYED.

[14½ ounces per yard, 56 inches; 10,000 yards, at 90 cents, $9,000; 9,062 pounds cloth. This would require 20,945 pounds grease wool.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:		
9,062 pounds cloth, 44 cents	$3,987.28	44.3
55 per cent of $9,000	4,950.00	55
Total duty	8,937.28	99.3
Actual compensatory required:		
20,945 pounds, 11 cents	2,303.95	25.6
Actual protection	6,633.33	73.7

PENDING BILL.

E119—WORSTED SERGE, PIECE DYED.

[10,000 yards, at 90 cents, $9,000; 20,940 pounds grease wool, at 24 cents, $5,026.80.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $9,000, at 40 per cent	$2,600.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $5,026.80, at 20 per cent	1,053.60	11.7
Actual protection	1,546.40	28.3

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

A226—COTTON WORSTED.

[14 ounces, 55 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 50 cents, $5,000; 8,750 pounds cloth. This would require 3,125 pounds grease wool.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:		
8,750 pounds, 44 cents	$3,850.00	77
50 per cent of $5,000	2,500.00	50
Total duty	6,350.00	127
Actual compensatory required:		
3,125 pounds, 11 cents	343.75	6.8
Actual protection	6,006.25	120.2

PENDING BILL.

A226—COTTON WORSTED.

[10,000 yards, at 50 cents, $5,000; 3,125 pounds of grease wool, at 24 cents, $750.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $5,000, at 40 per cent	$2,000.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $750, at 20 per cent	150.00	3
Actual protection	1,850.00	37

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

A25—WORSTED SERGE.

[18.4 ounces per yard, 54 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at $1, $10,000; 11,500 pounds cloth. This requires 21,941 pounds grease wool.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:		
11,500 pounds cloth, 44 cents	$5,060.00	50.6
55 per cent of $10,000	5,500.00	55.0
Total duty	10,560.00	105.6
Actual compensatory required:		
21,941 pounds grease wool, 11 cents	2,413.51	24.1
Actual protection	8,146.49	81.5

PENDING BILL.

A25—WORSTED SERGE.

[10,000 yards, valued at $1, $10,000; 21,941 pounds grease wool, at 24 cents, $5,265.84.]

	Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $10,000, at 40 per cent	$4,000.00	40
Compensatory duty of $5,265.84 on grease wool, or 20 per cent	1,053.84	10.54
Actual protection	2,946.16	29.46

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

608—PIECE-DYED KERSEY.

[25 ounces per yard, 55 inches. Stock: Back warp, 40 per cent Oregon, 60 per cent shoddy; face warp and filling, 50 per cent California, 50 per cent shoddy; 10,000 yards, $1.25, $12,500; 15,625 pounds cloth. This would require 32,426 pounds wool in grease, 13,167 pounds shoddy.]

		Amount.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
15,625 pounds, 44 cents		$6,875.00	55
55 per cent of $12,500		6,875.00	55
Total duty		13,750.00	110
Actual compensatory required:			
32,426 pounds, 11 cents	$3,566.86		
13,167 pounds, 5 cents	658.35		
		4,225.21	33.8
Actual protection		9,524.79	76.2

PENDING BILL.

606—PIECE-DYED KERSEY.

[10,000 yards, at $1.25, $12,500; 32,426 pounds grease wool, at 24 cents, $7,782.24; 13,167 pounds shoddy, at 12 cents, $1,580.04.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $12,500, at 40 per cent		$5,000.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $7,782.24, at 20 per cent	$1,556.44		
Compensatory duty on shoddy valued at $1,580.04, at 20 per cent	316.00		
Total compensatory		1,872.44	14.97
Actual protection		3,118.56	25.02

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

E382—COTTON-WARP BEAVER.

[28 ounces per yard, 55 inches; 10,000 yards, at 75 cents, $7,500; 17,500 pounds. This quantity would require 3,611 pounds raw cotton, 1,309 pounds cotton warp, 22,123 pounds shoddy, 4,886 pounds fine wool, 1,137 pounds coarse wool.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
17,500 pounds, 44 cents		$7,700.00	102.7
50 per cent of $7,500		3,750.00	50
Total duty		11,450.00	152.7
Actual compensatory required:			
6,023 pounds, 11 cents	$662.53		
22,123 pounds, 5 cents	1,106.15		
		1,768.68	23.6
Actual protection		9,681.32	129.1

PENDING BILL.

E382—COTTON-WARP BEAVER.

[10,000 yards at 75 cents, $7,500; 6,023 pounds grease wool at 24 cents, $1,445.52; 22,123 pounds shoddy at 12 cents, $2,654.76.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $7,500 at 40 per cent		$3,000.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $1,445.52 at 20 per cent	$289.10		
Compensatory duty on shoddy valued at $2,654.76 at 20 per cent	530.95		
Total compensatory		820.05	10.93
Actual protection		2,179.95	29.07

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

E24—IRISH FRIEZE.

[34 ounces per yard, 55 inches. Stock: 50 per cent wool and 50 per cent waste; 10,000 yards, at $1, $10,000; 21,250 pounds cloth. This requires 23,625 pounds grease wool, 17,719 pounds shoddy and waste.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
21,250 pounds, 44 cents		$9,350.00	93.5
50 per cent of $10,000		5,000.00	50
Total duty		14,350.00	143.5
Actual compensatory required:			
23,625 pounds, 11 cents	$2,598.75		
17,719 pounds, at 5 cents	885.95		
		3,484.70	34.8
Actual protection		10,865.30	108.7

PENDING BILL.

E24—IRISH FRIEZE.

[10,000 yards at $1, $10,000; 23,625 pounds of grease wool at 24 cents, $5,670; 17,719 pounds shoddy at 12 cents, $2,126.28.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $10,000, at 40 per cent		$4,000.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $5,670 at 20 per cent	$1,134.00		
Compensatory on shoddy valued at $2,126.28 at 20 per cent	425.20		
Total compensatory		1,559.20	15.59
Actual protection		2,440.80	24.41

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

A211—WOOL CASSIMERE, TERRITORY WOOL.

[13 ounces per yard, 54 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 85 cents, $8,500; 8,125 pounds cloth. This will require 32,143 pounds grease wool, shrinking 65 per cent.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
8,125 pounds cloth, 44 cents		$3,575.00	42
55 per cent of $8,500		4,675.00	55
Total duty		8,250.00	97
Actual compensatory required:			
32,143 pounds, 11 cents		3,535.73	41.6
Actual protection		4,714.27	55.4

PENDING BILL.

A211—WOOL CASSIMERE, TERRITORY WOOL.

[10,000 yards, at 85 cents, $8,500; 32,143 pounds of grease wool, at 24 cents, $7,714.32.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $8,500, at 40 per cent		$3,400.00	40
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $7,714.32, at 20 per cent		1,542.86	18.15
Actual protection		1,857.14	21.85

DINGLEY SCHEDULES.

DE—WOOL DRESS GOODS, PIECE DYED.

[6 ounces per yard, 50 inches wide; 10,000 yards, at 40 cents, $4,000; 3,750 pounds cloth. This would require 14,823 pounds grease wool, shrinking 65 per cent.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Dingley duty:			
3,750 pounds, 44 cents		$1,650.00	41.2
55 per cent of $4,000		2,200.00	55
Total duty		3,850.00	96.2
Actual compensatory required:			
14,823 pounds, 11 cents		1,630.53	40.8
Actual protection		2,219.47	55.4

PENDING BILL.

DE—WOOL DRESS GOODS.

[10,000 yards at 40 cents, $4,000; 14,823 pounds of grease wool at 24 cents, $3,557.52.]

		Duty.	Per cent.
Duty on cloth valued at $4,000 at 45 per cent		$1,800.00	45
Compensatory duty on grease wool valued at $3,557.52 at 20 per cent		711.50	17.78
Actual protection		1,088.50	27.22

Recapitulation.

	Dingley duty.		Dingley duty, actual.		Total Dingley duty.	Pending bill.		Total duty.
	Compensatory.	Protective.	Compensatory.	Protective.		Compensatory.	Protective.	
A25	50.6	55	24.1	81.5	105.6	10.54	29.46	40
A96	73.7	50	19.9	103.8	123.7	8.66	36.34	45
C96	46.0	55	26.8	74.2	101.0	11.71	33.29	45
E119	44.3	55	25.6	73.7	99.3	11.70	28.30	40
A226	77.0	50	6.8	120.2	127.0	3.00	37.00	40
A207	85.2	50	44.8	90.4	135.2	6.12	33.88	40
608	55.0	55	33.8	76.2	110.0	14.97	25.02	40
E382	102.7	50	23.6	129.1	152.7	10.93	29.07	40
E24	93.5	50	34.8	108.7	143.5	15.59	24.41	40
A211	42.0	55	41.6	55.4	97.0	18.15	21.85	40
DE	41.2	55	40.8	55.4	96.2	17.78	27.22	45

	Per cent.
Average compensatory duty under this bill	11.74
Average protective duty under this bill	29.62

Without going into details of these tables, they show actual compensatory duties under the schedules of the pending bill running from 3 per cent to 18 per cent and actual protective duties running from 21 per cent to 37 per cent. They show an average compensatory duty on the 11 pieces of cloth of 11.74 per cent and an average protective duty of 29.62 per cent.

If there is any gentleman on that side of the House who can justify an average protection of approximately 30 per cent on the principle of a tariff for revenue, I would be glad to have him do it. The tables on piece A96 cotton warp dress goods show an actual compensatory duty of 8.66 per cent and an actual protection of 36.34 per cent. If there is any gentleman on the other side of the middle aisle who can justify a rate of 45 per cent, of which more than 36 per cent is protection, on ladies' cotton warp dress goods, I should be glad to have him make that demonstration. To claim that a bill providing protection averaging 30 per cent is a purely revenue measure is a nonsensical absurdity so profound as to startle the brain of an idiot.

There are gentlemen on this side of the aisle who, I think, believe, with honest conviction, that the rate of protection afforded by this bill is too low. I do not share that opinion, for such information as I have been able to gather leads me to the conclusion that a protection of 30 per cent upon the value of the cloth is ample to protect the manufacturer of woolen cloths in this country against the cheaper labor of foreign countries.

Shortly prior to the debate of two years ago in the Senate on the wool schedule Mr. W. A. Graham Clark, special agent of the Department of Commerce and Labor, made an extended and careful investigation and analysis of the cost of production of woolen yarns and cloth in this and several foreign countries.

He prepared, after a thorough investigation, a list of tables showing the various items of cost entering into the production of woolen yarns and cloth, and I print at this point one of these tables as an illustration of the thoroughness and care with which Mr. Clark investigated the subject.

CLARK'S TABLE.

Sample No. 2—Fancy worsted suiting.

[1,056 yards, medium quality; weight per square yard, 11.8 ounces; threads per inch in warp 45, filling 48; grade, dark gray botany No. 64, at 66 cents; No. 64, at 74 cents; yarn, 1,370 pounds, 2/20s.]

	Yarn.	Interest and depreciation.	Repairs.	Rent.	Gas, etc.
Material	$908.20				
Office expense			$0.36	$0.18	$0.18
Discounts, terms, etc		$27.40			
Warehouse				3.12	1.72
Patterns				.16	.06
Weaving		12.36	3.30	4.80	4.94
Mending				1.20	1.20
Finishing and dyeing		6.30	1.08	3.72	3.12
Total	908.20	46.06	4.38	13.36	11.22

	Power.	Supplies.	Wages.	Salaries.	Total.
Material					$908.20
Office expense		$0.12	$20.82	$0.12	21.60
Discounts, terms, etc					27.40
Warehouse		1.56	3.12	21.68	31.20
Patterns		.72	16.58	3.28	20.80
Weaving	$4.12	1.38	86.40	19.90	137.20
Mending			21.60		24.00
Finishing and dyeing	6.48	8.10	30.48	.72	60.00
Total	10.60	11.88	179.00	45.70	1,230.40

Cost per yard, 58 inches, $1.165.
Cost of yarn, $908.20=74 per cent of the cost of finished goods (cloth).

Cost per running yard, 58 inches		$1.165
Weight per square yard	ounces	11.8
Weight per yard, 58 inches	do	18.998
Compensatory duty per running yard at 44 cents per pound	cents	52.228
Protective duty at 55 per cent ad valorem	do	64.075
Total duty		$1.16303

(or practically 100 per cent ad valorem).

Wages, weaving	per cent of cost	14.5
Wages, spinning (12 per cent of cost of yarn)	do	9
Total wages	do	23.5

Total duty should therefore be—

	Per cent.
Protective duty	23.5
Compensatory duty	24.4
Total duty	47.9

The table referred to shows a labor cost in the production of fancy worsted suiting of 23.5 per cent, and an examination of all the tables prepared by Mr. Clark leads to the conclusion that the labor cost of production seldom exceeds 25 per cent of the value of the cloth itself. The table of wages prepared by Clark shows that the wages paid in this country on all classes of employment in the manufacture of yarn and cloth is from 17 to 125 per cent higher than in England. While I believe that there is every reason to think that the average difference in cost of production is considerably less than 100 per cent, in order to be on the safe side, as a protectionist, I have assumed for the purpose of this argument that the labor cost in this country is double the labor cost in foreign countries. So that taking the labor cost in the production of woolen cloth in foreign countries at 25 per cent of the value of the cloth a protection of 25 per cent ad valorem would cover this difference. It must therefore be apparent that the protection afforded by this bill is amply sufficient, so far as the manufacturer of woolen cloth is concerned, and that the pending bill is not only an abandonment by our Democratic friends of the policy of free wool, but a betrayal as well of the doctrine of tariff for revenue only.

The present Schedule K of the Payne bill, covering wool and manufactures thereof, was written into the tariff law in 1867, and has been reenacted substantially in the same form in every Republican tariff measure from that day to this. It was compiled through the various grades of manufacture, washed and scoured wool, yarn and cloth, according to a system of mathematically compounded, frenzied high finance, that, piling one duty upon another, resulted in a schedule that has, not unreasonably, I think, been called the "citadel of protection." I have no doubt that its provisions were adapted to and warranted by the necessities, conditions, and environments of our then infant woolen industries. But wonderful changes have taken place in the method and cost of production of woolen and worsted fabric since that day and generation. The importation of foreign labor and the improvement of machinery has greatly reduced the labor cost in the finished article. It is claimed that the Worsted Trust dominates and controls not alone the market for its products, but in a measure the price of raw wool to the producer in this country. It is not strange that in the application of this schedule to the changed conditions that forty-odd years of development have evolved in the manufacture of wool cloth that great discrimination between manufacturers of different kinds of cloth, inequalities between the woolgrower and manufacturer, and injustice to the consumer have resulted.

The imposition of a specific duty upon raw wool, regardless of its value or shrinkage in the scouring, and the imposition of a high duty upon noils and other by-products of worsted manufacture and shoddy has resulted in a discrimination against the manufacturer of woolen cloth, as distinguished from worsted cloth, that has kept the woolen industry at a standstill for many years. I have no quarrel with the manufacturers of cloth of wool. I desire as a protectionist that they should have all the protection that the difference in the cost of manufacture warrants. But such investigation as I have been able to make indicates that the operation of Schedule K in later years has been detrimental to the development of the industry engaged in the manufacture of cloth of wool as a whole.

It ought not to occasion great surprise that methods and practices have been evolved whereby the provisions of the law and the duties imposed upon raw wool have been, in effect at least, evaded so that the woolgrower has received the benefits of a protection upon his products not exceeding 6 cents per pound, and I believe in many instances less than that. Two things have conduced very largely to this result—one is the discrimination in the law which admits washed wool of the second class at the same specific rate of duty as on grease wool of that class, while it imposes double the specific duty on washed wool of the first class that it imposes on grease wool of that class. The effect of this discrimination and of the specific duty on grease wool generally has been to exclude the heavier-shrinking wool and induce the importation of light-shrinking wools, with the ultimate result of very materially reducing the actual protection to the woolgrower. The general arrangement of Schedule K has also conduced to this result by producing a situation which has enabled the buyer and manufacturer of wool to in some measure, at least, control the domestic price to the producer.

I print at this point the following tables, showing the prices of foreign and domestic wool for the last 20 years, by semi-decades, as follows: First, the Boston price of 13 domestic wools; second, the average foreign or import price of wool; third, the London price of 6 foreign wools; fourth, the Boston price of 6 foreign wools; and, fifth, a recapitulation of the averages of the first four tables.

TABLE No. 1.—*Boston price of domestic wools.*

	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910
Fine Adaine	22	13	21	32	27
Combing, Ohio half blood	26	18	23	35	29
Clothing, Ohio half blood	22	13	20	31	25
Clothing, Ohio quarter blood	25	19	24	34	27
Texas, 12 months' average	25	12	17	25	21
Georgia and Lake	27	19	23	25	26
Oregon Fine Eaden staple	21	13	15	25	21
Oregon Valley No. 1	25	13	22	28	22
Montana staple	21	13	18	30	24
Idaho average	20	12	16	23	18
Mohair combing	28	18	21	33	32
Mohair carding	18	8	15	25	21
Cal. Spg., 12 months	25	15	17	26	21
Average	23	14	19	29	24

TABLE No. 2.—*Average foreign or import price of wool.*

	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910
Clothing wool	23	15	21	23	24
Combing wool	23	20	21	25	25
Average	23	17½	21	24	24½

TABLE No. 3.—*London price of foreign wools.*

	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910
Port Philip	23	17	23	.....	.....
Australian cross breed	20	17	16	.....	.....
Cape fleece	19	14	19	.....	.....
East India	18	15	16	.....	.....
South Down	24	21	20	24	29
London half hog	22	24	16	25	20
Average	20	18	18	24½	24½

TABLE No. 4.—*Boston price of foreign wools.*

	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910
Adelaide 60's combings	41	23	36	48	41
New Zealand cross breed 36's to 40's	42	22	33	38	36
Montevideo quarters	29	16	28	37	35
English and Irish	36	26	28	43	42
Mohair Turkey average	41	30	36	46	46
Buenos Ayres	.....	.....	.....	37	34
Average	36	23	32	41	39

TABLE No. 5.—*Recapitulation.*

	1890	1895	1900	1905	1910
Average import or foreign price	23	17½	21	24	24½
Average London price, foreign wools	20	18	18	24	24½
Average Boston price, domestic wools	23	14	19	29	24
Average Boston price, foreign wools	36	23	32	41	39

I think that a study of these tables will bear out the conclusions that I have mentioned. These tables show a difference of approximately 3 cents per pound between the Boston price of the domestic wool and the London price of foreign wool, but it is probable that this does not measure the whole difference, so far as the domestic producer is concerned by reason of a cheaper rate of water transportation of foreign wool than can be obtained by the domestic producer for railroad transportation. But to me the significance of the situation shown by these tables is to be found in the very much higher price of foreign wools upon the Boston market in comparison with the price of domestic wool upon that market. This situation points, it seems to me, directly to the conclusion that the manufacturer has been importing a high grade shrinking wool, that the woolgrower has not been very greatly advantaged by the supposed duty of 11 cents a pound on grease wool, and that the domestic price is very largely controlled by the user of wool for manufacture.

The consumer, however, has been the chief sufferer from these discriminations, for upon him necessarily falls the entire burden.

In conclusion, let me say that I do not consider the pending bill a perfect one, and it is to be regretted that Democratic caucus action will probably prevent the passage of any amendments looking toward an approximation of that perfection. It is to be regretted that it will probably not be possible to eliminate from the bill the iniquitous clause "in whole or in part of wool" and other provisions which the science of the present day make possible of elimination. Nor must it be inferred that I indorse the Democratic proposal to go still further in the reduction of the schedules of this bill. On the contrary, I shall in the future vote for such increases of duty as an investigation of facts and conditions may show to be warranted.

It is to be regretted that we have not before us a report of the Tariff Board upon this schedule, which would make possible a scientific determination of all of the numerous and intricate questions which an examination of this schedule suggests. I have done what I could to get this information. And in its absence it becomes necessary to arrive at some conclusion regarding the pending bill upon the information which is at hand.

Upon all of the considerations that I have enumerated I find it difficult to vote to retain Schedule K of the Payne bill, with all its discriminations, inequalities, and injustices, which is the effect of a vote against the pending bill. If the time ever comes when caucuses do not dominate and control the action of a majority, when we shall have definite and accurate information gathered by a tariff board, we may build a wool schedule in which well-considered tariffs will be scientifically applied to known necessities and conditions and the burden of taxation justly and equitably apportioned. But until that times comes I intend to do whatever I may to lift from the backs of the people the great and unequal burdens of the existing wool schedule. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have heretofore said in this Congress and during the last campaign that I believe that tariff modification should follow the report of the Tariff Board. I feel that that position is correct, in view of the fact that the Tariff Board will be required by law to make its report not later than the 1st of December of this year, and then there will undoubtedly be placed before this body such information as will enable the Congress to enact a schedule touching our wools and woolens that will commend itself not only to the good judgment of the Members of this body, but as well to the approval of the country at large. I believe that plan to be wiser than the plan the House seems bent upon now, to refuse to await the report, when in all human probability this schedule can not be modified until the report shall have been received. I believe the House should have the benefit of the valuable information that this report will contain, as well as the Senate. I have just that faith in the American people that prompts me to say that they desire nothing but the square deal, and that they desire a reduction in the tariff only to the extent that there will be removed from the tariff the possibility for exorbitant prices to be charged by those who may be in control of special commodities when any kind of competition within this country would warrant a lower price.

MODIFICATION OF WOOL SCHEDULE.

I have no patience with those who urge that we "stand pat" on Schedule K and refuse to recognize errors, however glaring, and I say to those Republicans who feel this way that they are following a most shortsighted policy and are contributing to their own retribution. It is the wise course to place every schedule on a basis that will command the respect of the people of our country.

For my part I do not defend Schedule K. Repeatedly during the last two years have I called attention to the inequalities that exist in that schedule, and repeatedly have I urged that that schedule should be modified at the very earliest practicable date by our Congress. I do not propose in what I shall say to go into great detail in pointing out inequalities that exist in that schedule. I believe that the schedule, as pertains to the manufacture of worsteds especially, is unreasonable, because, in the first place, the compensating duty that is given to the manufacturer is far in excess of what it ought to be, as I think a few words will illustrate.

Under the present law we place a duty of 11 cents per pound upon wool in the grease. We then give a compensating duty—to refer to one paragraph of the law—of 44 cents per pound upon all classes of goods that will require, theoretically, 4 pounds of raw wool to make. If 4 pounds of wool were actually used in the manufacture of a pound of cloth of this character, the compensating duty would be just and uniform; but such is not the case. It is a fact that needs no amplification upon my part that in many instances instead of the best of 4 pounds of wool being used for the manufacture of a pound of cloth that is protected on the basis of 4 pounds of wool to a pound of cloth only 3 pounds, 2½ pounds, or 2 pounds, or even less, are used. Manifestly the manufacturer is given an unreasonable advantage by reason of this inequality in the practical working out of the compensatory duty that he is entitled to under our tariff system. I could use the same illustration with respect to the different classes of manufactured goods,

but it is not necessary. I could go on further and point out that, in addition to this, the manufacturer has the use of the surplus that does not enter into the pound of cloth; and this he uses for the manufacture of some other piece of woolen goods; or if he has discarded the poorer parts that are classified as noils, he can use this in places where a cheaper class of wool will suffice.

I am frank to say that I believe that the manufacturer is entitled to a compensatory duty. I do not believe that he should be required to pay a higher price for his wool in the United States by reason of a tariff if he shall not be granted at the same time the benefit of a compensatory duty on his manufactured goods that will equal the duty that is afforded the grower of wool. Again, the manufacturer is given, as I believe, and as I believe many manufacturers are willing to admit, a higher specific duty than that which represents the cost of production in the United States and in foreign countries. To the extent that this duty is in excess of the difference of cost of production in our country and in foreign countries, it should be scaled down so that no greater difference shall be represented, and so that at the very moment that the consumer is asked to pay a price for any commodity in excess of the cost of producing that commodity in the United States he will be immediately met by a competing commodity.

TARIFF COMMISSION.

I said a little while ago that I have felt that tariff modification should follow along the lines of the finding of the Tariff Board. I am a firm believer in the maintenance by this country of a tariff commission that may be regarded as a permanent institution, and that will be required to furnish to Congress such facts touching the cost of production of all competing goods in the United States and in foreign countries. The need for such a commission is apparent now as never before, and the need for this commission has developed with the rapidity that those interested in various productive lines have concentrated their wealth and have eliminated the element of competition. At a time when competition was the great adjuster of trade conditions we had no need for a tariff board. At a time when in all the various lines of manufacture—for I take it that production upon the farm can not be concentrated under one control—at a time, I say, when in the production of manufactured commodities competition was playing so keen a part that each producer was seeking to invade the territory of his rival, not only in the selling of his goods at the lowest price possible, but in the making of his goods in the best workmanlike manner possible, there was no need for a tariff board.

But in the economic evolution that has been going on during the past comparatively few years more and more organizations have been perfected in the various lines of production and distribution, organizations which now have reached the point that they can dominate not only the prices at which commodities shall be sold or services shall be rendered, but dominate as well the prices that shall be paid to the farmer in the purchase of raw materials and to the laborer for his work.

Hence I say that if prior to recent years there was no necessity for a Tariff Board in the history of our country, the very change that has been brought about in the economic conditions that have attended our people for the last score years has brought with it the necessity for such a board. Under the old system if a tariff was too high the great and inviolable law of competition guaranteed the square deal to the consumer upon the one hand and to the producer of raw materials upon the other. With the elimination of that law, unless the Government shall see to it that the protection afforded any industry does not exceed the difference in the cost of production in foreign countries and at home, the capital invested in that industry will have it in its power through organization to dominate the market, to fix the price of the raw materials and of the manufactured product, and to receive as so much "velvet" for its pains in organizing that which the consumer may be required to pay in excess of the difference in cost of production in our country and in foreign lands.

SCHEDULE K.

As regards Schedule K, I believe that not only the highest good of the people generally demands a speedy modification of that schedule, but I believe that the highest good of every grower of wool and of every manufacturer demands that at the very earliest possible time the schedule may be shaped along such lines as will commend itself to the confidence of the American people, upon the principle that reasonable and fair returns upon an investment that may be counted upon to continue over a long period of years are far more satisfactory than great returns upon an industry that may be brought to ruin as a result of public opinion that shall have been wrought upon by reason of unjust conditions until it finally shall demand relief. I believe we are now dangerously near that condition in this country.

There were those interested not only in woolgrowing, but in the manufacturing of woolens, two years ago, who urged that reasonable concessions be made in the woolen schedules. There were others, and they seemed to be able to dominate the situation, who would listen to nothing less than the most extreme bill that could possibly be framed. Their folly has well nigh pulled down the pillars of their temple, and now, before public sentiment shall have finally demanded such extreme legislation as will complete their utter ruin, let them join in an earnest manner with the great body of people of our country and help to frame at the earliest moment such a law touching wools and woolens as will commend itself to the honest judgment of the American people.

THE PENDING BILL.

The bill that is before us for consideration, I am sorry to say, it is not possible to amend by taking from or by adding to. The bill in the form that it is drawn will undoubtedly be passed by the majority in this House. They have tied themselves hand and foot by a caucus rule which prevents them from accepting any amendment, however reasonable, however much it may add to the merit of the bill. That fact, however, will not prevent me from calling attention to one or two features of the bill that the State that I have the honor to represent has vital interest in.

IDAHO'S INTEREST IN WOOL SCHEDULE.

Mine is a State that produces the raw material. It is an agricultural State. Idaho last year produced wool to such an extent as gave her the rank of third among the States of the Union. The producers of wool in my State are kindred to the producers of wool throughout the United States, and the total number of woolgrowers, in a small and a large way, throughout the United States aggregates between three-quarters of a million and a million people. These are directly interested in the industry. There are, in addition to this, millions of people who have an indirect interest that can not be overlooked. The future of this great industry in our country may depend upon the action that shall be taken by the present Congress in connection with this bill. There has not been the sentiment throughout the country that the woolgrower is responsible for the inequalities in Schedule K.

You must look some place else to find the "Jonah." It may be that the protection accorded to the woolgrower is too high, it may be that it is too low. I have felt that we should be governed in this in very large degree by the report that will be made not later than next December on the cost of growing wool within the United States and in foreign countries.

For my own benefit, I have made something of an examination of this question, and I find some very interesting figures in connection with the cost of production of wool in this country and in foreign countries. In my State, for instance, the time has passed when we had large and unlimited areas of land upon which sheep might be grazed. The time has passed when there was little or no competition, and the time has come when there is great competition to see who shall control, either by ownership or by lease, every available acre upon which sheep may be grown. In my State sheep herders can be employed only by paying them from $35 to $50 per month; and last year probably the largest stock company in my State paid as high as $70 per month for this class of labor. In addition to this, these men have to be kept, and this requires a cost of from $12.50 to $16 each per month. In this connection touching the matter of expense I invite attention to the testimony of Mr. F. J. Hagenbarth and Mr. A. J. Knollin, of Idaho, given before the Senate Finance Committee on the 19th and 22d of last month. More than this, the time has passed when not only good business instinct but humanitarianism demands that the sheep shall not be compelled to take a chance on living through the winter on the range, but hay must be provided, and the hay at probably a fair average per sheep would cost something like 20 cents each for the season. Our lands that are leased from the Government from the forest reserves require a rental of something like from 7 to 9 cents per acre, and besides this large sums must be expended in valuable lands and for necessary improvements.

CONDITIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Now, let us compare the conditions that I have suggested with the conditions in other countries that compete with us. In Great Britain, in the counties of Kent and Surrey, according to the report of the American consul submitted last year, sheep herders can be employed at a cost of $5.34 per week, and the sheep herders are required to "keep" themselves. They may be employed for $4.86 per week and be furnished cottages and little plots of ground for garden purposes. In

another part of the United Kingdom I found that foremen were employed by the year at from $121.66 to $146 and "keep." The wages of horsemen and other farm hands was far below this. In Australia a report that I have and that was made by our consul general at Sydney, at the time the Payne law was being considered, tells us that the wages of sheep "drivers" is $5 per week, including board, and of the more experienced men from $7.50 to $10 per week, including "keep." Not only that, but the difference in wages between Australia and the United States does not represent the difference in cost of production of wool. In the United States a sheep herder, for instance, will be required to take care of something like 1,700 head of sheep. He will be given a camp tender, and the expenses of them both will need to be charged against a flock of sheep of this size. In Australia I am advised that they do not have herders in the sense that we have herders, but they have what they call their "riders," and with the large range and ample fencing one rider is able to care for and supervise not less than 2,000 head of sheep, as in this country, but many thousands of sheep, and he is paid for his labor a compensation that is something like one-half of that which is paid in my own State. The winters there are open and the sheep may run at large upon the range during a season that is most expensive to the American sheep grower. In addition to this, instead of being required to pay from 7 to 9 cents per acre for grazing purposes, the owners of the herds may lease hundreds of thousands of acres at 2 cents per acre, or, in other words, for something like 25 per cent of the cost of leasing our land for similar purposes, and the land that the sheep growers own is of small value in comparison with the land in the United States.

In South America conditions are even worse, and the wages paid something like one-third of the wages paid within the United States. In Europe, in Asia, and in Africa conditions are infinitely worse, and I hesitate to say that in some places sheep herders are paid as low as 25 and 50 cents per week in addition to their "keep" for services for which we pay $10 to $15 per week and board.

I do not mention these figures and conditions with any idea of finality. I do mention them to call attention to the important fact that there is a difference in cost of production at home over the cost of production in foreign countries. I do not believe that the American people expect the growers of sheep and the producers of wool to employ peasant methods of caring for their flocks and compensating their workmen, and I do believe that right here is the great opportunity for the Tariff Board to point out the difference between the cost of production in foreign countries and at home. I would not have you understand that I believe that the measure of cost of production is entirely a question of wages. I was much interested in the address of Representative REDFIELD, of New York, the other day, and I was much impressed by what he said with respect to the greater efficiency of American labor over the underpaid and underfed labor of foreign countries. At the same time it can not be overlooked that the difference in this cost of labor does represent a factor of great importance and one that we can not fail to take cognizance of in the consideration of this important question.

The schedule that is proposed in the bill that has been reported by Mr. UNDERWOOD furnishes practically no protection to growers of wool. For instance, a 20 per cent ad valorem duty gives an apparent protection to our growers of something like 4 or 5 cents per pound. Just at this time it would not be so much. It costs the grower of wool in Australia 1¼ to 1½ cents per pound to ship his wool by steamer from Sydney to Boston, and it costs him but 1⅛ to 1⅜ cents per pound if he ships it by sailing vessels.

The woolgrower of South America can ship his wool to these same markets from his ports for three-eighths of a cent per pound. It costs the woolgrower of Idaho from 1¾ to 2½ cents per pound to ship his wool to the Philadelphia, New York, or Boston market. But Australian and South American wool shrinks but little more than half as much as Idaho wool shrinks, and while it requires 3 pounds of our wool to make a pound of scoured wool it requires only a little more than 1½ pounds of Australian or South American wool to make the same quantity. As a matter of fact, then, the freight rates on Australian or South American wool are from ¾ to 2¼ cents per pound on the basis of scoured wool, while to reach the same market the scoured wool of Idaho must pay 6 cents per pound. In other words, although the Idaho woolgrower under the proposed bill will have in his favor a duty of, say, 5 cents per pound, he is required to turn a large part of it over immediately to the railroad company, in order that he may have his wool hauled to the same market in which the wool of his Australian or South American competitor is offered for sale.

Even under the present tariff law the manufacturer has had an unfair advantage over the grower of wool, as I intimated a little while ago, because of his ability to buy wool in the grease in foreign countries, whose shrinkage is half or less than half the shrinkage of the wool of the American producer. If under the present law wool is washed or scoured it is required to pay twice the duty that would be asked if it were not washed, and three times the duty if scoured, over what it would pay if in the grease. The woolen manufacturer has been able to bring in wool from foreign countries the shrinkage of which has been as low as 12 and 15 per cent, and from this up to 50 per cent, with little above that figure, while the shrinkage of the wool of Idaho, for instance, is something like 67 per cent.

With the skirting clause inserted in the Payne law, large quantities of wool have been imported on the skin, with the skirt of the fleece removed, or, in other words, the very part of the fleece that was filled with dirt removed and not required to be used in bringing down the average quality of the wool as against our domestic growers.

Suppose the shrinkage on foreign wool were as great as 33⅓ per cent, with the apparent duty of 11 cents per pound upon wool in the grease, the manufacturer would be enabled to import wool to such an extent as would bring down the actual protection to our wool producer, under the present law, as low as 5½ cents per pound. However, as I said, some of the wool goes even beyond that and the duty is but a few cents.

SCOURED WOOL THE TRUE BASIS.

I believe that the true basis for the tariff upon wool should be figured upon scoured wool. Here is a weakness in the Payne law, and in the Underwood bill as well, and I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment on this head. Scoured wool would furnish a basis that would be fair and equitable to the woolgrower, fair and equitable to the woolen and worsted manufacturers. It would be absurd to talk about a bushel of wheat that to one person would weigh out 15 pounds, to another one 30 pounds, and to another one 60 pounds; and yet, using wool in the grease as the unit or basis for our tariff schedules we are committing as great an absurdity, because wool in the grease may mean wool that contains so much dirt that its shrinkage will be even more than 67 per cent, as it is in my State, or it may be less than 15 per cent, as some of the wool that is sold in the market.

A wool buyer may go to my State and pay one price for his wool. He may go to the State of Oregon, where possibly different conditions prevail, and he may pay another price for his wool. The wool will be shipped to the scouring plant, and when it shall have been scoured it will be found that because of the different shrinkage of the two classes of wool that the wool bought has been purchased, as a matter of fact, at the same price.

It will be urged that this method of placing a duty upon wool can not be sustained because of the difficulty in reducing all wool to the basis of scoured wool. In answer to that I would say that there is not the slightest merit in this contention. Any purchaser of wool who has enough experience and ability to be intrusted by any woolen concern interested in the purchase or the sale of wool knows how to reduce wool to the equivalent of a scoured basis upon the most superficial examination of the wool that is brought before him for him to purchase.

For instance, wool buyers will visit a warehouse in my State, they will take several samples of wool, they will separately and apart offer bids upon the wool based upon a certain shrinkage, and they will not miss the same percentage of shrinkage by more than one-half of 1 per cent as the usual thing. If this can be done by men in the rough and tumble of life in the buying of wool, surely as accurate work could be done by the employees of the Government at the customhouses; and any manufacturer of wool whose buyers do not reduce the wool which they buy to the equivalent of scoured wool and do not know how to so reduce it is doing business upon a most dangerous basis, and bankruptcy for him would seem to be a matter of the merest chance. The true basis to be used upon which to rest protection for the wool industry is the basis of scoured wool.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman there for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. That can be done in a mere washtub.

Mr. FRENCH. It can be done with the very same means that has been indicated—any means of that kind. The wool buyers, as I have said, will go to the warehouse in the gentleman's State, pick out a few bunches of wool here and there from that which is offered for sale, and the different buyers,

each one of them separately, will prepare the bids that they will offer upon it, and will come to practically the same bid, because they are able to figure out within the fraction of less than 1 per cent the exact amount of scoured wool that will be offered for sale.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Is that not true in all the sales in the western country? You will find a man so expert in even the feeling of the wool as to be able to determine what it will amount to in the washed state, although it is in the grease state.

Mr. FRENCH. Absolutely; and hence I say it ought to be a comparatively easy thing, if this can be done in the rough and ready way in that part of the western country, for our Government to employ experts who will be able to tell immediately on slight examination exactly how much scoured wool there is in any cargo that may be landed in any part of the country.

The woolgrower now has an apparent protection of 11 cents per pound on wool, but with light-shrinking wool imported the actual protection is less than that amount. An equivalent of 11 cents per pound on wool in the grease, as it now is, would be 33 cents per pound on scoured wool. I would suggest a flat duty of 30 cents, or possibly 25 cents, on scoured wool as a basis, and then require all wools imported to be reduced to that basis. I propose at the proper time to introduce an amendment on this head. This would constitute a rate on scoured wool less than the present rate, and would establish the right balance that ought to exist between the woolgrower and the manufacturer. It would eliminate entirely the duty of 11 cents per pound on wool in the grease and the duty of 22 cents per pound on washed wool, under which there has been so much of juggling by the importer, and in its place there would be established a basis that would be fair to all alike and easily understood.

AD VALOREM V. SPECIFIC DUTIES.

I do not believe that the ad valorem basis is the best revenue basis from the standpoint of protection or from the standpoint of revenue as regards raw wool. Here is another weakness of the pending bill: From the standpoint of protection the ad valorem basis utterly fails, for it places the highest duty on foreign wool when it is the highest and the lowest duty when it is the lowest.

It applies the law that has been stated in these words: "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." In other words, the very years in which the world's supply is excessive and when the wool is offered on the market at a low price, the very years when our woolgrowers need protection, those years we have the minimum of protection under the ad valorem system. The years that wool is scarce and when the price is high the ad valorem system puts the price still higher, because the duty must increase as the price increases.

I do not believe the ad valorem system meets a better test from the revenue point of view. A given amount of wool might yield in one year upon the ad valorem basis $10,000,000 in revenue, while another year the same wool might not yield one-third that amount of revenue by reason of the low price of wool.

Again, I am opposed to the ad valorem basis, for it will mean that the cheapest kinds of wool will be brought into this country and sold to the American consumer in the clothes he buys. Under the specific basis our buyers would select the best. Under the ad valorem basis the best will be left abroad and the cheaper wool will be brought to this country, for if the better were brought the price would be compounded, for the simple reason that the wool is better and has a higher value in the market.

On the manufactured products probably a combination of ad valorem and specific duties should be established—the specific to meet the compensatory duties on the raw material and the ad valorem to meet the difference in cost of poduction of the manufactured products in foreign countries and in our own.

I believe in tariff modification and not tariff agitation, and in conclusion, and with the end in view of doing away with tariff agitation, I am going to urge the members of my own party in this Chamber to listen no longer to those who urge the sacredness of Schedule K, but to assist in bringing about at the earliest practicable moment modifications along those lines that experience has demonstrated are imperative. Then, and then only, will you have acquitted yourselves so as to bring to you the approval of your constituents. And then you will have aided in placing this great business upon a basis that will be firm and stable, because its foundations will be grounded in absolute justice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY].

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool will receive practically a unanimous vote on the Democratic side of this Chamber, and will be supported by at least a few members on the Republican side. The situation from the point of view of the Democratic Party is a very gratifying one. It is, I believe, to the credit of the Democratic membership of this body that we have been able to agree with practical unanimity on the course to be pursued in the revision of Schedule K, and, Mr. Chairman, it is no less to the credit of the Democratic membership that there have been honest and frank differences of opinion among the Democrats. It is a sign of the freedom of thought within our party, and at the same time a sign of the party's fitness to administer the affairs of our Government, that we can think differently and by somewhat conflicting processes of reasoning, and yet, making concessions respecting details, reach a substantial agreement upon the important things which we have been sent here to accomplish.

The pending bill seems to me an exact and literal fulfillment of the Democratic platform adopted at Denver in 1908, so far as Schedule K is concerned. And I state this opinion with all deference and respect to those good Democrats who interpret the platform somewhat differently and sincerely believe that the party was pledged to free wool and to a more radical cut in the rates on the manufactures of wool.

The Democratic platform of 1908 specified that pulp, print paper, lumber, timber, and logs should be placed upon the free list. No other article was specified in this connection. It was declared that—

> Material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessities of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and graduated reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Wool and woolens must be considered necessities of life, and therefore the platform calls for a material reduction. There can be no doubt that the reduction herein proposed is material. The latter part of the sentence I have quoted from the platform, calling for graduated reductions, seems to me to carry a promise of conservatism in dealing with the tariff, a promise upon which the people of the country had a right to rely. Many of us who are free traders in the abstract would not for a moment advocate free trade as a practical working proposition to-day. Nor would we venture a prediction as to when, if ever, it may be a practical issue. Many of us who believe that a tariff should be levied no higher than the highest revenue producing point must concede that an immediate reduction to such a point might in some cases be so radical as to create undue disturbance of business and inflict unnecessary hardships. We must not, if we would retain the confidence of the people, overreach ourselves and overdo our program. We must not go beyond the promises of our platform.

Whether or not it was intended to do so, the pending bill carries a certain amount of protection; and I see no harm in being perfectly frank to say so. I shall be equally frank in saying that I favor it. Let me not be understood to indorse the principle of protection as advocated by the Republican Party. If we had the power to write a retroactive tariff, going back for 40 years, if we could do over again what has been done in the past 40 years, I believe we could develop an economic structure more just and sound than has been developed under Republican rule. But that we can not do. What we can do is to make the best of the situation as it exists, and set our faces in the right direction for the future.

However unsound economically a given rate of duty may be, however unsound economically may be the business grown upon that unsound basis, we must take care in tearing down lest we do more harm than good. We may justly denounce a tariff as a robber tariff, and yet it does not follow that all who have established in business under a robber tariff are themselves robbers. It is probably true that a false economic system can not be remedied without some damage to some individuals at some time. I hope we may have the courage to face this situation squarely, and not to flinch because someone is getting hurt a little by a reasonable tariff revision. But, on the other hand, let us be spared from doing any unnecessary damage; let us proceed with the caution which our platform pledges us to observe.

When I say that I believe our platform is conservative I do not use the word in contradistinction to progressive. The Democratic Party is essentially progressive, and there is no place in it for reactionaries or standpatters. The Democratic Party, as I understand it from reading the Democratic platform, is

conservative as distinguished from radical. It is conservative in the sense that the spirit of the American people is conservative, and, at the same time, progressive as the American people are progressive. In short, it is in tune with the spirit and desires of the whole people, as the elections of last autumn bore witness. And I believe if we continue in conservative progress along the lines we have already commenced a greater victory awaits us in 1912.

It has been said that the duties proposed in this bill are necessary to maintain the revenues of the Government, and I do not question the sincerity of those Democrats who think that this is true. For myself, however, I do not care to place my vote on that ground. I see no reason to question the substantial accuracy of the prediction made by the minority of the Ways and Means Committee that the surplus in the National Treasury of ordinary receipts over ordinary expenditures for the year ending on the last day of this month will be more than $36,000,000; in fact, I believe that estimate is conservative. Schedule K, which produced a revenue of about $42,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, will fall several millions short of that amount during the present fiscal year. And I believe that the surplus of ordinary receipts over ordinary expenditures during this fiscal year will exceed the total amount of revenue from Schedule K; in other words, we could disregard all revenue from Schedule K during the current year and still show a surplus from the ordinary operations of the Government. Should the Government receipts continue at the present rate, the problem will be rather to reduce them than to maintain them. Some loss in revenue there will doubtless be if the Canadian reciprocity and the "free-list" bills become law, and the amount of such loss is necessarily somewhat uncertain now. If these measures should reduce the revenues by $15,000,000—and the reduction will probably not be greater than that—a large surplus will still remain.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to show my own reasons for supporting this bill. It is sufficient for me that it is a fulfillment of the Democratic platform. I am glad that all my Democratic brethren are going to vote together on this measure, even though some of them may like the bill because it carries some protection, others may favor it because they believe it a revenue necessity, and still others may make some concessions in their views and vote for the bill because it is a party measure.

The speeches made in opposition to our party action on this schedule seem rather to emphasize the wisdom of our course. We have been criticized for acting together, and we have been criticized for thinking independently and disagreeing about the exact extent to which the reduction in this schedule should be carried. We have been criticized because the proposed cut is said to be too great, and we have been criticized for not making a greater cut. I have come to the conclusion that the greatest trouble with the bill from the Republican point of view is that it is too nearly right.

I have listened with particular interest to the remarks of the Ohio member of the Ways and Means Committee, who signed the report of the minority of that committee. I was especially interested to hear him say that he was concerned not only with the interests of his own district, but with the interests of the entire State. I was interested because I, too, have at heart the interests of the State of Ohio and have given some thought to the effect which the proposed legislation might have upon the State.

The minority report on the pending bill contains a criticism of the majority members of the committee for their alleged lack of care and study in preparation of the bill, and my distinguished colleague [Mr. LONGWORTH] who signed that report, emphasized that criticism in his remarks and further criticized the report of the majority members of his committee as being based on insufficient authority, saying:

> I have reason to know from information acquired from this report that its authors have no facts based on information more recent than that of 50 years ago.

What led him to think that they did not have the information contained in the hearings before the Payne committee he did not say, but later in his remarks he did say:

> It has been as difficult to extract any information, any authoritative, up-to-date, modern information from any speech or any presentation of this subject made by any gentleman of the Ways and Means Committee as it is from the report.

Having been thus generous in his criticism of the Democratic position, he could reasonably have been expected in the course of his remarks to present us with at least a little authoritative, up-to-date, and modern information. I listened attentively to secure it, and I have since carefully studied his remarks as they appeared in the RECORD. Being particularly interested in the effect of this bill upon the State of Ohio, I turn first to such up-to-date information as I can find in the gentleman's remarks upon that subject:

> I can not forget that while my district is mostly in the city of Cincinnati, it is also in the State of Ohio. I can not forget that while there are very few farmers in my district, there are thousands upon thousands in the State of Ohio, and that they are there, as they are everywhere else, the backbone and sinew of the community. I am not willing to ask for reasonable protection for an industry in my district and deny to the farmers in Ohio outside of my district reasonable protection on their most important product.

On their most important product! As an example of authoritative, up-to-date information the gentleman tells us that wool is the most important product of the Ohio farmer.

The information to which I shall refer is no more up to date than the Statistical Abstract of the United States for the year 1910, but I believe it will be sufficient to refute that statement. The total amount of wool, washed and unwashed, produced in Ohio in 1910 is given as 17,000,000 pounds, which yielded something over 8,000,000 pounds of scoured wool, having a total value on October 1, 1910, of $4,554,550.

Surely the Ohio farmer is in sore straits if this is his most important product. But I find some encouragement respecting the farming situation in Ohio on other pages of the Statistical Abstract. For example, I find that the Ohio farmer in 1910 produced 144,000,000 bushels of corn, which, at 49 cents a bushel, had a value of over $70,000,000. In that year Ohio produced nearly 4,000,000 tons of hay, having a farm value of over $49,000,000; 31,500,000 bushels of wheat, valued at $28,000,000; 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes, valued at $7,600,000; 75,000,000 pounds of tobacco, valued at $6,400,000. As to eggs, I have not found the figures for 1910, but I presume I shall do no violence to the argument if I show the number of eggs produced in 1900, as there is no doubt that the production in 1910 would be greater. In 1900 Ohio produced some 91,000,000 dozens of eggs, which, at the prices prevailing in 1910, would have sold for more than $21,000,000, or about four and one-half times the value of the scoured wool produced in the State in that year.

I quote again from the distinguished gentleman's remarks:

> The sheep-raising industry is practically the farming industry of Ohio. Practically every farm in the State has sheep, and the profits of that farm at the end of the year are made up largely, in the majority of cases, of the result of the sale of the wool of those sheep; the wool, mind you, not the mutton. It is the wool that makes the Ohio farmer prosperous. If you have a reasonable duty on wool, the Ohio farmer is prosperous.

Mr. Chairman, the investment in farm property in Ohio, including land, improvements, buildings, implements, machinery, and live stock, in the year 1900, as given in the Statistical Abstract, was nearly $1,200,000,000. I believe it is not less than that amount, certainly not substantially less, to-day. Now the total value of all the wool produced in the State in 1910, after it had been scoured, was about $4,500,000. Had it cost absolutely nothing to produce this wool, had it cost nothing to feed, shelter, and tend the sheep, had it cost nothing to shear them and to scour 17,000,000 pounds of wool, had this whole $4,500,000 been net clear profit, without a penny of expense or cost, it would amount to less than two-fifths of 1 per cent of the money invested in farm property in the State. But as the gentleman tells us that the cost of producing wool is so great that the farmer will be unable to continue in the business if his protection is reduced, as he tells us that woolgrowing is done on a very close margin, a precariously close margin, it must follow that only a small part of the $4,500,000 production represents profit to the farmer, and I leave it to the distinguished gentleman from Cincinnati to tell us just what infinitesimal fraction of 1 per cent the Ohio farmer's profit on wool bears to his total investment. Can the gentleman look these figures in the face and tell us that the sheep-raising industry is practically the farming industry of Ohio? Can he tell us that the profits of the farm are made up largely of the result of the sale of the wool—"the wool, mind you, not the mutton"?

When I recall that the sponsor for this extraordinary statement is none other than the author of the Tariff Commission bill, that he is literally thirsting for information which he believes no one but a tariff commission can collect, I wonder whether he and his colleagues on the Republican side who are so concerned about Ohio's wool production will make as intelligent use of the information to be gathered by the Tariff Board as they are making of the information already laid before them by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

To return to the question of the probable effect of the proposed law on the farmers of Ohio, let us endeavor to make an estimate in dollars and cents of what the loss to them is likely to be by reason of this law. In as much as the present price of wool in Ohio is approximately the same as the present price in London, it is difficult for me to see that the Ohio farmer can

lose anything. But as it is argued that the agitation attendant upon the reduction of the schedule has already resulted in a lower price of wool, let us concede for the sake of argument that there will be a drop in the price of wool in Ohio exactly commensurate with the reduction in duty. I will say in passing that if we are really interested in maintaining prices for the Ohio woolgrowers, we would do well to inquire into the charges that there is some understanding among wool buyers affecting the prices to be paid for wool. But that question is not under discussion now, and we are now to assume that the price of wool in Ohio will go down to the full extent of the tariff reduction.

A dollar's worth of wool imported during the fiscal year 1910 paid under the Payne law an average duty of 44.31 per cent. Let us assume then that an amount of wool which would sell in England or elsewhere for the equivalent of $1 would sell in Ohio for $1.45. It is proposed in the pending bill to substitute a 20 per cent straight ad valorem duty for the duty levied under existing law, which has resulted in an ad valorem equivalent of about 45 per cent. Therefore, we are to assume that the amount of wool which has heretofore sold for $1.45 will now sell for $1.20, a reduction of about 17 per cent. If we apply a 17 per cent reduction to the value of the wool production in Ohio we will know the worst. We will then know the total loss which Ohio woolgrowers will theoretically be called upon to sustain. Practically it is not likely that they will lose anything like so much. Applying then the assumed percentage of reduction to the total value of wool produced in Ohio in 1910, we find that had the pending bill been law in that year, and had it had the greatest effect on prices which it possibly could have, and which it probably never will have, the Ohio crop in 1910 would have been worth $775,000 less than the price which it actually brought.

This is the grand total of the possible theoretical calamity which could befall the Ohio farmer. It is one-fifteenth of 1 per cent of his invested capital. If, as the gentleman assumes, there are 71,000 owners of sheep in Ohio, the greatest average loss that each of them could be called upon to bear by reason of this reduction is about $11 a year. Eleven dollars a year is the largest conceivable average gross loss to the individual sheep raiser, and if he has a family of five to clothe he may, perhaps, buy as many as five woolen suits in a year, and possibly some woolen underclothing and blankets. On these purchases under the operation of the proposed law he will recoup at least a large portion of what he may lose in the price of his wool. The ultimate burden on the farmer will be absolutely inconsiderable.

But as the gentleman has refused to have his vision limited to the confines of his own district and has stated his purpose to take a view as broad as the State itself, so he must also refuse to limit his vision to any one class within the State. He must consider not only the growers of wool, but all of the inhabitants of the great State of Ohio.

The average per capita consumption of raw wool or its equivalent throughout the United States for the year 1910 was 7.11 pounds. The average for the State of Ohio, with its climate more rigorous than that of many of the States of the Union, must be very considerably above that average, so that if we assume a per capita consumption of wool in Ohio of 7.11 pounds we shall certainly be well within the truth. The State had last year 4,767,121 inhabitants, and must have consumed not less than 33,894,230 pounds of raw wool or its equivalent—just about twice the State's production. In the face of these figures will anyone say that it is to the interest of the State of Ohio that this tax should be maintained on raw wool?

Let me pause to comment on the significance of these figures. Those Representatives from Ohio who oppose a reduction in the tariff on wool can not justify it on the ground that it is for the benefit of the State as a whole, because they must, if they are candid, admit that the production of wool within the State is totally inadequate to supply the needs of the State. Looked at from the point of view of the State of Ohio, the proposition is simply one that requires the citizens of the State to bear a tax of $1,700,000 in order that one-half that amount may go in profits to the sheep raisers. This refers only to unmanufactured wool. If this bill works out as we have reason to hope, the tax which will be lifted from the shoulders of the Ohio consumer will be much greater than $1,700,000, because it will give us a freer market for the purchase of finished woolen products. As to whether any attempt will be made by dealers and middlemen to gobble up the advantages intended to be afforded to the consumers by reduction in the tariff is a totally different question and one which it is not appropriate to go into at this time. I can only say briefly that if competition is free among the dealers the consumer will get the benefits which he should get; and if there is any restraint of competition we have laws to stop it.

Now, let us examine what sort of authority is sufficient for a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee to base an opinion on. Let us see what is the reliance of the gentleman who thinks he sees such woeful want of care and scientific accuracy among his Democratic colleagues. I must add that what I am about to quote is the sole and only authority cited in the whole entertaining speech of the gentleman who insists that the Ways and Means Committee has based its action on insufficient authority. Now let me quote:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to quote some real authority, an authority that, I think, will be admitted by gentlemen on that side of the House to be high. I do not believe that there is a man among you who pretends to be a student of political economy that has not read Taussig's History of the Tariff. This work and his other works on the tariff are the standard in this country, and particularly the standard on the tariff from the free-trade point of view. Prof. Taussig has been for years at the head of the department of political economy at Harvard. He has been for years the leader of the free-trade school of thought in this country—at least one of the great leaders. He appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and testified, and among other things he spoke of wool; and I will read in full what he said about wool. I had hoped that all of the gentlemen on that side of the House had read the hearings on this subject.

I doubt whether they have heard Prof. Taussig, their great authority. He said: "I will take up the case of wool. I do not believe there is any sound, economic reason for maintaining a duty on wool; I think, in principle, wool should be admitted free. At the same time the woolen industry of the United States and woolgrowing in the United States has adapted itself to so great a degree to the present duty on wool that I should not now advocate the immediate sweeping away of the duties on wool. I think the wise policy in regard to the duty on wool is to reduce the duties on clothing and clothing wool from their present rate, and I think no substantial harm will be done to the woolgrowers of the United States, not enough certainly to offset the advantage to the community, by reducing those duties one-third, from 12 to 8 cents a pound."

That was in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the Payne bill in 1909. Note that he says it would be unwise policy to disturb too greatly either the woolgrowing or the wool manufacturing industries at once, while he still believes ultimately in free trade. Note that he says:

"I think no substantial harm will come to the woolgrowers of the United States, not enough certainly to offset the advantage to the community, by reducing these duties one-third."

But, gentlemen, you have reduced them two-thirds. I am speaking of authority. Upon what authority can you state that you will not destroy the woolgrowing industry of Ohio, my State, and other States similarly situated, when you reduce the duty two-thirds, and when this great authority on the tariff, from the free-trade standpoint, says that it would be unwise to reduce those duties more than one-third?

I think the country ought to understand that even from your free-trade point of view you are not proceeding according to the judgment of authority in this country. That is the reason I use the word.

Now, I ask the question, Upon what authority have the majority of the Ways and Means Committee founded their action upon this bill? What new information have they acquired? A careful reading of this report shows that there is nothing new or up to date in it.

At that point he proceeded to admit that certain tables of figures in the committee's report were up to date, but the passage I have just quoted is the meat of his discourse on "real authority." The date of Prof. Taussig's testimony before the Ways and Means Committee was given by the gentleman as 1909, which is approximately correct, the exact date being December 15, 1908. The testimony, therefore, is just 2½ years old, but is, nevertheless, substantially as good as new, as it has not been necessary for Prof. Taussig to change his position during that time; and that is more than can be said for the Republican Party, which at that time had not yet conceived the necessity of a report from a board of experts in order to revise the tariff. My criticism as to the use of this authority is not based on the fact that the testimony was given two and one-half years ago; my criticism is that the testimony was totally misconstrued and misinterpreted and that it never was intended to convey the inference which the gentleman seeks to draw from it. And in support of this criticism I desire here to quote from a letter which I have just received from Prof. Taussig, which not only upsets the notion that he considered as dangerous a reduction greater than one-third in the duty on raw wool, but also throws light on the opinion of that thorough economic scholar concerning the bill now before the House, a copy of which I sent him.

In the letter I have just received Prof. Taussig says:

When I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in 1908 I tried to suggest changes that might be made by a protectionist body really desirous of making some "downward revision;" in other words, minimum changes. I have always been of opinion that, as a matter of principle and of long-run expediency, wool should be duty free; I have repeatedly said so; I still believe so. But the process by which free wool is to be reached may be a slow and gradual one or a quick and abrupt one. What process shall be adopted must be a matter of political expediency and more or less of compromise. There is much to be said in favor of gradual changes and of a tentative measure such as the Democrats now propose.

Whether a reduction of the wool duty not by one-third but by one-half will work "substantial harm" to the woolgrowers no one can predict with confidence. You have got to face the fact that a reduction in duty, if it is really to accomplish anything, must hurt some one

to some degree. The difference between an 8-cent and a 6-cent duty (20 per cent ad valorem=about 6 cents) does not seem to me likely to be of much consequence. Neither would be "ruinous" to the woolgrowers. The Territory ranchers would raise a tremendous howl—they will do so, anyhow, on the slightest provocation—and some of them would very likely shift gradually from sheep to cattle. But woolgrowing would not cease. The farmers proper (in the agricultural districts proper) maintain sheep, if at all, as a by-product, and probably would not be much affected one way or the other—I say, *much* affected. Unless the price of wool falls, and with it that of woolens, the change means nothing.

On the whole, the Democratic bill seems to me to deserve support, whether or no one would have drafted this precise sort of measure if one had the say about it. My own feeling is that carpet wool (as now defined in the tariff) might have been admitted free and the duties on carpets lowered correspondingly. If any general duty is to remain on wool, there is a great deal to be said in favor of an ad valorem rate, especially one so moderate as 20 per cent, which offers comparatively no inducement for undervaluation. The ad valorem rates on woolens are in this regard—undervaluation—dangerous; but that is the case with the existing high duties, and the situation is made better by the pending bill, not worse.

Mr. Chairman, is not this expression from Prof. Taussig a complete answer to the question of my colleague from Ohio when he asks upon what authority we can state that this measure will not destroy the wool-growing industry of Ohio? Can he not find his answer in the words of the great economist whom he quoted and whom he so highly honors? To repeat these words, "the farmers proper—in the agricultural districts proper—maintain sheep, if at all, as a by-product, and probably would not be much affected one way or the other." In the next sentence Prof. Taussig frankly says what I think we all agree with, that the price of wool would probably be somewhat reduced by the proposed reduction in the duty. The point is that the loss to the farmers of Ohio would be very small, as Prof. Taussig states, and as the figures which I have heretofore submitted conclusively show.

Let it be remembered not only that Prof. Taussig is a highly qualified expert who has devoted his life to the study of economics, but that he looks at these questions from an absolutely disinterested point of view, with no ax to grind and no purpose to serve other than to express his best judgment for the best interests of the country. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we may well feel a sense of gratification in knowing that our party platform, and our action in carrying out that platform, are broadly and substantially indorsed by an economist of Prof. Taussig's character and attainments. I have not in the course of this debate heard an equally great authority cited in opposition to this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, having discussed the question of scientific, economic authority to sustain this bill, I must refer to that still higher authority, the will of the American people. When the people voted last November they voted for a reduction of tariff duties, and there is no doubt but that they had Schedule K very clearly in mind. There is no doubt but that their votes were cast for a material reduction in this schedule.

The Republican Party once pledged itself to a substantial downward revision of the tariff and violated its pledge, violated it notably in the very schedule which we are now considering, and because of this repudiation of its plain duty the party was itself repudiated at the polls. Let the Republican Members in this body pick flaws in this measure if they will; let them seek, if they will, a still further postponement of this revision, contrary to their own platform and to the known and expressed wish of the people. It is enough for me to know that this bill is a performance of a Democratic promise, a promise which the American people have commissioned us to carry out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is entitled "A bill to reduce the tariff on wool and the manufactures of wool." The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Before the bill was introduced the Democratic caucus placed upon the measure the seal of its approval. The proposed bill is to all intents and purposes a distinctive Democratic tariff measure, and is fashioned in harmony with the policy of the Democratic Party on the tariff question. The bill will have practically a solid vote in its support from the Democratic membership of this House. Being a party measure, approved by the Democratic caucus, no amendments will be allowed. All effort to perfect, amend, or modify the bill will be futile. Discussion of the measure, with any expectation of thereby changing any of its provisions, will be time and effort wasted. So far as this bill is concerned the House of Representatives, in a formal and perfunctory way, will merely register the will of the Democratic caucus.

As this measure is typical of other Democratic tariff bills that will be passed by this House during the present and subsequent sessions of this Congress, we may with profit give careful study to the same, with a view to pointing out its defects and calling attention to the dangerous provisions therein. This is indeed the duty of the Republican minority. We have no power to control the legislation. The responsibility of legislation rests upon our political adversaries. We do have the responsibility of critics, and we should discharge this duty faithfully and patriotically, with a view of thereby serving our constituents and our countrymen.

After somewhat careful consideration I have concluded that I can not support the bill, and I desire to express some of the reasons for the conclusion I have reached.

PRESENT TARIFF ON WOOL.

Under the present law the tariff on wool is as follows: Wool of first class, 11 cents per pound; wool, second class, 12 cents per pound; wool of third class, 4 cents per pound, if valued at 12 or less than 12 cents per pound, and 7 cents per pound if valued at more than 12 cents per pound. These rates are specific—that is, so much per pound. But these specific rates are equivalent to an average ad valorem rate of 44.31 per cent. Under the proposed bill no specific rates are applied to wool, but, in lieu thereof, ad valorem rates have been substituted. On wool of the first class the rate is 20 per cent ad valorem. This is equivalent to a specific rate of from 4 to 5 cents per pound. So that this bill provides for a reduction in the rate of duty upon wool of the first class from 11 cents per pound to from 4 to 5 cents per pound; or, in other words, a reduction from 44.31 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem. To express the same thing in still different language, the proposed bill makes a reduction in the tariff upon wool of about 60 per cent. A corresponding reduction is of course made on all articles manufactured out of wool.

Before going into the discussion further, I desire to say that my chief objection to this measure is the reduction made on raw wool. I believe some modification should be made in the present tariff on the manufactures of wool. I have no objections to changes in the present rates of duty that apply to the products of our woolen mills. But I can not consent to do a great injury and injustice to the woolgrowers for the sake of securing a more scientific and appropriate rate upon cloth and all kinds of fabrics manufactured from wool. Rates should be reduced when they are excessive, unreasonable, or inequitable; but when an existing rate is fair, reasonable, and competitive, as the present rates on raw wool are admitted to be, any reduction in the rate is unfair and unjust and will inflict great financial loss upon all persons engaged in the industry involved.

VIOLATES PLATFORM PLEDGES.

The Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, in its very lengthy report upon this bill, quotes that portion of the Democratic platform of 1908 which relates to the tariff. Apparently the able gentlemen who prepared this report believe that the provisions of the proposed bill follow the declarations in the Democratic platform. But as I read and construe this platform the pledges therein made are clearly violated, and the principles enunciated therein are wholly ignored.

The Democratic platform referring to the tariff, in part, is as follows:

> Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list. * * * And gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

In this language two positive declarations are made, and there is one clearly implied promise. There is a plain statement that all trust-controlled products should be placed on the free list. There is a positive declaration that in other schedules "gradual reduction" should be made to restore the tariff to a revenue basis. Finally, there is a clearly implied promise or pledge that there should be no reduction in rates when the existing tariff is upon a revenue basis.

As I read the proposed bill, it clearly violates these three plain and positive declarations in the Democratic platform of 1908.

TRUST-CONTROLLED PRODUCTS.

It has been asserted in this debate that the American Woolen Co. is a trust. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, opened the debate on this bill in a very able and carefully prepared speech. On revenue measures he speaks for his party in this House. During this opening speech he used this language:

> There is nobody in this country who does not know that the American Woolen Co. to-day fixes the price of woolen goods; that it is a monopoly; that it is a trust.

If it be true that the American Woolen Co. "fixes the prices of woolen goods; that it is a monopoly; that it is a trust," then the Democratic platform demands that the products of this trust shall be placed upon the free list. But the proposed bill, indorsed by the Democratic caucus, and presented here as a Democratic revenue measure, places an average ad valorem duty on the products of the American Woolen Co. of 42½ per cent. Is not this a plain violation of the declaration in the Democratic platform that trust-controlled products should be placed on the free list? Have we not the right to conclude that the declaration in the Democratic platform that all trust-controlled products should be placed on the free list is to become a dead letter? Certainly, in the proposed bill no attempt has been made to follow it.

NOT GRADUAL REDUCTION.

But this Democratic platform calls for "gradual reduction" to restore the tariff to a revenue basis. The proposed bill in the rates on wool does not follow this declaration. Changing the rate on wool from 11 cents per pound to 4 or 5 cents a pound is not gradual reduction. Reducing the tariff on wool from 44.31 per cent to 20 per cent ad valorem is not gradual reduction. We are all perfectly familiar with the meaning of the word "gradual." The people understood what it meant. The farmers, the woolgrowers of the country know what gradual reduction means. But that there may be no question about it, I quote the following definition of the word "gradual" from the Standard Dictionary:

1. Proceeding or advancing by steps or degrees; moving, changing, or varying slowly and regularly; slow. 2. Divided into degrees; marked by regular graduations; graduated.

In view of this definition no one will claim that a reduction of the tariff on wool from 11 cents to 5 cents per pound, or a reduction from 44.31 per cent ad valorem to 20 per cent ad valorem is a gradual reduction. In other words, a reduction of 60 per cent on wool, as provided in this bill, is not a reduction "proceeding by steps or degrees"; it is not changing the tariff on wool "slowly and regularly"; and is not therefore a gradual reduction, as demanded and promised to the people in the Democratic platform. On the contrary, the proposed change in the tariff on wool is sudden, sweeping, and radical. Is it right to obtain power, under promise to take the tariff wall down by degrees—to take a layer of stones off at a time—and then when you come to exercise that power to proceed forthwith, in effect, to entirely obliterate the wall? Whatever dissatisfaction there may be with Republican revision in 1909, on the ground that the reduction in some cases were not sufficient, I feel sure there is no sentiment among the people in favor of any sweeping, radical reduction of the tariff at the present time. And the farmers of this country will, at the first opportunity, punish the political party that promised gradual reduction, but gave the country radical reduction in the tariff rates.

REDUCTION BELOW REVENUE BASIS.

There is another particular in which the Democratic platform is not being carried out in good faith. The gradual reduction was to be made to a revenue basis. This clearly implied that rates now on a revenue basis would not be disturbed. The declared policy was to reduce all rates to a revenue basis. This is equivalent to saying there should be no change in rates that were admittedly already on a revenue basis. But the present tariff on wool is conceded to be upon a revenue basis. In 1910 the duty collected on wool amounted to more than $21,000,000. The Ways and Means Committee, in their report on this bill, estimates that under the proposed rate of 20 per cent ad valorem the duties collected will amount to but $13,000,000 annually. In other words, the rate on wool by this bill is reduced below a revenue basis—that is, below the point where the greatest revenue can be collected. Under the platform declaration there can be no authority, justification, or adequate excuse for making a reduction of 60 per cent in the tariff on wool when the present rate on the article is upon a revenue basis. The woolgrowers may justly and truthfully say to the leaders of the Democratic Party, your reductions in the tariff on wool have not been gradual, as you promised all reductions should be, and you have violated the plain implication in your platform that you would not disturb or change rates which under the present law are admitted to be upon a revenue basis.

TEST PROPOSED.

To test the willingness of the Democratic Members of this House to carry out their party's platform declarations, I shall, at the proper time, offer the following amendment to this bill:

That when, under existing law or any law hereafter enacted, it shall be finally determined by any court, board, commission, or other competent legal authority having jurisdiction in such cases, that any article or articles hereinafter mentioned enter into competition with trust-controlled products, then the said article or articles when so imported shall thereafter be admitted free of duty, until such time as said article or articles shall cease to enter into competition with trust-controlled products.

But if this bill goes through without any change, as decreed by the Democratic caucus, my amendment will not be adopted, and my philanthropic effort to aid the Democratic Party in redeeming the pledges in its platform will be in vain.

FREE TRADE WILL NOT DESTROY THE TRUSTS.

Personally I do not believe that "the tariff is the mother of trusts," or that you can regulate, control, or prevent trusts by tariff legislation. We would still have trusts even with every article manufactured in the United States on the free list. This is demonstrated, first, by the fact that in England, where free trade prevails, except as to noncompeting articles, the trusts abound as extensively as in this country; and, second, we have trusts in articles upon which there are no tariff duties levied. But in amending and modifying our present tariff law we may well take in consideration what, if any, competition we have at home in the article or articles upon which protective duties are levied.

In adjusting our tariff we should have all information possible as to whether the articles in the bill under consideration are largely the product of so-called trusts. Every honest industry needs encouragement and protection. As a Republican I believe we may give this encouragement and this protection in levying our tariff duties. But at the same time we should exercise the greatest of care that we do not by our tariff legislation aid those who, in violation of the law, have combined to suppress home competition.

TARIFF LEGISLATION PREMATURE.

General tariff legislation at this session of Congress is premature. We are proceeding without adequate information. There is a widespread sentiment throughout the country in favor of a more scientific method in tariff legislation. This has given rise to the almost universal demand for a permanent tariff commission, to furnish Congress the best information obtainable. While the bill creating a tariff commission failed to become a law at the last session of Congress, by reason of a filibuster conducted by Democratic Members of this House, Congress did, however, authorize the President to appoint a Tariff Board, that may do the same work as the commission. The board was appointed, organized, and its work has been in progress for some time. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars were appropriated for its support, and all told about 80 persons are now at work under this board. The work of this board is to make a thorough study of the cost of production in the United States and in foreign countries and furnish to Congress all the facts, information, and knowledge obtainable that will guide Members of Congress in the preparation of a tariff law, that will afford reasonable and adequate protection to all American industries, and yet will not be excessive, in such a way as to impose unjust and unnecessary taxation or serve as a shield to monopoly.

But the Democratic majority in this House, without waiting for the information that the Tariff Board will furnish for use at the regular session of Congress which convenes next December, have prepared this bill, and the caucus has decreed that it must be passed without modification or amendment. This is certainly very unwise action. In legislation, as in all other things, nothing contributes so much toward valuable results as comprehensive information and thorough knowledge. The consideration of this measure is premature. It would be much wiser to wait a few months, get the report from the Tariff Board—we will then have more accurate and trustworthy information as to the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and will be better prepared to fix rates of duties that will more nearly equalize the difference between the cost of production in the United States and other nations.

PROPOSED LAW BASED UPON WRONG THEORY.

In the preparation of this bill no consideration was given to the producers of the United States. Capital and labor were left to their fate. The manufacturers, the men employed in woolen factories, and the men on farms and ranches engaged in producing wool and mutton were wholly ignored. But one object was kept in view—the raising of revenue. If the bill affords protection to any industry it is unavoidable, unintentional, accidental, and incidental. It is protection forced upon us by the necessity of the Government to have revenue. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in his speech opening the debate on this bill, said:

The Democratic Party does not believe that any interest in this country is entitled primarily to the fostering care of the Government of the United States.

The primary purpose from the beginning, with those who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party, is to levy these taxes for the purpose of supplying the revenue of the Government, and if any pro-

tection arises from the levying of these taxes it is a mere incident which grows out of the constitutional warrant given by the people to levy taxes at the customhouse.

We disclaim any purpose whatever of writing this bill in the interests of the manufacturers of wool or the producers of raw wool.

I can not subscribe to this doctrine. I can not vote for any measure that places the industries of our country at the mercy of foreign competition. I can not support any bill that may close our mills and factories, rob American workingmen of employment, reduce their wages, and render them unable to support themselves and their families. I can not comprehend how men whose ability and patriotism I do not question can seriously advocate that in the preparation and enactment of a great revenue measure our eyes must be blind to our own industries and our own people.

In the United States we have 914 woolen mills. They have been constructed and equipped at an expense of $415,465,000. Their annual products amount to $419,826,000. Thousands of stockholders are interested in these institutions. But when I point to our 1,000 woolen mills, to the vast capital invested therein, to the immense annual output of these factories, to the large number of individuals directly interested in their growth and prosperity, the Democratic leaders in this House calmly say: "In preparing a tariff bill we can not consider men, mills, or money; we can not foster business, stimulate production, encourage enterprise, or protect American industries; our tariff for revenue only policy must be followed, even though we close mills and factories, destroy investments, paralyze business, wreck industries, and bring financial ruin to thousands of American citizens."

One hundred and sixty-eight thousand two hundred and thirty-nine persons are employed in our woolen mills. With those dependent upon them, they represent 500,000 individuals, all depending upon the profitable operation of these mills for food, clothing, shelter, and other necessaries of life. They receive annually in wages $79,214,000. But the advocates of the tariff for revenue only policy, apparently indifferent as to the fate of these men, declare: "In enacting revenue laws we have no concern about food and clothing and shelter and education for the men employed in our woolen mills."

Nearly 700,000 farmers and ranchmen are interested in the wool industry. They own 57,216,000 sheep. They sell every year 328,110,749 pounds of wool. The annual wool crop is worth $72,439,838. Every year about 20,000,000 sheep are slaughtered for mutton. In wool and mutton our flocks yield to our farmers annually an income of over $100,000,000.

But when I call attention to the vast importance of the wool industry, to the money invested therein, to the large number of farmers interested, to the certainty that, if the proposed reduction in the tariff on wool shall be made, great loss to our farmers is inevitable, you close your eyes, turn a deaf ear, and leave the farmers to their fate.

The present tariff on wool is not excessive. The present rates are competitive. Foreign woolgrowers pay existing tariff rates and compete in our markets with American woolgrowers. If under present rates they can compete, under the proposed rates they can destroy. Nearly one-half of the wool consumed in the United States comes from abroad. Last year 263,939,584 pounds of foreign wool were imported into the United States. There is no woolgrowers' trust. Our farmers are all in free competition. Even with present tariff rates woolgrowing and sheep raising are not sufficiently profitable to induce the average farmer to engage in the business. In the campaign of 1910 the main complaint was that the rates on manufactured products were too high; that the "special interests" dictated the tariff law of 1909. We heard nothing about excessive rates on wool and other farm products. Still, at the very inception of Democratic tariff revision a bill is proposed to reduce the tariff on wool 60 per cent. The farmers are hit first. The great corporations in a measure are able to care for themselves. They may form an international trust and avoid foreign competition. The farmers can not do this. Instead of first giving attention to the tariff levied on products of our giant corporations, a great agricultural industry is threatened with destruction.

I can not voluntarily be a party to this destruction of a great American industry, which, with the men employed and those dependent upon them, directly affects at least 3,000,000 American citizens. If the tariff on woolen and worsted goods is too high, reduce it. I will vote for any reasonable reduction that does not mean annihilation to American industries, but if to get this reduction on woolen and worsted goods you demand that I shall vote to confiscate the property of the woolgrowers of the country, I refuse to follow you. In order to make reasonable reduction in the tariff on manufactures of wool it is not necessary that you inflict irreparable injury upon the woolgrowers. It is admitted that under the provisions of this bill there will be a large increase in the importations of foreign wool, that the farmer will get less for his wool, and the value of sheep will be depreciated. As an offset to this loss the farmer is promised cheaper clothing. The American farmer will not be deceived by such promises. Two years ago the farmers were told that for placing hides on the free list they would buy boots and shoes and harness cheaper. Hides went on the free list, but boots and shoes and harness and leather have not gone down. So when American flocks have been destroyed, when the woolgrowing in the United States has ceased as an industry because it has become unprofitable, the 100,000,000 people in the United States will still be paying the same high prices for woolen goods.

THE PRESENT AND THE PROPOSED LAW—A CONTRAST.

Much has been said in criticism of our present tariff law. However just some of this criticism may have been, time and experience have largely vindicated the measure. It has served admirably the two great purposes for which it was enacted: To provide adequate revenue for the Government and afford reasonable protection to American industries and American labor. Nearly two years have passed since it became a law. What are the conditions in our country to-day? Business is good. Times are prosperous. Commerce is flourishing. Industrial establishments are busy. Labor is employed. Good wages are paid. Never before in our history were our citizens better fed, better clothed, or better housed. Never before were they enjoying superior advantages, greater opportunities, or more substantial blessings.

This Republican tariff act did not close a single factory, destroy a single industry, or bankrupt a single individual. It did not reduce the wage or earning capacity of a single American laboring man. It did not disturb business, reduce production, or retard enterprise. It did not depress trade, discourage commerce, or frighten investors. It made no bankrupts, paupers, tramps, or beggars. It did not depreciate the value of property or multiply debts and mortgages. Under it the farmer has received good prices for his products, and the value of his land has been enhanced. The merchant has extended his trade, increased his stock of goods, and augmented his profits. There is something for every man to do at remunerative wages, and there is a demand for every product at living prices. Our country, throughout its length and breadth abounds in peace, plenty, and prosperity. Fortunate will it be for our country if this happy state of affairs shall continue for an indefinite period.

But, alas! if the present revenue law shall be revised schedule by schedule on the lines followed in the pending bill, no one can fully comprehend the evil consequences that will follow. To change our tariff system from a protective basis to a tariff-for-revenue-only basis is revolutionary and will require an absolute readjustment and rebuilding of our industrial fabric. It means that we must pass through a long period of doubt, uncertainty, and gloom. Prices, values, rents, incomes, wages, salaries, earnings, profits—all must change to correspond to the new order of things. And as the tariff goes downward to a revenue basis, to a point where the greatest revenue will be secured with the lowest rate of duty, so everything else will travel the descending scale. As the tariff wall shall be obliterated and importations of foreign products shall increase, so our standard of living and our standard of prices and values must necessarily seek the level prevailing in foreign countries. A revolution in our tariff from a protective system to a tariff-for-revenue-only system will put in motion a train of misfortunes that will travel along every avenue of trade, commerce, and business in our country, touch every profession, avocation, and calling in life, and visit with its unwelcome shadow every household, fireside, and home in the land. To what level we will be brought no one can foretell. No one can accurately estimate the force and fury of the wave of disaster that is bound to follow a revolution in our tariff system. Those who are conducting this revolution in our tariff system are playing with fire. Persist in this policy and a conflagration is inevitable. There will be reduction in wages, depreciation in the value of farms and farm products, shrinkage in rents and values of real estate in cities, contraction in trade and commerce, and disturbance, depression, disaster, devastation, and ruin in all lines of business. The evil consequences that will follow are beyond the realm of human comprehension—too great to be grasped by the greatest intellect, too complex and far-reaching to be described by the most eloquent tongue, and too awful to be conceived by the most vivid imagination.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES].

Mr. AMES. Mr. Chairman, I am a manufacturer at home, as my people before me have been for some generations. We manufacture a variety of products, and my family connections are largly interested in the manufacture of cotton and woolens. I feel the necessity, in this debate on this proposed Democratic wool bill, of giving some of the facts concerning the manufacturer, that they may be a matter of record. I realize that with the inflamed public mind on this subject—inflamed by the demagogue, the muckraker, and the misinformed reformer—that for a decent man to tell the facts as he knows them to be in the woolen and worsted industry makes him liable to either ridicule for being a fool or to scorn for being a liar; but the facts I have gathered, and now present to you, have been gathered in my own representative district, which includes the cities of Lowell and Lawrence—I think the largest manufacturing district in the country, where there are many woolen and worsted and cotton mills. I will confine myself to-night to the woolen question, having gone personally into a number of these woolen and worsted mills, having consulted their pay rolls and their cost sheets. I have verified their wage scale, their processes, what they pay for their machinery, and their accounts. The figures that I give can be verified. They are fundamental; they are susceptible of proof or disproof.

Now, a word about the wool "barons" and the Woolen Trust—and we have just had here a fair example of the misconception and misinformation by a Member of the House concerning the so-called Woolen Trust, the same misinformation that is shared by the public. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] spoke to-night, a few minutes ago, and in the course of his remarks quoted from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who spoke yesterday. I read from the reporter's notes of the speech of Mr. CULLOP, delivered to-night. Speaking about the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], he said:

> The gentleman from Massachusetts said this: "The amount of capital in the year 1909 invested in the woolen and worsted manufacturing industry was $419,000,000. The capital at that time of the American Woolen Co. consisted of $35,000,000 of preferred stock and $29,000,000 of common stock. It was the customary method of organizing corporations of that kind 10 years ago. The estimated value of the plants was submitted to the auditors and a report was made as to the condition of those plants and their value. It was estimated at that time that the plants and machinery and real estate, and other things that went to make up the property of that company, had a value of $25,000,000."

That ends the quotation from the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Indiana then went on with utter disregard of facts, and this is a fair example of the public misconception and misunderstanding of the very simplest thing. The gentleman from Indiana said:

> Ten years ago worth $25,000,000; issued $20,000,000 of preferred stock and $29,000,000 of common stock, and out of that little capital to-day it owns a property valued at $419,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, that $419,000,000, which he states is the value of the American Woolen Co., is the total product of the woolen and worsted industry of the entire United States, comprising our 900 establishments, and has no more connection with the property value of the American Woolen Co. than has the total product of the cotton industry [applause on the Republican side]; and yet you gentlemen on the Democratic side applauded that display of misconception of the facts.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AMES. Just for a moment.

Mr. MONDELL. Did the gentleman from Massachusetts call to the attention of the gentleman from Indiana the error that he had fallen into?

Mr. AMES. I tried to repeatedly, but the gentleman, sure of his facts, would not permit an interruption. Now, a word about the wool barons.

Mr. Frederick Ayer, of Lowell, owned the Washington Mills, in Lawrence; Mr. Charles Fletcher, of Providence, the Providence Worsted Mills; and Mr. James Phillips, of Fitchburg, two mills in Fitchburg. Mr. Wood, the son-in-law of Mr. Ayer and treasurer of the Washington Mills, brought these gentlemen together, and they, with some of Mr. Fletcher's friends, put their mills into the new company, which they called the American Woolen Co. They then issued stock, and with the proceeds bought up a number of bankrupt woolen mills, or mills whose owners were glad to sell out because their business was unsuccessful. The original capital issued in preferred stock was $20,000,000, which was not excessive. Since then there have been two issues of $10,000,000 paid for in cash, in order to build mills which gave more employment to labor and to provide more working capital. Where is the harm in this? Is it criminal to employ labor? Is it illegal to sell stock in order to build mills?

In the relatively short time remaining, I shall hurry from one fact to another. In my district are the largest mills of the American Woolen Co. Its head, Mr. Wood, has repeatedly thrown his influence against me in caucus, and between us little political love has been lost, but he is entitled to his due. How was the American Woolen Co. formed? Their property was audited at the time of organization, and its value was set at $25,000,000, but that does not begin to represent the value of the investment sunk into those plants and never taken out. It is a fact that very few of those engaged in the woolen industries charge off depreciation; and, indeed, I do not know of one, except the American Woolen Co., which charges against the cost of manufacture an interest charge on the money invested, and they have to do it because they have preferred stock that brings in the investment as a charge against the net profits in the sales. So I have no fear as to the final result.

Now, gentlemen of the Democratic Party, inform yourselves and let the country know the truth, because I believe that this wave of misinformation and misstatement can not be overwhelming. I realize that people, even in high positions, have characterized the schedule as "indefensible," but from the point of view of truth, justice, and fact it is most unfortunate. I think they were misinformed, and I think they were hasty in their speech.

The protection afforded by schedule K to the wage earners of America may be high in spots, and the Committee on Ways and Means will bear me out in this statement, that I think I was one of the very few, if not the only Member of Congress, who went before the Committee on Ways and Means with technical and expert testimony in an effort to reduce the rates in the wool schedule. With the treasurer of one of the biggest woolen mills and of one of the biggest worsted mills in my district, I went before the committee and showed how the woolen schedule could be reduced without injury to the manufacturer. We felt that the rates of duty under the Dingley law were higher than were needed, and we knew that the country demanded a lowering of those rates. They gave us full hearings, and were quite impressed with the value and sincerity of the testimony, and I believe they considered the proposed reduction favorably. But when they took it up on the other side of the Capitol, the person in charge of the bill there—I will not mention names; you all know who he is—would not consent to any reduction on raw wool or any change, and as a compromise the woolen schedule was left as it was.

We are going to have a tariff report from the Tariff Board by December 1. Wait until you get some information, gentlemen, that you know is not partisan—and we all have to assume that they are honest men on that Tariff Board—and you will find that Members of Congress, representing districts in which there are large woolen and worsted mills, will come down here and vote for any decent bill within a thousand miles of the truth in order to stop this agitation and permit the already much-disturbed condition of business in this industry to straighten itself out. There is nothing worse for any manufacturing business than this constant agitation of a question which vitally affects values. The woolen business is practically in a state of coma, because the buyers of cloth do not dare to make purchases until they have assured themselves that values have become stable.

Now, to go a bit further. We talk about the difference in labor here and abroad. That is not all. Here are some figures estimated for furnishing a plant capable of producing 6,000 pounds per week of 2-ply No. 44 worsted yarn—that is, drawing and spinning, and so forth. In England, for that machinery, they pay $31,000 and we pay $48,000. Nine-tenths of the worsted-spinning machinery is imported because there is only one manufacturer of that class of machinery in this country. There is not a mill supply that goes into the manufacture of cloth that does not stand us higher than it does the manufacturers in England, because here everything is protected.

Why, I ask, should you pick out the woolen industry, or any other particular industry, to deal it a blow such as you here propose?

This cloth was made in a mill in my district. There are 3½ yards in a suit. This cloth was sold by the mill that made it for $1.50 a yard, and the net profit to that mill on that cloth is 14 cents, and that is all that mill got out of it. The cloth that the average suit of clothes of the average man is made out of is sold by the mill at $1 a yard, and 3½ yards of that is $3.50, and the net profit to the mills making that cloth is a fraction over 10 cents per suit of clothes. Your robber barons——

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. How much wool is in the suit?

Mr. AMES. It is all wool.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. But how many pounds of wool?

Mr. AMES. I can not say offhand.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Not more than 3 pounds—4 pounds.

Mr. AMES. Oh, I will give you the percentage of material in the United States, which is 52 per cent of the cost of the goods; and the gentleman can figure out the value of wool himself. I would like to give the information, but I have only got a few minutes and I have many things to go into. Now, I will take another example. Here are some facts concerning a prosperous mill in Massachusetts, and what I tell you of this mill is true of 99 out of 100 mills engaged in this industry.

The sales of that mill for 10 years from January 1, 1901, to December 30, 1910, were, total, $13,301,422.62. The profit was $416,335.18, or 3⅛ per cent, and that did not count in a charge for interest on the money invested in the plant and in the business. And yet you gentlemen on the Democratic side have denounced the wool barons and the worsted barons, and you are now planning to ruin the industry regardless of facts. If their money had been placed in a savings bank these manufacturers could have sat idly by and twirled their thumbs and got more out of their investment than by working every day in the year and lying awake nights thinking how to cheapen some process.

Mr. CULLOP rose.

Mr. AMES. I have but 25 minutes.

Mr. CULLOP. The gentleman did not hear all the debate between myself and Mr. WEEKS on that question.

Mr. AMES. I only read the gentleman's statement. With his original investment safely placed in a savings bank the manufacturer could sit at home and twirl his thumbs. But what does he do? He takes chances in buying the wool perhaps not at the lowest price. If he makes an error in purchasing his wool, he is likely to lose more than he could possibly earn. He struggles to get the patterns and samples that will attract the public eye, and thereby keep his mill running. He takes the chance of some customer failing to pay or canceling his orders, and a hundred other chances and kinds of worry and hard work, in the end to earn only 3⅛ per cent on his sales. I will go further than that. With one exception, and I will make that the American Woolen Co., because they claim they earn 9 per cent, while other manufacturers doubt that very much. But let that go. You can not name outside of that company, you can not find one engaged in the woolen or worsted business if they allow 4 per cent interest on their actual cash investment in their business, you can not find a so-called wool baron or worsted baron that earns 3⅛ per cent per annum.

Now, there is nothing wicked about an industry that earns as little as that. You can with equal grace, logic, and reason say all the savings banks were money barons and ought to be cleaned out. This small margin of profit has all been brought about by home competition, competition that has forced the price of goods down almost to the price in other markets, and without the additional competition of the cheaper labor of foreign lands. There is no margin to go upon or economy that can be effected, and there are only two ways in which the price of the cloth can be reduced at the mill, and those are to cheapen wool or reduce the wages of labor. There is nothing left to the manufacturer. In the mills at home in the last 17 years they raised wages three times voluntarily—10 per cent in 1895, another 10 per cent in 1905, and another 10 per cent in 1910. You ask where the protection goes. It goes to the operatives, of course; and two years ago the hours of labor under the Massachusetts laws were changed from 58 to 56 hours per week, and that is equivalent to an increase of 3.57 per cent, because wages were not altered, so that the increase amounted in the last 17 years to 37½ per cent, which you will find by compounding the figures just given. And this year the hours of labor have again been reduced from 56 to 54 per week.

Now, a word as to wages, and I commend to you, gentlemen, and to everyone else who has any interest whatever in being guided by facts, the report of the Bureau of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, by W. A. Graham Clark, in 1908. I was not willing to take it on faith. So I got some of my relatives who were studying the woolen business in England to bring over to me an account of the wages paid to operatives in the combing, drawing, and spinning industries, those that I knew particularly about, and then I compared them with these, and found that they were very accurate, and I have written in the book here the wages we pay our people in our mills at home. Let me give you a few instances. We pay a gill tenter $7.26, in England she gets $3.04; a spindle gill tenter, $7.22, while in England they get $3.04; drawing-box tenters we pay $14.44, while they pay $6.08; for finishers we pay $28.88, they pay $11.68.

Now, I will read the figures alternately for overlookers, takers-off, twisters, sweepers, and so forth. While we pay totals of $55, they pay $23; while we pay $8, they pay $2.92; while we pay $66, they pay $28; for a jobber lad we pay $8.12, and they pay $2.67; and so on down the list.

Labor.	English mills.		Lowell mills.	
	Per week.	Total.	Per week.	Total.
	£. s.			
1 can gill tenter	12½	$3.04	$3.22	$7.22
2 spindle gill tenters, at 12s. 6d	1 5	6.08	7.22	14.44
2 draw box tenters, at 12s. 6d	1 5	6.08	7.22	14.44
4 finisher tenters, at 12s	2 8	11.68	7.22	28.88
3 reducer tenters, at 12s	1 16	8.75	7.22	21.66
8 rover tenters, at 12s	4 16	23.35	6.94	55.52
1 jobber tenter	12	2.92	8.12	8.12
1 overlooker	1 12	7.78	20.32	20.32
28 spinners, at 10s	14	68.13	5.82	162.96
14 doffers, at 8s. 6d	5 19	28.95	4.76	66.64
1 jobber	11	2.67	6.94	6.94
2 takers-off, at 10s	1	4.86	5.49	10.98
2 setters, at 9s. 6d	19	4.62	4.36	8.72
1 sweeper	7	1.70	.....	.....
1 overlooker	1 12	7.78	17.42	17.42
24 twisters, at 11s	13 4	64.23	6.38	153.12
8 doffers, at 8s. 6d	3 8	16.54	4.76	38.08
1 jobber lad	11	2.67	8.12	8.12
2 takers-off, at 10s	1	4.86	5.49	10.98
2 setters, at 9s. 6d	19	4.62	4.36	8.72
1 overlooker	1 12	77.78	20.32	20.32
	59 8½	289.90	.....	683.60
Share of manager's wages, at £6	4	19.47	.....	20.00
Total	63 8½	308.56	.....	703.60

Now, if you will average those up you will find we pay 230 per cent more than the wages paid in England for the same work, and I think you will agree that English paid labor is as well paid as any on the Continent. In fact, if my memory does not play me a trick, the British Parliament sent over a committee within a year and a half to investigate the wages in America and the cost of living, and what they report back is 230 per cent increase in this country over the English wage, and they also report that the cost of living is only 152 per cent greater over here. And if any of you will go over into the English textile country and stop in one of those cities you will be awakened in the morning when the bell rings at an early hour by the clack, clack of wooden shoes on the street. You will look out of the window and you will see women going by with shawls over their heads. But in our district in Massachusetts you will see the women come to the mills in nice hats, gloves, shoes, and dresses. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can talk as much as you please about protecting the "barons" and the woolen manufacturers. My friends, there is only one way we can meet this competition from abroad if you open the doors so it may come in, and that will be to reduce wages. We can not get our wool any cheaper. If this bill goes through, you will put a duty of 20 per cent on it, which, by the way, I do not think is enough to protect the sheep raiser. We do not want to reduce the wages of our people. They are fairly well paid; they are happy, prosperous, and contented, and if we started in to reduce wages they would strike; they would not work, and the mills would close. And then what would happen? One advantage of having an industry established in a country is that it takes so many men and women out of the labor market and reduces the competition among the laboring people by just so much. Now, suppose by the reduction which is proposed, which, God knows, I hope will not become a law as it is, that the woolen industry, with its 500,000 employees, be crippled, and that number of working people have to seek some other channel for a livelihood, some other occupation? They will go into other industries. There will be labor competition and wages will be reduced everywhere.

I want to call your attention to another thing. I want to be quite candid with you. In spite of the fact that we Republican Members of Congress got for Massachusetts in the last revision all the protection there was, the people at home came within a few hundred votes of turning us all out; and the reason for that was this: It is 15 or 16 or more years ago since they knew what free trade or reduced protection meant. A man does not vote until he is 21. The average expectation of life of a man having reached 21 years is somewhere around 42 years, and so 31 years would represent the age of the average voter; and the average voter represents the average state of mind in the country. And it is the average state of mind of the country that is the voice of the people; and to that we must bow, right or wrong. It is now more than a decade since they have had an

experience of insufficient protection, and they have got to have their experience. As sure as the sun shines, if you take the protection off of cloth and manufactured goods that is necessary to equal the cost of the difference of labor here and abroad, these people in the course of a year or two will learn for themselves the folly, shortsightedness, and the impossibility of government by the Democracy, and they will come hurrying back to the Republican Party. So I have no fear as to the ultimate result, but I fear for my people and the hunger and want and privation they will have to pass through before they learn the full value of your false promises and your impracticable theories.

And so it follows that with each decade we have a new generation of voters; also that each generation of voters is unwilling to go by the experience of a preceding generation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REDFIELD] made a speech here the other day. I am sorry I was not present. I can not find his speech in the RECORD. I do not want to do him an injustice, but I have been told that the purport of his speech was to show that American labor was much more efficient than foreign labor and produced more per capita. I hope I am not overstating the case, as he put it. If so, I wish some one would correct me.

Now, I do not believe the gentleman, if he be a manufacturer, even intimated that his remarks should be applied to the woolen and cotton business, because they can not apply in the slightest degree. And to prove that, let me give you some statistics here.

In the woolen-mill industry in Massachusetts there are 38,801 men and women, of whom 5,038 have native fathers; 33,763 have foreign fathers; so that 87 per cent are of foreign parentage or foreign born. You can get all these figures from page 69 to page 114 of the census of Massachusetts for 1905. There are no later statistics available. The Census Bureau this morning had nothing to date. From what countries do these people come? Ireland, 10,761; Canada (English), 693; Canada (French), 5,743; England, 4,433; Germany, 2,029; Scandinavia, 312; Italy, 1,952; Poland, 1,529; Russia, 1,514; Austria, 952; Scotland, 1,108; and smaller numbers from other countries.

In the cotton business there were 89,467 men and women employed in my State. Of these 7,119 had native fathers, while 82,338 were of foreign parentage. In other words, 92 per cent were foreign born or of foreign parentage, distributed as follows:

Ireland, 16,657; Canada (English), 1,110; Canada (French), 27,185; England, 13,494; Germany, 2,289; Scandinavia, 238; Scotland, 1,695; and smaller numbers from other lands.

Is it not absurd to suppose that crossing the water changes a man's efficiency? These figures that I gave you in regard to wages in the mills at home and in England mean wages for men working at the same machines, running at the same speed, producing exactly the same amount of goods. Do not these facts completely controvert Mr. REDFIELD's proposition?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, will my friend allow me just a moment?

Mr. AMES. Surely. I hope the gentleman will not make it too long.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How do you account for the fact that the value of the product of American labor is double that of the product of any foreign labor?

Mr. AMES. I do not know that it is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And in many instances the product sells for three or four times as much as the product of foreign labor. How do you explain that?

Mr. AMES. I will answer by stating that in these industries—the cotton and woolen—American labor produces exactly the same amount as foreign labor.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As a general proposition, the product of American labor is twice as valuable as the product of foreign labor. We are just as much in favor of taking care of the American laborer as you are, but the difficulty about the question is the profit to the American manufacturer.

Mr. AMES. That may be, but I have no proof of it, and I have to take the gentleman's say so for it. I have not yet seen it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do you not know that as a fact?

Mr. AMES. No; I do not know that it is a fact.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, it is a fact, to my certain knowledge, that the value of the product of American labor in any given line will average twice that of the product of labor in any country in Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] has expired.

Mr. AMES. May I have three minutes more to explain just where the cost goes?

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. AMES. You want to know why American-made goods cost so much. One reason is this: There is a class of merchants known as tailors to the trade or book houses, because they send out all over the country sample books of cloth, from which suits of clothes may be selected by the customer. Chicago is a center for this business, and it amounts to a good many millions a year. You will see their advertisements in every magazine. We sell them goods at a dollar a yard. They insist they can not make any profit if they pay more than a dollar a yard. Then they send these books around, and a few measurements are taken, and people order clothes in that way. I will tell you how it works.

A treasurer of one of the woolen mills in my district went into a drug store in Florida last year and saw one of these books of cloth on the counter. He recognized some of the cloth as his own make. He asked the druggist what he did with that. The druggist said, "I sell ready-made clothing." The treasurer said, "What do you get for it?" He said, "$25 a suit." The treasurer said, "How do you do it?" He said, "The customer selects his sample from the book, we take the measurement around the neck and the measure around the chest and around the waist and the length of the trousers and send that to Chicago, and the booking house sends me a suit and charges me $15 for it." He got $25, or a gross profit of $10 for filling the order. The manufacturer gets between 10 and 11 cents for making the cloth. Gentlemen, it is the cost of distribution. Of course, the manufacturers can not go into that. [Applause.]

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

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. It has been said on the floor that the American manufacturers fake the people with all sorts of shoddy clothing. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not possible to make as good fabric here as they can in England and Scotland?

Mr. AMES. Yes; if we could get the price. But we can not pay 230 per cent of the English wages and pay the tariff on the raw material, and then sell at a price that the average person would be willing to pay for it.

Mr. FOCHT. I was wondering why they imported that cloth.

Mr. AMES. Because they are able and willing to pay $40 or $80 for a suit of clothes.

If some gentleman had asked me if we could make as poor a suit as can be made in England, I should answer that it was very doubtful, because by the report for the year 1907 the latest I happen to have available—but any report would do as well—there was imported into England 113,000,000 pounds of rags from other countries and into the United States in the same year 115,000. Now, I am not abusing rags and shoddy, for they are very serviceable materials for making cheap, heavy garments, like overcoats; but if anyone thinks that they use only pure wool in England he had better take a trip through the Batley and Dewsbury districts and see for himself, or I would refer him to the report of Mr. Clark.

In the preliminary report of the Census Bureau the value of products of woolen and worsted goods is given as $419,826,000 and the salaries and wages as $79,214,000. From the above figures many people, including the present Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, have erroneously concluded that labor is less than 19 per cent of the value of the product. That this assumption is utterly without justification is shown by the following:

The census report includes in "products"—	Value.
Yarns	$94,539,000
Tops, slubbing, etc	8,110,000
Noils and waste	12,528,000
Other products	3,485,000
Total	118,662,000

All the above-mentioned articles appear again under the heading of "Material," as reported by the maker of cloth, since he buys these articles and adds further value to them by labor and expense. If every mill carried on all the processes of manufacture, there would be one total labor cost and one ultimate value of product, but in the instances of subdivision of product, as reported above, the finished product of one branch of the industry becomes the material of the next, so that it is obvious that any comparison of relative percentages of labor and material are incorrect and misleading.

The following table shows clearly how there may be a small percentage of labor cost where the industry is subdivided, but a much greater percentage of labor cost where the relation

between total labor and the ultimate value of products is considered:

Process.	Material.	Waste.	Labor.	Expense.	Product.	Per cent labor to product.
Manufacturer of tops	$0.45	$0.05	$0.03	$0.02	$0.55	5½
Manufacturer of yarn	.55	.03	.10	.07	.75	13
Manufacturer of cloth	.75	.07	.18	.20	1.20	15

Total labor	$0.31
Ultimate value of product	$1.20
Total labor to total product per cent	26

I quote the following from page 307 of the Bulletin of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

These totals, as seems to be unavoidable in all census returns, contain a very considerable element of duplication, owing to the subdivision of the industry, in consequence of which the productions of one department become the raw material for the next step in the manufacturing process and the statistics for the minor processes become part and parcel both in the cost and value of the final result.

These complications seriously affect, in fact render impossible, an exact comparison of some of the most important points in manufacture. The "Cost of materials used" and the "Value of products" are greatly enhanced, while the items "Capital engaged" and "Wages paid" are not correspondingly increased, so that calculations involving the relations of the second group of items to the first are misleading and of no value.

The costs of production in the earlier processes properly belong in the item of total cost, but the cost of yarn, etc., purchased is a doubtful element. A portion of it no doubt belongs in the general account and clearly also a part of it does not. Again, in the total value a similar difficulty appears. The values of the product of the earlier processes, if carried on independently, appear in the total value twice at least—first as yarn produced, and again in the cloth manufactured. If every establishment carried on all the processes of manufacture, as formerly was the case, such difficulties would not exist, for the cost of the raw material—wool, for instance—would appear in the value of the product only in the cloth, and not, perhaps, as tops, again as yarn, and finally as finished cloth.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I now yield a half hour to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREGG].

Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reference has just been made to the cost of labor in the United States for woolen operatives. The average wage paid to the woolen operatives, according to the census prior to the last, was $364 per year. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In approaching a brief discussion of the very important question which is now before this legislative body of the Government, I do so with a full knowledge of the responsibility which should characterize the conscientious effort of every Member of the House. Listening to the debates on this schedule, I am impressed with the sincerity of those who have entered into this discussion. There seems to be an honest difference of opinion between the two great parties upon the question of taxation, one contending that the greatest revenue can be collected by a high protective duty and the other alleging that sufficient revenue can be raised for the economical administration of the affairs of the Government by the imposition of a tariff for revenue only. The issue is well defined. There is no mistaking the battle ground. But whatever the issue, the people of the United States by their ballots at the polls in 1910 declared that there should be an abandonment of the principle of high protective duties and commissioned the majority party of this House to make a reduction in the present high duties. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The duty, then, is not as to whether it is right or wrong to make a reduction, but as to the degree that such reduction should be made, keeping in mind the welfare of all the people of our great country.

TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

The Constitution of the United States has plainly declared what the taxing power is and the use to which the moneys realized from such taxation shall be put. It declares that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

This can mean only one thing, and that one thing is laying a duty, a tariff, for the purpose of raising revenue for the administration of the affairs of the Government. The defense and maintenance of this fundamental provision of taxation in the Constitution of the United States always has been, and will remain to be, a cardinal principle of the Democratic Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has never wavered from this position; and, moreover, it has always insisted, and still insists, that only such revenue shall be raised as is necessary for the economical administration of the affairs of the Government. This always has been its creed. The greatest battle of ballots that was ever fought and won in the interests of the people of the United States and in behalf of an economical administration of governmental affairs was the battle fought and won by the great Samuel J. Tilden. [Applause on the Democratic side.] How well that great master of political economy and civic affairs wrote into his platform this declaration:

Reform is necessary in the sum and modes of Federal taxation, to the end that capital may be set free from distrust and labor lightly burdened. We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly 4,000 articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sale of American manufactures at home and abroad and depleted the returns of American agriculture, an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be only for revenue.

And how true to present conditions! All over this fair land there are cries of fraud; in every port arrests of the "get rich quick" are made for smuggling; dishonest officials are being called to the bar of justice; and the records of the bankruptcy courts show how mercilessly the honest merchants have been trodden under the feet of trusts and combinations. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And this very day, within the shadow of this Capitol, committees of this House are investigating the business conduct of mammoth corporations, the outgrowth of this iniquitous tariff, "the masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense." [Applause on the Democratic side.] And so down to and including its last great convention, in 1908, the Democratic Party has stood for a tariff for revenue only. At that convention it declared:

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and that gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

The report of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee on this wool schedule, understood by every man, woman, and child in the United States who is fortunate enough to have clothes, is sufficient evidence that we propose to redeem that pledge and keep the faith. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

PREELECTION PROMISES OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY VIOLATED.

On the other hand, the Republican Party since its birth has declared for the very highest rate of protective duties, and with each succeeding tariff bill proposed and enacted by that party when in power increased the rate, while the importation of almost all classes of goods became prohibitive. However, prior to the meeting of the Republican national convention of 1908, the leaders of that party recognized that the people demanded a change from the higher rates of duty to lower rates of duty and wrote into its platform the promise for a revision of the tariff in the following language:

The Republican Party declares unequivocally for the revision of the tariff at a special session of Congress immediately following the inauguration of the next President.

That the people understood that revision to mean a downward revision is unquestionable. President Taft on numerous occasions prior to the election of 1908, and, in fact, prior to his nomination in that year, unequivocally declared in favor of the revision of the tariff downward.

In a speech he delivered at Kansas City February 10, 1908, he said:

In the 10 years which have elapsed since the enactment of the Dingley tariff the conditions have so changed as to make a number of schedules under the tariff too high.

In his speech of acceptance of July 28, 1908, he said:

The tariff in a number of schedules exceeds the difference between the cost of production of such articles abroad and at home, including a reasonable profit to the American producer.

And further:

The excess over that difference serves no useful purpose, but offers a temptation to those who have monopolized the production in this country to profit by the excessive rates.

Later, in a speech delivered at Cincinnati September 22, 1908, Mr. Taft said:

The Dingley tariff has served the country well, but its rates have become generally excessive. They have become excessive because conditions have changed since its passage in 1897.

And after referring to the fact that some of the rates are probably too low, due also to the change of conditions, he next said: "But, on the whole, the tariff should be lowered." And to clinch his statement, and as a further pledge to the people that there

would be a revision downward of the tariff, in this same speech, delivered at his home in Cincinnati, he said:

I wish there to be no doubt in respect to the revision of the tariff. I am a tariff revisionist, and I have been one since the question has been mooted.

Two days later in Milwaukee, on September 24, 1908, in answer to a speech that had there been delivered by Mr. Bryan, he said:

I can say that our party is pledged to a genuine revision, and as a temporary head of that party and President of the United States, if it be successful in November, I expect to use all the influence that I have by calling immediately a special session, and by recommendation to Congress to secure a genuine and honest revision. * * *

It is my judgment that a revision of the tariff, in accordance with the pledge of the Republican platform, will be on the whole a substantial revision downward, though there probably will be a few exceptions in this regard.

Again, in a speech delivered at Des Moines, Iowa, September 25, 1908, Mr. Taft said:

It is my judgment, as it is that of many Republicans, that there are many schedules of that tariff in which the rates are too excessive, and there are a few in which the rates are not sufficient to fill the measure of conservative protection.

And later, on the same occasion and in that connection, he declared:

As the temporary leader of the party, I do not hesitate to say, with all the emphasis of which I am capable, that if the party is given the mandate of power in November it will perform its promises in good faith.

As a result of these preelection promises and pledges Mr. Taft was elected President of the United States. His first official utterance was his inaugural address, March 4, 1909, and then and there Mr. Taft emphasized his previous utterances in these words:

It is thought that there has been such a change in conditions since the enactment of the Dingley Act, drafted on a similarly protective principle, that the measure of the tariff above stated will permit the reduction of rates in certain schedules and will require the advancement of few, if any.

The history of tariff legislation shows that a special and extraordinary session of Congress was called soon thereafter for the purpose of considering the tariff question. At that session the Dingley tariff bill was revised, but instead of being revised downward, as the Republican Party and its standard bearer had pledged, it was revised upward. And although President Taft had pledged the people that there should be an honest revision of the tariff downward, the President signed the bill containing this same Schedule K, the woolen schedule, which proved itself to be the most iniquitous, extravagant, unjustifiable one that has ever been placed upon the statutes of the United States. The Republican authorities admitted this, and President Taft on one occasion declared:

The woolen schedule is indefensible, and I propose to say so.

Later on, in a public address in New York, February 12, 1910, he is officially reported as saying:

The one substantial defect in compliance with the promise of the platform was the failure to reduce woolens.

UNDERWOOD BILL FAIR AND EQUITABLE.

Without going into detail to show that there was no revision at all in the Payne-Aldrich bill by Schedule K, it is agreed by all authorities that the rates in this schedule are too high and go beyond any difference in the cost of production, including protection of profits to the manufacturer. As I have already stated, the people at the polls, last November, demanded a revision of Schedule K. The action of the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting this bill with these substantial reductions, not intended in any manner to injure the trade of the country or to affect the business interests of the country, is abundantly justified. It would be highly foolish and grossly unjust for the Democratic Party, at this time or at any other time, to make radical reductions in the tariff affecting great industries and which might possibly result in business disaster.

The Democratic Party is pledged to conserve the interests of the American people, regardless of class, and the wise provisions and schedules of duties contained in this particular schedule is sufficient evidence to prove the sincerity and honesty of purpose of that great party.

To my mind, and I believe to the mind of the average layman, the most noteworthy and most commendable feature of this bill, outside of the general reduction in the duties on wool and woolen manufactures, is the change from the compound, specific, and compensatory duties to the ad valorem system. This bill, when it becomes a law, will be fair and equitable to all interests under all circumstances. The primary object of any tariff law should be the collection of internal revenue with the least possible burden on the people. Specific duties have always proved themselves unjust and have invariably worked injury upon the consumer. As was admirably said in the report of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee:

The great evil of specific duties is that they always and inevitably bear more heavily upon the poor than upon the rich. When goods are taxed according to kind, pound, weight, measure, or the like, without regard to value, the coarser and cheaper grades necessarily must pay as much as the finer and more expensive grades, and the taxes fall with most crushing force on those least able to pay.

The abolition of the specific duties removes all opportunity for concealing and disguising the various tricks and manipulations for the private profit of favored rings and groups and prevents frauds and juggling of weights. In other words, it places the collection of duties upon a thorough business basis and makes easy of computation and calculation the amount due the Government.

REDUCTION IN WOOL SCHEDULE DECREASES COST OF LIVING.

The final result of this bill will be the reduction of cost to the consumer and the increase in imports of the articles that he uses. It means that the cheaper class of goods worn by the greater mass of our people, upon which there was a tax equivalent to 144 per cent ad valorem as against a tax of 96 per cent ad valorem on more expensive goods, will be imported into this country, thus giving cheaper cost to those least able to pay. The truth is that the tariff duties upon cheaper grades of woolen goods heretofore were prohibitive and that these goods, the average value of which was 35 cents per pound, were only imported to an amount of 6,016 pounds, yielding $2,111 of duties, while of the more expensive goods, the average value of which was $1.07 per pound, were imported to an amount of 5,433,182 pounds, yielding $5,827,777 in duties.

The people of our country asked for relief. You know and they know that clothing and blankets are a necessity of life. You know and they know that the Payne-Aldrich bill imposed additional burdens upon the consumers of the country. You know and they know that the Payne-Aldrich bill increased the cost of living in every home in the land, and the only thing that saved the Republican Party in the campaign of 1908 was, as I have stated before, its express promise to relieve the American people of this burden. The people trusted the Republican Party and believed it would fulfill its platform pledges and campaign promises. When it failed, they turned to the Democratic Party and asked that they be relieved. The Democratic Party is willing to relieve them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has reduced the duty on raw wool from an ad valorem duty of 44.31 per cent to 20 per cent. On wool wastes, rags, and so forth, and materials that are worked up with the raw wool into fabrics, from an ad valorem duty of 38.96 per cent to 20 per cent. On combed wools and combed wool or tops and other woolen hair which have been advanced by processes of manufacture, from 105.19 per cent ad valorem to 25 per cent, the duty was reduced. In fact, in some of the cheaper articles in this group the ad valorem equivalent of the duties collected ranges from 112.86 to 252.21 per cent. On cloths and knit fabrics, wholly or in part of wool, 97.11 per cent to 40 per cent. Yarns were reduced from 82.38 per cent to 30 per cent.

One of the most beneficial paragraphs in this whole bill is the reduction of the duties on blankets and flannels, and it will be observed that the least duty is placed upon the cheaper grades and kinds that are used by those least able to bear the burden of taxation. This section, which should and will receive the hearty indorsement of every American, reads:

On blankets and flannels, composed wholly or in part of wool, the duty shall be 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on flannels composed wholly or in part of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, the duty shall be 45 per cent ad valorem.

The duty under the Payne-Aldrich bill is 95.57 per cent.

On women's and children's dress goods the burden is again lifted, and instead of an ad valorem rate of 102.85 per cent this bill proposes the rate of 45 per cent ad valorem. On clothing ready made and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls, instead of the high rate of 81.31 per cent ad valorem exacted by the Payne-Aldrich bill this bill proposes an ad valorem rate of 45 per cent. And so we might run through the entire bill in order to show that on those articles most used by the common people the committee has endeavored to reduce the duties in order to relieve the burdens upon the people and at the same time to raise a revenue sufficient to carry on the affairs of the Government economically administered.

According to statistics, the actual imports and duties under the Payne-Aldrich schedule in the fiscal year 1910, the average ad valorem equivalent of the duty collected that year on manufactures of wool was 90.10 per cent. Under this bill on the estimated imports the duties for 1910 and the ad valorem equivalent would be 42.55 per cent. This proposed schedule is giving to more than 92,000,000 American people a relief from the burdens

of taxation, and it is within the power of the toiler to clothe his wife and little ones against the snows and storms of winter without taking the bread out of their mouths.

PRESENT AMERICAN CONDITIONS NOT DIFFERENT FROM ENGLISH CONDITIONS IN 1820.

In this connection it might be well to observe that with the growth of the population there has been more than a corresponding growth of tax collecting. In 1897 the tax paid directly to the National Government amounted to about $3.85 per capita, and in 1910 it amounted to about $7.35 per capita—almost twice as much. In 1910 the tariff tax alone paid directly to the Government amounted to about $3.55 per capita. Add to this the State tax, the county tax, the municipal tax, and the school tax, and we might then exclaim, as did Sir Sydney Smith in 1820, that the American pays—

Taxes upon every article which enters into the mouth, or covers the back, or is placed under the foot; taxes upon everything that is pleasant to see, hear, feel, smell, or taste; taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion; taxes on everything on earth, and the waters under the earth; on everything that comes from abroad or is grown at home; taxes on the raw material; taxes on every fresh value that is added to it by the industry of man; taxes on the sauce which pampers man's appetite, and the drug that restores him to health; on the ermine which decorates the judge, and the rope which hangs the criminal; on the poor man's salt, and the rich man's spice; at bed or board, couchant or levant, we must pay.

The schoolboy whips his taxed top, the beardless youth manages his taxed horse with a taxed bridle on a taxed road, and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine which has paid 7 per cent into a spoon that has paid 15 per cent, flings himself back upon his chintz bed which has paid 22 per cent, and expires in the arms of an apothecary who has paid a license of £100 for the privilege of putting him to death. His whole property is then immediately taxed from 2 to 10 per cent. Besides the probate, large fees are demanded for burying him in the chancel, his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble, and he is then gathered to his fathers, to be taxed no more.

[Laughter and applause.]

INDUSTRIES OF WESTMORELAND-BUTLER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

When I addressed the House on the Canadian reciprocity question I stated that the district which I represent is probably one of the most important in the United States. I stated also that my home county, Westmoreland, was bounded on the west by the district which the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] has the honor to represent. No county in the State of Pennsylvania contains more diversified industrial and productive interests than does Westmoreland. It is a part of the great bituminous coal field, and is, in fact, second in point of production of bituminous coal in the State of Pennsylvania. Within the confines of my district there are located at least two of the largest plants of the United States Steel Co., the Page Woven Wire Fence Co., the American Window Glass Co., the Pennsylvania Rubber Co., and the Kelly & Jones Co., manufacturer of iron and brass castings, employing upward of 2,000 men in a town adjacent to the one in which I live. In this same county there is located probably the largest tin-plate factory in the United States and one of the largest aluminum factories in the world. We have brick factories, paper mills, iron foundries, breweries, distilleries, drug manufacturing establishments, swing factories, and pit-wagon factories—in short, about everything that is used in the mechanical and industrial world except textile goods.

In Butler County there is located one of the works of the great Standard Car Co., employing 5,000 operatives and more, and a large plate-glass works, and in addition Butler County is one of the greatest oil-producing territories in the North. As I have previously stated on the floor of the House, it is a large agricultural district, probably more than one-third of its inhabitants being engaged in the honorable, honest, and staid pursuit of farming, and everywhere is seen the fructifying results of honest toil.

FOREIGN LABOR PREFERRED TO AMERICAN LABOR.

The claim is made that the enactment of this bill into law will reduce the price paid to the wage earner. It has always been the contention of the Republican Party that a high protective duty increased and maintained the price of wages that the laborer receives. The advocates of a high protective tariff have always contended, and are contending, that the American laborer is the highest-paid laborer in the world. Whether he is the highest-paid laborer in the world, God knows it is low enough. Pennsylvania has always been pointed to as the citadel of high protection and the home of the best-paid wage earner on the earth.

Let us see whether or not Pennsylvania, with its diversified and protected interests, pays such wages as the advocate of high protection can boast of.

I take as my authority the annual report of the Secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania, prepared by the Bureau of Industrial Statistics of that department, providing data and statistics for the year ending December 31, 1909, and containing also statistical facts taken as late as April 28, 1910. It is well to remark here at this point that this report was prepared by a Republican official, it being generally admitted that the State of Pennsylvania has for its officials no other than those who belong to that political faith, and it might be added that too severe a case would not be made out against the party to which the officers owe their election.

By this report of the Bureau of Industrial Statistics of the department of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania it is shown that in the several occupations given the total of 790,048 persons were employed. Of this number 126,293, or nearly 20 per cent, were reported with "nationality not known." The remaining 663,755 were grouped in three classes—Americans, foreigners, and negroes—and were employed as indicated in the following table of industries in the year 1909:

Industries and the number of Americans, foreigners, and negroes employed.

	Americans.	Foreigners.	Negroes.
Anthracite mining	51,567	86,105	23
Bituminous mining	54,531	107,728	1,602
Cars, car wheels, and castings	5,600	5,324	35
Cement works	3,498	5,928	14
Foundries and machine shops	5,946	1,295	124
General industries	77,550	20,217	228
Glass factories	15,401	8,057	201
Leathers (tanneries, etc.)	5,418	4,997	21
Paper mills	4,643	2,052	3
Pig-iron furnaces	4,977	8,290	407
Powder mills	533	108	3
Rolling mills	21,487	14,592	804
Steel ingots and castings	4,683	3,316	300
Steel works	22,241	30,331	1,436
Silk mills	22,936	6,014	.....
Slate quarries	3,532	1,204	14
Textile mills, Philadelphia	44,923	9,937	70
Tin plate mills	1,732	671	48
Total	342,197	316,130	5,428

Thus it will be seen that in the 18 industries marked in this table that there are 342,197 Americans employed, as against 316,130 foreigners and 5,428 negroes. It is fair to reason that since this report states that the 126,293 persons were of "nationality not known" that they are mostly foreigners, which would seem to indicate that there is more foreign labor employed in these 18 industries which I have mentioned than there are Americans. In bituminous coal mining, which prevails mostly in the district which I represent, there are 45,531 Americans employed, as against 107,728 foreigners and 1,602 negroes, or, in relative percentage, 29.4 Americans, 69.6 foreigners, and 1 per cent negroes. In the glass factories the percentage is 65.1 per cent American, 34 per cent foreigners, and nine-tenths of 1 per cent negroes. In the pig-iron furnaces the percentage is 26.4 per cent American, 60.6 per cent foreigners, and the balance negroes. In the steel works 42.2 per cent are Americans, 56.2 per cent foreigners, and the balance negroes. In these four industries, which operate chiefly in the district which I represent, there is, then, practically 43 per cent American, 55.1 per cent foreigners, and the balance negroes.

Again, I will quote from this same Republican authority wherein this Republican officeholder makes the following observation:

A particularly noteworthy feature of the tabular statement is the large number of foreigners in some of the chief occupations of the State. It will be seen that they greatly predominate in coal mining and in steel work. That fact may be the explanation, in part, of the many distressing accidents occurring so frequently in those industries, and may be the cause also of so many labor disturbances connected with them. A recent report of the United States Immigration Commission, headed by Senator DILLINGHAM, of Vermont, gives color, if not entire confirmation, to that theory. That body reports concerning the bituminous coal fields of western Pennsylvania that 75 per cent of the miners are unable to write any language, and that more than half of them were incapable of speaking or barely understanding English. It would seem that a very large proportion were from southern Europe, and were composed of elements not at all skilled in even the simplest forms of manual labor as carried on in our country. Scarcely any of these has ever worked in mines before coming to this country, and were so densely ignorant of our usages and customs pertaining to such operations that it is a source of wonder that greater disaster has not occurred in consequence of their employment in such excessive numbers. Compared with them the commission found even the poorest American superior.

All through this debate and in all pleas that are made to preserve the protective tariff there has been a constant demand that the duties which are sought by this bill to be removed be retained in order that the American laborer and American labor may be protected against foreign pauper labor, yet we have the spectacle before us in the State of Pennsylvania of a preponderance of foreign labor. The protectionist would protect woolen manufactures by a high rate of duty and declare against the just reductions in this bill, but under no circumstances would he be willing to put a protective wall around the

physical structure of the American laborer. Every ship bears hundreds of foreigners who come to this country to take the place of the American in the fields and shops of the United States, and no restriction is placed upon this influx. The American laborer competes with the world, but the clothes that cover the backs of himself and his children, and the food that is placed upon his table, and the shoes that he wears upon his feet, and the hat that covers his head is laden with a duty which he must pay, and it is pretended that this is necessary to sustain the Government of the United States.

DOES HIGH PROTECTION BENEFIT AMERICAN LABOR?

Now, we have considered the American laborer in the light of when he competes with foreign labor. Let us see whether or not this American labor is protected to the degree that is contended for it. Let us see whether or not the wages that are paid him are so very much in excess of the wages that are paid labor in foreign countries. Let us see if he is growing rich and fat upon the wages that he receives for work performed in the bowels of the earth or in the heat of the furnace. Let us see if he can clothe himself and his family and lade his table with the necessaries of life, to say nothing of the luxuries of life, upon the magnificent sum which he earns. Let us see what his total bill will be after he lays down his tools at the end of the year. Let us see if he can place a balance to his credit in the savings institutions of the country, or does he place his wages to the credit of the trusts and the protected interests?

THE PENNSYLVANIA COAL MINER.

From this same report, compiled by this same Republican officeholder, I find that the total of value of coal mined in the State of Pennsylvania in the year 1909 was $132,837,578; that the average wages paid superintendents, foremen, and office men were $3,732,612. I find that the number of superintendents, foremen, and office force is 3,603. I find that the average number of people employed was 173,003, and the aggregate wages paid to these employees were $90,680,216; that the average yearly earnings of these men who mine the coal, toil all day, and expose themselves to accidents and death, who are not protected by any employers' liability act, are $524.15, making an average daily wage, according to this report, of $2. I find in this same book a statement of accidents in bituminous coal mining for the year 1909, in which it is shown that there was a total of 449 fatalities, 4,151 nonfatal, making a total of 4,600. From the same Republican authority I discover a comparative table in which it is shown that the average yearly earnings, beginning 1903 and ending 1909, are as follows:

Average yearly earnings.

1903	$540.69
1904	453.09
1905	502.58
1906	545.21
1907	603.72
1908	477.56
1909	534.15

Average daily earnings, same period.

1903	$2.31
1904	2.26
1905	2.23
1906	2.66
1907	2.25
1908	1.92
1909	2.00

It might be of interest at this time to show from this comparative table that the average days of employment was:

1903	234
1904	204
1905	261
1906	205
1907	268
1908	248
1909	279

And while in no instance was he employed more than 279 days in one year, yet we know that it was necessary for him to clothe and feed his family for 365 days in a year.

THE PENNSYLVANIA GLASS WORKER.

Again, let us quote from this same book on the subject of glass bottles and tableware market in the State of Pennsylvania for the year 1909. We find that the market value of the production was $15,615,089, while the aggregate amount of wages paid was $6,609,998, and the average yearly wage was $440.94, and an average daily wage of $1.81. From this same authority we find that the market value of the production of polished plate-glass market in Pennsylvania in the year 1909 was $8,774,240, while the aggregate amount of wages paid was $3,528,337 and the average yearly wage was $628.04, or an average wage daily of $2.14. Window glass is produced to a very large extent in the district that I represent. The market value of that production was $4,848,587, while the aggregate amount of wages paid was $2,646,757, the average yearly wage being $509.87 and the daily wage $2.01.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STEEL WORKER.

Iron and steel bridges and structural work are manufactured in my district, and from the same report I discover that the market value of the production was $20,133,208, and the aggregate amount of wages paid $3,505,295, that the average yearly earning was $464.89, and the average daily wage $1.52. How much of a family could any husband and father provide for on the yearly wage of $464.89?

THE PENNSYLVANIA LEATHER WORKER.

Much was said in a previous debate about shoe leather and the irreparable damage and vast loss that would come to the wage earner in this branch of business, yet I turn to this same report of this same Republican officeholder and find that for the year 1909 the market value of the production of shoe leather, enameled and glazed kid, in the State of Pennsylvania was $19,949,502, while the magnificent amount of wages paid in the aggregate to the wage earners was $2,194,256, making a yearly average of $475.32, and an average daily wage of $1.58. And this same Republican authority informs us that there were actually 1,850 Americans employed as against 2,071 foreigners and 3 negroes in this branch of business. Let me inquire who is protected here? The manufacturer, the American, the foreigner, or the negro?

Again, let me refer to the report of the bureau of industrial statistics of the State of Pennsylvania and see what was done in the way of manufacturing sole and harness leather in 1909. The market value of the production in that year was $37,944,268 and the aggregate amount of wages paid was $2,999,288, and the average yearly earnings was $483.33 and the average daily wage was $1.41. Who gets this great balance of more than thirty millions of dollars? Let us look into another branch of leather production, from the same report of 1909, viz, leather-belting production. The market value of this production was $1,713,701, while the aggregate value of the amount of wages paid was $173,779, and the average yearly earnings $489.57, and the average daily wage $1.58. It will thus be seen that the operative and wage earner who works by the day secures one-tenth of what he produces. The same authority informs us that the market value of leather miscellaneous production for the year 1909 was $5,651,449, that the average amount of wages paid was $380,222, that the average yearly earnings of these laborers was $438.04, while the average daily wage was only $1.41; and it might be interesting to quote that of this average daily wage of $1.41 the average to the male was $1.45 and to the female 93 cents and to the minor 74 cents.

PAUPER WAGES PAID IN HOSIERY INDUSTRY.

If time permitted me, I might go into further detail along this line, on the subject of the various industrial productions in the State of Pennsylvania. I know it would be as interesting to you as it is to me, but I will finish with just one quotation from this report from the bureau of industrial statistics of Pennsylvania, which shows the market value of a protected production and the wages paid. I refer to the hosiery production, and I presume that wool and woolens enter into this production. The market value of this production was $15,388,382 and the aggregate amount of wages paid was $4,315,546, the average yearly earning was $277.26, and the average daily wage paid was 97 cents. In this industry there were employed 2,698 males, 11,032 females, and 1,837 minors; the average yearly wage was $451.14 for the males, $250.89 for the females, and $180.44 for the minors; and the average daily wage, based upon 285 days, being the average time of operation, was, males, $1.55; females, 88 cents; and minors, 63 cents. These are the figures prepared and published in the State of Pennsylvania and reported to the governor of that great State by one of its chief officers. These figures show that the wage earner of Pennsylvania is poorly paid, and that what he does earn he spends for the support of his family.

HIGH COST OF LIVING IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Now let us turn for a few minutes and see what it costs for this wage earner to live in the State of Pennsylvania. In this same report I find that the secretary of internal affairs of Pennsylvania caused an investigation to be made of the prices of foodstuffs. These prices were ascertained on April 28, 1910, at Uniontown, the county seat of Fayette County, 38 miles from where I live, and, as the report says, these prices were found not to vary greatly from those obtained from other localities about the same period. Here are the quotations given:

Beef: Tenderloin and porterhouse, 25 cents per pound; sirloin, 22 cents per pound; pin, 25 cents per pound; round, 18 cents per pound; boiling and neck, 11 to 12½ cents per pound.

Pork: Loin and chops, 22 cents per pound; shoulder, 18 cents per pound; steak and boiling pieces not handled at this season.
Lamb: Leg, 25 cents per pound; chops, 30 cents per pound; roast (loin), 30 cents per pound.
Veal: Cutlet, 25 cents per pound; chops, 17 to 18 cents per pound; chops (loin), 20 cents per pound; roast, 17 to 18 cents per pound.
Dried beef, 35 cents per pound.
Ham: Whole, 25 cents per pound; sliced, 30 cents per pound.
Bacon: Sliced or whole, 30 cents per pound; some at 28 cents per pound.
Chickens and ducks: Live, 22 to 23 cents per pound; dressed, 28 cents per pound.
Bologna, 12 to 25 cents per pound.
Sausage: Fresh, 20 cents per pound; smoked, 12 cents per pound.
Eggs, 24 to 25 cents per dozen.
Butter, 35 to 38 cents per pound.
Lard, 20 cents per pound.
Flour: Winter wheat, 80 cents per 25-pound sack; blend, 85 cents per 25-pound sack; straight spring, 90 to 95 cents per 25-pound sack; fancy brands, $1 to $1.05 per 25-pound sack.
Potatoes, 50 cents per bushel.
Apples: Baldwins, 50 cents per peck.
Turnips: New, 5 to 8 cents per bunch.
Beets: New, 5 to 8 cents per bunch.
Cabbage: Old, 6 cents per pound; new, 10 cents per pound.
Lettuce, 20 cents per pound.
Onions: Green, 5 cents per bunch; old, 3 pounds for 25 cents.
Carrots: New, 5 cents per bunch.
Sugar, 7 cents per pound, or 16 pounds for $1.

These are the prices that are paid by the wage earners in the district which I have the honor to represent. Clothes are not mentioned, nor are shoes. Besides these, the wage earner is required to pay his rent and is required to pay for his fuel and for his light. Thus it will be seen that little remains to him at the end of the year. He can save but little. In most of the industries I have mentioned his employment tends to incapacitate him for work as he grows older. His life of activity and usefulness is not so long as that of others.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is in line with the principles of the Democratic Party and its platform and its pledges. It lifts one of the many burdens from an already tax-burdened people. It places within the means of the toiler the power to purchase with the fruits of honest labor the clothes that shield himself and family from the blasts of winter; that protect him from the heat of the furnace and the deadly fire damp of the mine. It secures to all the necessities and comforts of life without impoverishing any. When our work is done, when we have finished and passed this bill to the other end of this Capitol, the strong, patient, and long-suffering American people will raise their grateful voices and call us blessed. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the management of our side of this Hall for giving me the honored opportunity of opening and closing the case on my side. [Laughter.] There has not been anybody here on our side who has spoken from the sheep end of this question.

It was with much reluctance and no little embarrassment, Mr. Chairman, that I addressed the House upon the Canadian reciprocity agreement and the farmers' free list bill, due to the fact that I realized I stood alone in opposition to my party colleagues in the views I entertained and expressed respecting those measures, and it is with similar reluctance and embarrassment, and for a similar cause, that I approach the discussion of the pending measure to oppose its essential provisions.

I am not an absolute unbeliever in the principle and policy of caucus action, but I am unalterably opposed to the principle and propriety of a caucus determination unless it is the outcome of a full, fair, and free discussion of the merits, as well as demerits, of any measure which it is proposed to enact into a law, and after ample opportunity has been afforded individual Members to give expression to their views upon the subject. It is manifestly impossible, in the consideration of a measure of such far-reaching and vital importance to such a large class of people, to accord it the full consideration it merits within the restricted space of ten hours and a half for debate, especially when such debate is confined to the members of the committee presenting the measure for caucus action. Such a time limit and such withholding of opportunity for an intelligent understanding of the character and import of the proposed measure renders it impossible for any unbiased Member of this House conscientiously and under his oath to give his support to the resolution of the caucus.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the members of the Ways and Means Committee, previous to the assembling of the caucus, it is doubtful if there is a Member of this body who knew just what rates were to be incorporated in this bill. It was an open secret that it was the purpose of the committee to carefully withhold the information, both from the Members of the House and the public at large—a species of unjustifiable cloture policy that I confess it is utterly beyond me to sympathize with. It would be a direct reflection upon the intelligence of the constituency which elected me to membership in this body to suppose that they would believe me capable of blindly acquiescing in a decision upon such an important matter and without an opportunity for its proper consideration. What I have said should not be construed as an arraignment of the Committee on Ways and Means, for I believe they were inspired by a disposition to conserve the interests of the country and the party as well; but, I repeat, I can not give my sanction and approval to any legislation the propriety of and the necessity for which I have been unable, through lack of opportunity afforded by the caucus of my party, to understand and discuss.

Mr. Chairman, the State which I have the honor in part to represent on this floor raises more sheep, produces more wool, and markets more mutton than that of all the districts represented by the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee combined, and I think I am safe in saying that the comparison would not suffer as respects my individual district alone.

I am neither young in years nor a novice in political affairs, nor am I wholly unacquainted with the sheep industry, Mr. Chairman. To the time I was 12 years of age I had never worn an outer suit of clothes the material of which was not clipped from my father's own flock of sheep, spun into thread by the old spinning wheel, woven into cloth and made into a suit right on the farm—a home product in every sense of the word. We did not have a great number of sheep, but we had over 100 negroes and a half dozen spinning wheels and two looms, which supplied the clothing for our entire family, and as well that of our dependents, both white and black. Since I became of age there has never been a time when I have not been, either directly or indirectly, engaged in farming and stock growing pursuits, in which sheep, and all of its products, have always claimed my favoring attention.

I have recounted this fragment of personal history, Mr. Chairman, as affording possibly some justification for my having entertained a feeling of resentment toward the Committee on Ways and Means for absolutely ignoring in their deliberations one of the Members of this House who really knows something about the sheep industry, and whose judgment respecting any legislation affecting it might not have proven inconsequential. I will, however, say very frankly that that feeling of resentment was completely dissipated by a reading of the bill as submitted and agreed upon in committee, for an examination of its provisions gave ample evidence of the fact that the committee had not been in need of any information or assistance that I, as a stock grower, or anyone else familiar with that business could furnish. Very greatly to my surprise and natural disappointment, the proposed measure failed to contain one provision which in the remotest degree reflected the true interests of the sheep grower. I was equally surprised that the purpose was candidly avowed that it was the intention that the sheep industry should be abandoned; that the 766,474 sheep growers of this country should be given notice to seek other occupation, and that the $500,000,000 of capital invested in that industry should be practically confiscated. My disappointment grew out of the rebuke to the hope I had cherished, that the triumphantly reinstalled Democratic Party, to which I claim allegiance, would deserve the faith recently reimposed in it by the country and would enjoy many years of usefulness. I could not bring myself to believe that that great party, strong of purpose, rich in long years of experience, and glorious in achievement, could, in an unguarded moment, yield to any temptation. And I am reminded, in this connection, of the inglorious fate of Samson of old. I am aware, of course, that we are all familiar with the potency of the historic teachings of the Bible, and their present-day application, but lest there be some who have not profited by them, let me briefly record how Samson was beguiled.

Delilah, the beautiful degenerate, with artful witchery sought for political purposes to know the secret of his strength.

Tell me—

She said—

I pray thee, wherein thy great strength lieth, and wherewith thou mightest be bound to afflict thee.

Then said Samson, evasively, and mayhap suspiciously:

If they bind me with seven green withs that were never dried, then shall I be weak, and be as another man.

The narrative tells us how Samson facetiously invited the binding with the withes; again, with the "new ropes that never were occupied"; and anon the "weaving of the seven locks of his head with the web," from which he severally quickly released himself, until he finally lent himself to his own destruction by revealing to the importunate siren the true source of

his might—his locks. "If I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak."

We can picture in vivid imagination her luring him into his fatal slumber under the soothing influence of the gentle stroke of her velvety hand, with his head resting upon her knee. She calls to the ready coconspirator, and Samson is shorn, undone, and rendered impotent. "The Philistines be upon thee, Samson," she cries; and they fall upon him and blind him and take him to prison. [Applause.]

This, Mr. Chairman, is the old familiar story of misdirected confidence and overcredulity. I can but wonder who was the fascinating and overweening Delilah who sat at the side of this sleeping giant, Democracy, and conspired to the deprivation of the source of its strength, and with it its golden opportunities. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, who is the conspirator in this case? Will the gentleman tell us? He pointed toward me.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. You are one of the Philistines. [Laughter.]

Was it the result of a disposition to "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee" to the pet fetich of the Nebraskan of free raw material for everything, regardless of what it is? Were they to divide with him the sentimental prejudice against the "bleating of the lamb," of which we have read so much in his journal, the Commoner, in his characterization of the selfishness of the stock grower, or is it because they really believe what Mr. Bryan said in the issue of the paper of June 9, as follows:

> A heavy tax is placed upon imported wool in the interest of the sheep owners of this country. Figures submitted by sheep men themselves disclose that there are not to exceed 22,000 persons engaged in the industry—owners, herders, shearers, and all. In view of the fact that the wool tariff adds hundreds of millions to our clothing bill, it would be a great deal cheaper for the Government to pension these men several thousand a year each.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Assuredly; and while you are at that I will find my place here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. But I want my friend to hear what I have to say.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Oh, I will hear you with pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. My friend does not mean to coincide with the views expressed by some distinguished leaders on the other side that the distinguished Nebraskan whom he refers to is still the leader of the Democratic Party, does he?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Well, sir, that will depend upon how you construe the resolution that was passed by the caucus the other night. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, does not my friend——

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. As far as I am personally concerned, I absolutely repudiate his leadership upon the proposition that I am now considering.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will my friend permit me just a little further to suggest, does he not know that although that gentleman has been inveighing against the action of certain Democrats here, that in 1894, although the Democratic platform of 1892 had declared expressly for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on State banks, he, being a Member of this House, not only voted against the repeal, but made a speech against it?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I do remember that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, then, does not the gentleman also remember that although this distinguished gentleman from Nebraska inveighs against other Democrats for what he calls "bolting," he within the last year bolted the Democratic State ticket in the State of Nebraska and opposed the Democratic nominee for governor?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Yes; but I do not want the gentleman to draw such a parallel between the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska and myself.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am not trying to do so.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Are you now meaning to say that I am bolting the Democratic Party?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all, because I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado I think he is perfectly within his rights, because he simply invokes the rule of the caucus which permits him to do that. It is perfectly honorable and perfectly lawful and perfectly within the party lines, and no man can accuse him of bolting on that account, but what I do want to ask the gentleman is whether he thinks the gentleman who for three times has been honored by one of the great parties of the Nation by a nomination for the Presidency, who bolted the action of the Democratic National Convention not only for the 10 per cent tax on the bank proposition, but he bolted the nominee of his party for governor last year. Is he in any position to advise the Democratic Party as to principles and honor?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Well, I will say to the gentleman I have known the Nebraskan as long and possibly as intimately as anybody in this land. I know that he is obsessed upon this one proposition of free raw material. I am satisfied that there is not a man in the country who is as well posted upon matters generally as that gentleman, but I do believe he has been misled concerning this matter, for, as I have already stated, he made an announcement in his paper of date of the 9th of this month that there were only 22,000 people in the United States who were engaged in the sheep business.

The figures I have given you of the number of sheep owners in this country are taken from the United States Statistical Abstract, and must be regarded as correct as to the sheep owners, to say nothing of the number of herders and other employees.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand it to be the gentleman's opinion that the view of the gentleman from Nebraska touching the possibility of putting wool on the free list was, perhaps, affected particularly by the misinformation he had touching the number of people interested in the industry? In other words, had he known there were a million instead of 22,000, would he have changed his views?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I would hardly say. I prefer to give him the benefit of the doubt as to whether he knew how important this question was, and consequently I do not want to be led into inveighing against Mr. Bryan and his doctrines outside of and beyond this one question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to ask my friend if he understands that the doctrine of free raw materials is a Democratic doctrine?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I know that it is not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Has it ever, by any Democratic national convention, been declared to be the policy of the Democratic Party?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Never; and never has been enunciated by any enlightened and intelligent leader of our party.

It will be observed, Mr. Chairman, that I am not responsible for the bringing on of this colloquy; it will also be observed that I hold Mr. Bryan in as high esteem as any man on this floor; and it will further be observed—and I wish to accentuate this idea—that I am neither in accord with the views entertained by Mr. Bryan, nor am I in accord with the majority of my party on this question; and therefore I am solely responsible for the views I have presented. What I have said and what I shall say is inspired by purely patriotic feelings and for the welfare of the Democratic Party.

Now, Mr. Chairman, viewing the matter from a party standpoint, can you, my Democratic friends, view with equanimity the following table, showing the sheep and goat owners in 1910 in doubtful States?

	Sheep.	Goat.
California	4,070	3,136= 7,203
Colorado	1,865	1,185= 3,050
Indiana	38,461	=38,461
Iowa	21,944	=21,944
Maine	11,267	=11,267
Minnesota	24,759	=24,759
Missouri	44,208	=44,208
Montana	2,303+ [1] 207	= 2,510
New Mexico	2,770+[1] 5,810	= 8,580
New York	25,104	=25,104
Ohio	71,906	=71,906
Oregon	6,462+[1] 4,226	=10,688
West Virginia	26,147	=26,147
Wisconsin	30,040	=30,040

[1] Goats.

Now, my Democratic friends, you can very safely multiply the number of sheep owners in the United States, as shown by the above table, by four, and this simple mathematical calculation will reveal, with what must strike you with potential and significant force, the very respectable voting strength of these citizens of our country who are either directly or indirectly interested in the sheep-growing industry of the various States I have enumerated, and it is this not inconsiderable and somewhat influential element with whom you will soon be called upon to reckon and suggest a defense of your position upon the

pending measure. How will you meet them on your political "judgment day," and just how will you render an account of your stewardship? Let us pause awhile in some apprehension for the answer.

I listened with much interest to the remarks of those gentlemen who favor this measure, with a view to ascertaining with what school of philosophy they are identified, when in one breath they tell us that wool, next to vegetable life, is most necessary for the human race; and in the next, as further indicated in the laborious effort in the report accompanying the bill, to show that the world's production of wool is on the decrease, and not only not in this legislation but in none promised is or will there be an effort to stay the hand of time against the day when the production will cease. I agree fully with them that this bill, if enacted into law, will lessen the production of wool here, but I deny that there has been any material reduction in the world's supply, barring a few years of drought, which is known to have existed in Australia and other countries. But in the United States our production has increased about 54 per cent in the last 14 years, and there is not a sheep grower in the United States but who will inform you that if we are allowed the freedom of competition with the foreign grower, as contemplated by the present law, in less than 10 years we would be producing more than we consume and have a surplus in addition.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States, aside from a natural sentiment, much prefer to patronize their home industry, knowing full well, as I shall later demonstate conclusively, that ours is the best quality of wool that is raised in the world, and that if the home industry is destroyed they will be at the mercy of the foreign grower with respect to what they shall pay for an inferior article. The people of this country had an abiding object lesson of this. They were promised, before the passage of the Wilson tariff bill, that the home industry would not be destroyed and that they would be enabled to purchase clothing at a lower rate. The magnificent result of the passage of that bill and the net benefit to the people was a much inferior article of clothing and at no lower price, and the near destruction of the sheep industry.

I characterized the passage of the "free-meat" provision of the farmers' free-list bill as a stupendous legislative blunder and a monumental outrage against the interests of the farmer and stock grower. I now say the same, with added emphasis, as respects this insidious measure. There was absolutely no excuse for its birth, and there could be no logical apology for its existence.

Mr. Chairman, I am not, as is well known, a protectionist in the commonly accepted definition of that somewhat elastic and much-abused term, but I think I voice the sentiment of approval of the American producer when I say that I view with favor the incidental benefit and protection, if you please, that is afforded the articles of domestic production that are not on the free list, by the mutual competition of similar articles of foreign production that enter this country. This, I take it, in the last analysis, is the true, honest, and correct principle of protection in one aspect of the situation.

I can not, however, be too strong in condemnation of the thoroughly un-American and really recreant policy of enacting legislation which places it within the power of the speculator, vaguely denominated the "middle man," to not only rob the American sheep owner of the just and merited fruits of his labor but also to deprive the Government of revenue receipts aggregating more than $7,000,000, as is the case in this instance, every dollar of which he appropriates to his own selfish purposes while he reaps a golden harvest from the proceeds of his nefarious work, importing no greater amount of wool than he has been importing under the present bill, and we have already seen that he has been importing much more than has been consumed. It has been suggested in a nebulous way that the ultimate consumer will be benefited by this measure, but is it not irresistably logical that as long as there is no specific law on the statute book which compels him to sell at a stipulated price it is within his power, and it is perfectly needless to say he will not fail to avail of it, to charge what he pleases and "bear" the market to the unfortunate producer?

Mr. Chairman, I concede to no man on this floor a greater devotion to and longer services in the maintenance of the principles of our party. There are few if any Members on this floor who enjoy as I do the rare distinction of having voted for 11 different nominees of the Democratic Party for the presidency. In a majority of those elections I was not only one of the modest counselors in the party but was a candidate for elector or some office. I think I am as well informed as the ordinary Member of what our party has stood for in the past and the place it occupies to-day with reference to the tariff, and my vote against the reciprocity agreement, and against the free-meat clause of the farmers' free-list bill, and my position on this bill I claim to be in strict accord with Democratic doctrine as declared by our Democratic platforms, as well as consistent with the intelligent thought expressed by the foremost of our statesmen.

Hear what President James K. Polk said in his message which preceded the Walker tariff law:

> The terms "protection to domestic industry" are of popular import, but they should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter who toils yearly in his fields is engaged in "domestic industry," and is as much entitled to have his labor "protected" as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator, or the mechanic who are engaged also in "domestic industry" in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute in the aggregate the "domestic industry" of the Nation, and they are equally entitled to the Nation's "protection."

And the author of the bill of 1842, Mr. Walker, said:

> It discriminates in favor of the manufacturer and against agriculture by imposing many higher duties upon the manufactured fabric than upon the agricultural product out of which it is made.

Andrew Jackson said:

> The agricultural interest of our country is so essentially connected with every other, and is so superior in importance to them all, that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your attention. It is principally as manufactures and commerce tend to increase the value of agricultural productions and to extend their application to the wants and comforts of society that they deserve the fostering care of government.
>
> The general rule to be applied in graduating duties upon articles of foreign growth or manufacture is that which will place our own in fair competition with those of other countries, and the inducements to advance even a step beyond this point are controlling in regard to those articles which are of primary necessity in time of war.

Albert Gallatin said:

> as shall be consistent with the purposes of revenue and equal in its operation on the different parts of the United States, and on the various interests of the same.

The Democratic platform of 1888 declared:

> Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations.

The Democratic platform of 1896 declared:

> We hold that tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country, and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government honestly and economically administered.

The Democratic platform of 1904 said:

> So levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

I am addressing myself to this bill as if it declared straight out for free wool, because I will show before concluding that at the present price of wool in this country it is as disastrous to the woolgrower as if the declaration should be for free wool absolutely. And it is not without amusement that I have witnessed the controversy going on between Members on this side. Some are trying to uphold the bill because it is protection, others would like to defeat it because it is protection, and it is also rather humorous to listen to the controversy that has been indulged in between the distinguished Nebraskan and those here in favor of the small duty placed upon wool in the bill.

I do not think this distinguished citizen of Nebraska need tear off more than his outer shirt concerning the position of our distinguished friends, the honorable Speaker, our honored leader the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and others, for, from my viewpoint, the inoculation of these leaders with the protection germ for the wool industry will not bring on even the mildest incipient case of varioloid. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, if the references I have given do not commit the Democratic Party to the doctrine of free wool, then we should look elsewhere for reasons for the passage of this bill. I am not a close student of the Bible, though I believe in the Book; I am possibly more familiar with the laws of our country, and I fail to find either in divine or human law any authority, under any condition or circumstance, that would justify this Government in passing a law to take a dollar from my pocket and transfer it to that of my neighbor, nor the bread that belongs to the mouths of my children to those of my neighbor's. I believe that immoral principle is here invoked, and, believing that, my conscience withholds my vote for this bill in its present form. It is worse than that; it does not go to the mouths, nor my neighbor's children, but to the foreign producer. Now, if from first to last I do not establish the proposition I make, then my attitude allows criticism, but that criticism should not go beyond a reflection upon my intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, it is often said that a Congressman's vote upon the tariff question is controlled by the interests involved to his immediate constituents. Whilst I deny that is entirely so in my case, yet I am not without sufficient reason to oppose this measure, viewed from that standpoint.

My State is credited with having a million and a half of sheep in 1910, but the number was very much greater than that. However, that would place her about seventh in rank of sheep-producing States of the Union. Besides, we have 37,669 goats, the clip of which is of vast importance to our State, and which also comes under the ban of this bill. We have 1,865 farms producing sheep and 1,185 farms producing goats, and I think it is safe to calculate there are at least 4 adults connected with or dependent upon the industry of each farm; there would therefore be 12,200 such persons, the same being one-eighth of the voting population, which, measured by the difference between the two parties in that State, would equal if not exceed a majority. And whilst it is neither here nor there, so far as the merits of this question are concerned, nevertheless, as a devotee of the Democratic Party, I can not close my eyes to the fact that in my judgment there will be at least 12,200 votes, regardless of party, that will be cast against anyone who believes in destroying these two industries of our State. The woolgrowers of that State drank very deeply from the bitter cup of adversity that followed the enactment of the Wilson law. The people of my district during the past winter and spring lost upon their feeding of lambs over a million and a half dollars. Whether justified or not, they believe the hue and cry of the high cost of living, accompanied by the threat of the free importation of meats by subsequent legislation, brought about this loss. Moreover, since the 1st day of May, consequent to the depression in the price of wool, occasioned by the introduction of this bill, they have lost on their wool clip over $400,000. This statement is based upon the wool clip of 1910, as given by the Statistical Abstract, and upon advice by wire I have just received that their loss will be not less than 5 cents per pound, and I regard these figures as extremely conservative. Further, not only in Colorado, but elsewhere, the sheepmen have for years been obliged to borrow money to keep up their foals, expecting always that wool prices and mutton prices would go up.

The wool speculator takes advantage of this situation at all times, and he is especially active in his inactivity to purchase at the present time, believing that prices will lower. The banker is anxious and is insisting upon his money; therefore the poor sheep grower is confronted with the importunate banker, the rapacious speculator, the manufacturer, and the Woolen Trust, clamoring for cheaper wool.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, we have a young and rapidly growing Commonwealth. The injury to one industry has always a reflecting and baleful influence upon all others. Our State was nearly depopulated at one time by reason of the demonetization of silver. We are to-day cursed and tax-ridden by the Federal Government in its "new national" doctrine of capitalizing all our natural resources to produce an asset for revenue purposes, and it has driven thousands upon thousands of our best citizens away, retarding beyond measure, in many ways I have not time to point out, the settlement and development of our State.

We live a long way from a central market for our products. Our sources of revenue from cultivation of the soil is now, and for many years to come must be, from the raising of live stock. With free trade with Canada, free meats from the world, and free wool, in my judgment, the clock of progress in our State will be turned back a quarter of a century.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said, I read in vain our platforms to find we are pledged to the Canadian agreement, the free-meat clause in the farmers' free list bill, or the passage of this bill. I search in vain through the columns of debates in the Sixty-first Congress on the tariff bill, and I remember the speeches made during the campaign of 1908 and 1910 by our Democratic leaders, but I neither find in one or the other a syllable expressing a promise for free wool should our party be elevated to power. It certainly was not heard upon the stump in Colorado, nor did it find expression in any of the many Democratic journals of that State over the period mentioned.

I could, Mr. Chairman, bring myself to a more patient pass should I have heard anyone upon this floor undertake to demonstrate that the consumer would obtain a benefit from the passage of the wool provision in this bill. And here let me say that the duty on raw wool has never been a feature in regulating the price paid by the consumer for woolen clothing, because the amount of wool that enters into a suit of all-wool clothing is so small as to be of no consideration when compared to the enormous profits of the middleman. The average suit of clothes requires 3¾ yards of cloth weighing from 10 to 14 ounces per yard. A 12-ounce cloth, then, if made of all wool, would require approximately 8 pounds of average American wool as it comes from the sheep. This wool is now selling at 16 cents a pound; therefore the woolgrower is receiving less than $1.30 for furnishing all the wool that goes to make a suit of clothes. If you figure out the price he is receiving for the wool, namely, 16 cents per pound, and what it has cost him to produce it, he is losing in the furnishing of that 8 pounds of average American wool from 25 to 40 cents per suit; in other words, even under the present law he is making a present to every person purchasing a suit of clothes of from 25 to 40 cents out of his labor and capital. And Heaven only knows what his loss would be measured by the present bill.

I will deflect for a time to the consideration of the objection to the ad valorem mode of fixing the duty as against the specific duty. Ad valorem duties are unfair to the grower of wool, as well as the users of woolen clothing, and offer most protection at a time when least is needed and the least protection when most is needed. For example, on a 20 per cent ad valorem basis—that being the basis of this bill—when wool is 20 cents per pound in London the duty would be 4 cents per pound; when wool is 10 cents per pound in London—when we most need protection—the duty would be 2 cents per pound. Ad valorem duties always lead to undervaluation and put a premium on dishonesty and tend to drive honest importers out of the business.

Wool is a commodity possessed of many variations. It is imported from nearly every nation on the globe, including many that are but partly civilized. It is bought in different manners—some direct from the grower, some through commission men, and some at the market places. Considering the wide variation in quality, the great number of nations from which it is imported, and the different methods of purchasing it, it is perfectly absurd to assume that any customs official should place any different valuation upon imported wool other than that given by the importer.

It is asserted that our customs officials could ascertain the value at which a shipment of wool was sold in the foreign market. This in some instances may be true, but, as I have said, much of our wool is not bought at public auction, and that which is bought at such sales could easily, on account of the insignificant charge for water transportation, be reshipped from the point of purchase to some other port and thence rebilled for shipment to the United States, thus most effectually defeating any effort to determine the point of origin of the consignment.

The value of wool rests largely upon the amount that it may shrink when scoured, and the only way our customs officials could even hope to arrive at an estimate of the foreign value of the consignment of wool would be to scour samples of it and obtain its value in that manner. This law, however, does not permit such a procedure.

Most honest importers are opposed to the ad valorem basis, for on such a basis they must either adopt the tactics of the most dishonest importer or be driven from business by unfair competition.

In all fairness I may ask how our customs officials could determine the foreign value of a shipment of wool purchased direct from the grower, or through some commission firm, in Egypt, Peru, or Russia.

The ad valorem duties are unfair to the consumer of woolen clothing, for under their operation only the lower grades or cheaper wools will be imported. It is only natural to assume that if the duty on a good wool, costing 20 cents per pound, is 4 cents, and a poorer wool costing 10 cents per pound could be imported for 2 cents, it naturally follows that the importer will select the poorer wool in order to effect a saving in duties. This practically would rob our producers and consumers by loading the country up with inferior wools.

The operation of ad valorem duties may be fairly estimated from the result of the tariff upon carpet wools during the past year. The present duty on carpet wools provides that wools valued at 12 cents per pound or less shall be admitted for 4 cents duty; if valued at over 12 cents per pound, the duty is 7 cents per pound. This, in effect, is an ad valorem duty. Last year's custom reports show that out of 115,000,000 pounds of carpet wool imported over 70 per cent came in valued at less than 12 cents per pound and paid the duty of 4 cents per pound, and less than 30 per cent was valued at over 12 cents per pound and paid the duty of 7 cents per pound. This occurred at a time when carpet wools were extremely high abroad, and when many well-informed people estimate that over 90 per cent of them probably cost in excess of 12 cents per pound and should have paid the 7-cent duty. The gross frauds apparently practiced in these carpet wools convinced many that this ad valorem

duty should be abolished and a flat specific duty given to all carpet wools.

It is a common argument of those who seek the destruction of the sheep industry that that has nothing to do with the maintenance of the industry. Every statistic available as to our sheep industry refutes this argument. By examining the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, we find that in 1897, following free trade in wool, the number of sheep in the United States was 36,819,000, valued at $1.82 per head, or a total value of $67,021,000. In the year 1910 the same report shows 57,216,000 sheep, valued at $4.08 per head, with a total value of $233,664,000. Thus showing an increase of sheep, after 14 years of protection, of approximately 50 per cent and an increase in value of 248 per cent.

In addition to this enormous increase we must recall the fact that in 1897 we were normally consuming about 8,000,000 muttons per year, while in the year 1910 it is estimated we consumed between 15,000,000 and 16,000,000 muttons. Had the consupmtion of mutton not increased and had wool production been very profitable during the past 14 years, it is safe to assume that to-day our wool production would fully equal home demands.

Again, in determining the number of our sheep, we must not lose sight of the fact that the national forests during the past five years have been a factor in somewhat decreasing their numbers by the withdrawing of grazing privileges.

The woolgrowers have not, for many years, received the full protection the law specifies and which it intended they should receive.

When the Morrill law was first passed, in 1867, the duty that it gave to the sheepman upon wool was based upon the fact that foreign wool and domestic wool shrunk about the same amount during the process of scouring, or approximately 66⅔ per cent. In other words, it required 3 pounds of grease wool, either foreign or domestic, to produce 1 pound of scoured wool. Foreign and domestic wools at that time did shrink from 60 to 75 per cent, and therefore the protection given the grower against a pound of foreign wool was equal to the protection indicated in the law. The importer of wool soon saw that under this arrangement he was paying a duty on dirt and grease, and forthwith set about to obtain foreign wools of lighter shrinkage, in order that he might get more scoured wool for the same amount of duty. Foreign growers being anxious to meet the American demand, began the production of light-shrinking wool through care in their sorting and preparation for our markets.

The wools were sorted and those of light shrinkage packed separately for the American markets. The cross-bred wools were substituted for the fine merino, and all wools were partially willowed before being packed. These efforts on the part of the foreign grower soon resulted in a material reduction in the shrinkage of foreign wools, and the climax was reached when the skirting clause was added to Schedule K. This clause permitted the foreign grower to skirt—that is, remove the necks, legs, bellies, tags, or locks from every fleece of wool and permitted the importation of the light-shrinking remainder of the fleece, without additional duty. It must be apparent to all that the removal of these parts of the fleece removed the part containing the greatest shrink, and is an injustice to the American grower, who must sell his fleeces intact. The skirts removed from foreign fleeces are not imported and are used by foreign manufacturers. The skirting process has gone on until to-day practically all of the class 1 wools imported into the United States are skirted wools.

In this process of evolution wools which shrank from 60 to 75 per cent as imported in 1867 shrink from 26 to 52 per cent as now imported. Of course, this assertion means that a cross-bred wool has been substituted for a merino and that the merino itself has been materially reduced in shrinkage.

American wools average 61 per cent in shrink, and the wools of Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Texas, Kansas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico shrink on an average of from 63 to 69 per cent. Therefore these heavy-shrinking wools have been displaced by imported wools shrinking on an average of but little more than half of what our wools shrink, and as a result our growers have but little more than half of the protection the law intended them to have.

We imported in 1909 about 20,000,000 pounds of class 1 wool from New Zealand. These wools shrunk when scoured from 26 to 38 per cent, averaging about 32 to 34 per cent shrink.

We imported from South America over 57,000,000 pounds of class 1 wool, shrinking from 30 to 39 per cent and averaging about 34 per cent.

We imported from Australia 60,000,000 pounds of class 1 wool, shrinking from 38 to 54 per cent, with very little shrink as high as 50 per cent.

All of these wools were skirted and paid a duty on the grease pound of 11 cents. Since the New Zealand wools averaged about 34 per cent in shrink, the importer paid in duty 17 cents to obtain sufficient wool to make 1 pound of scoured wool.

The average shrink of the wools from South America was 34 per cent. Therefore, the importer paid in duty about 17 cents to obtain 1 pound of scoured wool.

The duty paid to obtain a pound of Australian scoured wool was a trifle higher, but I am informed does not exceed 22 cents.

On all of the above wools the law says the duty on a pound of scoured wool shall be 33 cents, yet, as I have shown, in reality about half of this is collected on sufficient wool in the grease to produce 1 pound of scoured wool.

You will readily understand that if 3 pounds of our western wool are required to make 1 pound of scoured wool, and if sufficient foreign wool to make 1 pound of scoured wool can be imported for, say, 18 cents in duty, the actual protection our growers receive against foreign wool would be one-third of 18 cents, or 6 cents per pound. We are charged with getting 11 cents protection on class 1 wool, when in reality we have but little more than half of this amount, and in every argument made against the tariff on raw wool they have calculated the increased cost of clothing to the consumer by reason of this tariff, upon the assumption that the growers received the full protection the law intended to give.

Now, when we consider class 2 wools, the situation is just as bad. These are the wools taken from the mutton sheep, such as should be extensively raised throughout all portions of this Nation and a sheep which we can raise as good, if not better, than any other portion of the world. These sheep are largely English breeds of sheep, some of which produce what is known as the luster wools, and I am told by manufacturers and by cloth importers that the United States can and does produce the best luster wool raised in the world. Now it has been asserted that we do not raise these class 2 wools. This is a falsehood, and I want to say that the sheep breeders of this Nation are prepared to produce all the class 2 wool that this country can ever consume any time they are given a modest degree of protection which would permit its production.

The law says the duty on 1 pound of wool of class 2, either washed or unwashed, is 12 cents per pound. We imported last year 31,000,000 pounds of this class of wool, shrinking from 16 to 26 per cent, and averaging not to exceed 20 per cent. Therefore the importer obtained enough of this class of wool in the grease to make 1 pound of scoured wool for 15 cents in duty. The shrink of this class of wool is a matter of record and was testified to before the House Ways and Means Committee two years ago, and is fully established. If there be those who doubt the accuracy of these figures as to shrinkage of foreign wools, I would refer them to page 20 of the "Wool Year Book," a standard publication of the wool industry of England, published by the Technical College, Bradford, England, and to the further fact that these statements have been made by men who know the wool industry.

No one denies that our importers handle only the lightest shrinking wool, on account of the reduction in duty. In the foreign markets the term "suitable for American trade" always means light shrinkage.

In referring further to the actual protection received by our growers, it has been repeatedly charged and never successfully denied that carpet wools imported at 4 or 7 cents per pound are used to a considerable extent in the manufacture of clothing. The extent to which these wools are used for this purpose can not be accurately ascertained and can only be estimated from the fact that carpet wools are advertised for "better than carpet purposes," and by the further fact that one most frequently sees upon the streets and in the stores suits of clothing made from carpet wool. The use of these wools for clothing purposes is admitted by the manufacturers of carpets in their brief submitted to the Ways and Means Committee. Every pound of carpet wool used for clothing purposes displaces a pound of American-grown wool and defrauds our woolgrowers out of the protection the law intended to give them.

The shrinkage of foreign-grown wools has grown less year by year, and will continue to grow less as time goes on. Just as this shrinkage decreases, the actual protection afforded to our growers also decreases.

It must be conceded by all that the cost of producing wool in this country is far greater than it was when the Morrill law was first passed. In fact the cost is gradually increasing each year and is now 50 per cent greater than it was just a few years ago. During all this time that the cost of producing American wool has been increasing, the actual protection that our growers receive from the tariff against foreign wool has been decreasing, due to the decreasing shrink of imported wools, and the wonder is, not that we do not pro-

duce all the wool consumed in this country, but that we do produce as much as we do.

It has been stated that this bill, at 20 per cent ad valorem, gives the grower a protection of 5 cents per pound, but in view of the light shrinkage of imported wools, an evil which is not corrected by this bill, the actual protection that it would afford our growers against imported wool would be from 2 to 3 cents per pound, not taking into account the fraud that would be practiced by undervaluations. Figuring 3 pounds of our Western wool to make 1 pound of scoured wool, our protection per pound under this bill would be approximately 2.9 cents, if undervaluation was not practiced. This is but little more than sufficient to equalize the difference in the cost of transporting wool from foreign countries to Boston and from our Western States to Boston. The Western woolgrower pays from $1.75 to $2.50 per hundred pounds for freight on his wool in the grease to Boston, Philadelphia, or New York, the points to which our wool must be shipped. Wool can be laid down in Boston or New York from South America at less than one-half cent per pound in the grease. And everyone knows that wool is produced in the great producing countries of the world for less than one-half the cost of production in the United States.

The cost of producing wool in the United States is a matter of record and will be found fully itemized in the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in the brief presented for the National Woolgrowers' Association by Messrs. Hagenbarth, Stericker, and Knollin.

The amount of money paid to labor by our woolgrowers ranges from 75 cents to $1.25 per head, amounting in the aggregate to $60,000,000 per year. The number of laborers engaged in caring for our sheep is over 150,000, and this figure does not include those engaged in other lines of industry dependent upon the sheep industry for its existence. The census shows about 756,474 individual woolgrowers in the United States.

Our Nation has built up a sheep industry which supplies our people with 330,000,000 pounds of the best wool in the world. American wool is superior to imported wool and outwears it, grade for grade, to a considerable degree. It is stronger, works better, wears better, and is better than imported wool. Our Government recognizes this fact, and in all contracts which it lets for woolen clothing for our Army and Navy specifies that only American-grown wool can be used in their manufacture. As tending to show the quality of foreign wools that are largely imported into this country, and upon which our people would have to depend for their clothing if our sheep industry is struck down, I submit the following statements from the Wool Yearbook previously referred to. This book gives the quality and uses of foreign wool and ours:

South American wools: Used as cheap material for blending or medium-quality dress goods. The weakness found in these wools are in strength and uniformity, this being somewhat marked.

African wools: These wools are slightly inferior in strength and are indifferent as to felting quality. Used as cheap material for blending or for medium-quality dress goods.

American wools: Used for the best grade for American trade.

It has been asserted that the sheep industry was limited in scope, but this is misrepresentation. The sheep industry obtains in practically every State in the Union, and it is an industry that should be maintained upon every American farm.

It is believed by some that the wool men make an immense profit from the production of mutton; but, unfortunately, mutton production has not been profitable. The report of the Department of Agriculture shows that the average price paid the woolgrower for 100 pounds of mutton in Chicago during the past six years is $5.13. This certainly is a reasonable price, and its production at this price has lost millions of dollars to the American sheep breeders. If the consumer has paid more than this for his mutton, the woolgrower did not get the difference and can not be blamed for the cost of meat at retail.

If we slaughter in this country annually 15,000,000 mutton, they will average, dressed, approximately 50 pounds each. Therefore the sheep industry furnishes our people with 750,000,000 pounds of meat per year. A reduction in the tariff on wool in the past, when the cost of production was low, has always meant a serious reduction in the number of sheep. A reduction in the duty now, when cost of production is high, means the destruction of the sheep industry and the removal of this annual meat supply of 750,000,000 pounds. This can not help but be reflected in the upward price of other meats. It is, therefore, of vital interest to the average citizen that we maintain our sheep industry in order that our people may have access to an increasing supply of meats. Mutton is recognized as a most desirable food on account of the fact that it is nutritious, low in price, and not bulky in volume, and to the further fact that sheep suffer from no contagious disease communicable to man. The reports of the United States Bureau of Animal Industry indicate that less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of the sheep inspected by its employees are condemned, something that can not be said for other meat foods.

A strenuous effort is made to demonstrate that the lowering of the duties on imported wool will not reduce the production in this country. On the other hand, those who oppose the reduction provided in the bill say that it necessarily will curtail the home production, and the arguments in support of the one or the other position center around the conditions prevailing just before, during, and just after the period when the Wilson tariff law of 1894 was enacted.

It would seem that it would be entirely unnecessary to go to that period or any other to solve the question, for the reason that it seems to me it goes without saying that since the imports and the local production combined are sufficient as a supply for home consumption that the importation of one pound more would necessarily tend to curtail the local or home production, for we must assume that it would lower the price, the doing of which would curtail the production. This must be true unless the price will rise out of proportion to the increased supply.

However, let us briefly examine the history of the wool business over the period of time mentioned.

The bill went into effect in 1895. Our production was 309,748,000. In 1896 it fell to 274,708,000 pounds; in 1897, the last year of the law, it fell to 259,153,251 pounds, a decrease of 50,594,749. The production since has constantly grown. In 1910 it was 281,363,000, showing an increase of 26 per cent.

Now, look at the imports. In addition to the imports of wool, we imported in three and one-half years under the Wilson bill 76,736,522 pounds of waste noils, rags, and shoddy. This reduced to its wool equivalent amounts to 230,209,566 pounds; in other words, it displaced that amount of our wool in the grease. Adding the above imports of shoddy, the wool imports, the total import of wool for the Wilson bill was 1,018,005,522. Compare this with the imports of shoddy, and so forth, during the three years beginning with 1898, which amounted to only 1,250,377 pounds, or an equivalent of our wool in the grease of 3,751,131 pounds. Add to this the imports of wool from 1898 to 1900, which amounted to 365,459,000, giving us a total import of only 369,210,000 pounds of wool and its equivalent in shoddy, showing an excess of importation under the Wilson bill of shoddy of 226,458,435 pounds, and an increase of wool imports of 422,337,000 pounds, or an increase in wool, shoddy, and so forth, during the period of the Wilson bill of 648,795,491 pounds.

Now, in the face of these figures, where is the man who has the assurance to say that the Wilson bill had no effect upon the importation of wool, the kind of clothing, and so forth, and by the same token can he say that the American woolgrower will not be injured by the enactment into law of the present bill?

Besides there was carried over from 1895, 194,724,651 pounds; from 1896, 393,986,523 pounds; from 1897, 794,484,726 pounds; from 1898, 761,515,011 pounds; from 1899, 589,891,246 pounds; from 1900, 494,073,762 pounds; from 1901, 396,818,135 pounds; from 1902, 314,760,961 pounds; from 1903, 286,097,713 pounds; from 1904, 283,622,700 pounds; from 1905, 253,524,107 pounds; from 1906, 180,299,002 pounds; from 1907, 158,115,586 pounds; from 1908, 228,515,586 pounds.

Now, this is over and above consumption and export. It demonstrates beyond question that during these 13 years the importer and speculator had a firm grip upon the wool business. With this large surplus on hand, from time to time he was enabled to manipulate the market against the stock grower as well as the manufacturer, and since 1908 there has been carried over not so much, but many million pounds. On the day this bill was introduced I wired to the customs officers in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia and ascertained that there was in bond in warehouses imported wool equivalent to one-fifth of our production for the year of 1910. And if there be added to this our surplus held by speculators, there is every reason to believe the entire amount will be somewhere in the neighborhood of the other figures I have given.

Now, you propose by this bill to exactly double the power of the speculator and importer to manipulate the market and drive down the price of the home sheep grower's wool by cutting the duties the importer did pay in half, thus enabling him to rob the Government of more than the $7,000,000, that being the amount of revenue we give up under the bill. You see that he was not only willing to pay the duties under the present law, but to import more than was needed for consumption; so, as a revenue measure, the bill must prove worse than a failure.

It is known that sheep will eat and destroy over 300 different varieties of weeds. Before I was pressed into the service of the Government for years they were the only lawn mower I had on my place. They are the only positive exterminators of the dandelion. Extracts from many of the glands of the ani-

mal are now recognized by the medical profession as being absolutely necessary for the nourishment of the ill and staying the hand of death, and especially is it valuable as a remedy for that aggravating and persistent affection—asthma.

It has grown to be a custom to refer to our venerable Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, as an authority upon all subjects pertaining to stock growing. I wish to read you what he says about sheep and the sheep industry of this country, and I especially commend it to my fellows on this side who speak so hopefully of the extermination of sheep:

SECRETARY WILSON'S LETTER.

I regret very much that it is impossible for me to accept your kind invitation and attend the annual meeting of your association. It gives me pleasure, however, to send representatives of the Department of Agriculture and to write this message to the convention.

I look upon the development of the sheep industry as a positive necessity for the agriculture of the country, and it should be encouraged all along the line.

Owing to the increase in the price of beef, the increase in the number of people in the cities who live in apartments, and the apparent decrease in the size of families in the cities, housekeepers have found it to their advantage to purchase cuts of meat which are low in price, comparatively small in bulk, and which are used up before they are kept any length of time in a refrigerator. These facts have caused the great extension of the use of mutton by the American people, and a great deal of the prejudice that formerly existed toward this meat has been swept away. The development of the use of mutton in the country has revolutionized the sheep business. The farmer in the East finds that he can make sheep profitable by growing them for sale as meat-producing animals, with the wool as an incidental item of revenue. The ranchman of the West finds that he can add very much to the income from his sheep by paying more attention to the mutton form of his animals.

In the solution of the problem how to feed and clothe our rapidly growing population from our own resources, the sheep will receive increased attention as time goes on, for the reason that sheep lend themselves perhaps more readily than any other animal to the development of agriculture. On almost every farm there could and should be a flock of sheep. In the thickly settled sections of the East, where the raising of beef cattle is becoming more and more difficult, sheep will thrive with a profit. The weeds of the roadside and the fence rows, the stubble field after the grain is harvested, and even the lawn can be turned into a profit if sheep are allowed access to them. There are millions of acres east of the Mississippi; I might say east of the Alleghenies and south as well as north of the Ohio River, that should maintain sheep. New England, which was formerly the center of the sheep-breeding industry, could produce annually many thousand of sheep at a minimum cost.

Somehow the American farmer has not appreciated the full value of the sheep as a meat producer and a renovator of the soil. The spring lamb that comes on the market during the summer is the one kind of meat that has been produced without feeding grain, and that is a mighty reason for the increase of the sheep industry.

The department has three flocks of sheep with which it is studying the industry—one in Vermont, one at the experiment station of the Bureau of Animal Industry near Washington, and one in Wyoming. In the work in Vermont we are endeavoring to encourage the New England people to get back into sheep raising. The sheep near Washington are being used in breeding experiments of various kinds and those in Wyoming in a breeding experiment to study the possibility of improving the type of sheep used on the range. In the Wyoming work the sheep have been selected for mutton form and high wool production, merino stock (principally Rambouillet) being used. The work has not yet gone far enough for us to make exhibitions of these sheep, and on this account we have been compelled to decline many cordial invitations to show them. Furthermore, we have not yet been in a position to make a thorough study of the wool which is being produced. I regard it as of the highest importance that scientific investigations be made of the effects of soil, climate, breeding, and feeding on wool. This will be done with the Wyoming flock. Some persons seem to think that American wool is deficient in quality. If this is true, the Department of Agriculture should ascertain the reasons and show sheepmen how they may breed and handle their sheep to produce wool of the highest quality.

It has been estimated that one sheep would add to the fertility of the soil $2 worth to every acre of agricultural land in the United States. For fear you will fall in your seats with a paralytic stroke, I will not here give you the number of millions of dollars that would add to our national wealth, but will leave you to figure this out for yourselves when you have left this stifling Hall, with its condensed heat, and have secured a comfortable seat before the friendly breeze of an electric fan. [Laughter.]

Besides that, it is known that the sheep industry has ever been a respectable calling since the days of Abraham, that old patriarch and flockmaster, so willing to sacrifice his son Isaac as a burnt offering instead of a ram, until prevailed upon by the Lord to choose the latter.

Going back further than that, we find that wool knocked the fig leaf out of business.

During the course of my colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], I tried to obtain from him some idea as to what we were going to use as a substitute for wool when he undertook to show that the growing of sheep was fast approaching an end. He drove the diminishing number from Vermont through the continent, over the trackless wastes, westward, owing, as he said, to the price of lands, and so forth, and was proceeding to drive them from my State over the snowy mountain tops, then with lolling tongues through the deserts beyond, seeking always for pastures new and green, until finally I had him driving them into the Pacific Ocean, feeding on crabs. [Laughter.] But neither he nor any other Member of whom I sought information concerning what the world was going to do for clothing when the sheep disappeared could afford me the slightest information. I do not share with them their prejudice against woolen clothing, nor yet their affection for the fig leaf. [Laughter.]

No, Mr. Chairman, there will at most be but a temporary cessation in this country of the production of sheep. Phoenix-like it will rise again as it has in times past, resisting the assaults of its enemies and manipulators and pursuing its invincible course, for it is as absolutely indestructible as an industry as it is imperishable and a necessity. But for the industrious and irrepressible ragpicker it would now be selling at at least a dollar a pound. Likely the suit of clothes you now wear contains the wool that was clipped from the back of a sheep three or four hundred years ago, for like gold it ever retains its intrinsic worth and its evolutions are practically limitless.

Many of you doubtless have in your households treasured antiques a thousand years old. There are prayer rugs known to be over 4,000 years old, the wool in which might have been clipped by Abraham, and as they are rare, there are many imitations of them. I bespeak for you, my friends, in the hour, yea hours, of your atonement for the sin you will commit in the passage of this bill the peculiar appropriateness of a prayer rug woven from the fleece of the American sheep; that your hands may be raised alike in supplication for pardon and benediction of the home-grown product which makes so much for American greatness. From the cradle to the grave, from the clipper's hand to the tailor's shears its fruitful coat of down has ever thrown its benign protection around young and old. The babe in arms, the rugged mountaineer, the aged and infirm alike are secure within its ample folds, and the best that is within us should be devoted to its safety and not its sacrifice.

No, Mr. Chairman, nor will the sheepmen be entirely exterminated, though what you have done and are now contemplating will put millions upon millions of dollars into the pockets of wool speculators, importers, and commission men, and will bankrupt 80 per cent of the men whose principal business is sheep raising. They may become tramps for a while, but there is time enough between now and the November election of 1912 for them to find a temporary lodgment long enough to qualify themselves as voters. Nor is the time too short between now and then for the consumer of woolen goods to find out that he has been buncoed, just as he was when promised by the Sixty-first Congress lower prices for leather goods in exchange for the duty upon hides. And unless I miss my guess those bankrupt and disappointed people will not cast their votes at that election for anyone who is not able to convince them that the passage of the measure will redound to their benefit.

A Democratic speech would be incomplete without referring to some sayings and doings of Jefferson, who was not only the "Father of Democracy," but the Abraham of our country. When the soil on his land began wearing out under the intense farming of grain, he said:

The first step toward the recovering of our land is to find substitutes for grain and bacon. I count on potatoes, clover, and sheep—the two former to feed every animal on the farm except my negroes, and the latter to feed them, diversified with rations of salt fish and molasses, both of them wholesome, agreeable, and cheap articles of food.

Capt. Edmund Bacon, who was for 20 years the overseer and business man of Jefferson's plantation at Monticello, says:

Mr. Jefferson was very fond of all kinds of good stock. The first full-blooded merino sheep in all that country was imported by Mr. Jefferson for himself and Mr. Madison while he was President. When I got home I put a notice in the paper at Charlottesville that persons who wished to improve their stock could send us two ewes, and we would keep them until the lambs were old enough to wean, and then give the owners the choice of the lambs and they leave the other lamb and both of the ewes.

We got the greatest lot of sheep, more than we wanted; two or three hundred, I think; and in a few years we had an immense flock. People came a long distance to buy our full-blooded sheep. At first we sold them for $50, but they soon fell to thirty and twenty, and before I left Mr. Jefferson merino sheep were so numerous that they sold about as cheap as the common ones. Some years afterwards he imported sheep from Barbary, I think, four large broad-tailed sheep. I have forgotten their names. He sent these from Washington in his own wagon, which had gone there with a load from Monticello. These sheep made very fine mutton, but they were not so popular—did not disseminate and ran out in a few years.

Mr. Jefferson, by this reference, can not by any source of reasoning be regarded as a free trader.

I want to say another word to my Democratic friends and call their attention to the Democratic platform of 1908 on this subject:

We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list, and material reductions shall be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home, and graduated reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

Reading between the lines, it follows you have not observed its direction by the taking of the duty off what you term "trust-made goods," but you have gone beyond this direction of reducing duties when applied to the wool features of this bill, for I have sufficiently demonstrated the reduction is but in name, avowedly only for the purpose of revenue, and means the destruction of the wool industry, and that was never contemplated by that convention, and much less by any other declaration of the party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I would like five minutes more.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is now 25 minutes of 12 o'clock, but I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I will endeavor to finish in that time.

Calmly, if you can, consider the situation of the woolgrower. We see him beset with every difficulty arising from the higher cost of wages, the increased value of lands, depleted pastures incident to droughts, yearly destruction of his flocks by the storm king, the increased rate of interest owing to his hazardous business, compelling him to sell his clip often before it leaves the sheep's back—the ever-ready victim of the speculator, the shuttlecock of tariff legislation—compelled to compete with the hatless and breechclouted bushman of Australia. And if placed in the position of the wildcat, prone on his back, surrounded by a pack of snarling, snapping hounds, is it passing strange that he should be less like the wildcat in not being overpunctilious as to whether he would use his teeth or his claws in defense? [Applause on the Republican side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me recommend, in all seriousness, the cultivation of a more intimate acquaintanceship on the part of legislators with the American sheep, in whose behalf I speak to-day, and a more thorough realization of what is due it both from a commercial and a sentimental standpoint.

From the commercial viewpoint it represents one of our very greatest and most far-reaching industries, involving, as I have already said, the investment of immense capital, careful and skillful business methods, and invoking the most intelligent operation of its affairs.

Its perennial yield furnishes the means of livelihood to thousands upon thousands of our countrymen in all of its ramifications, from the shears of the clipper to the shears of the tailor, and in the inherent durability of its weave it is a never-ceasing source of comfort from the cradle to the grave.

Gentlemen, you who would pass this measure, with what degree of assurance will you return to your homes, witness the gamboling of the golden hoofs—yes, and golden possibilities—upon the hillside, and greet your farmer constituents, in view of the devastation you have wrought them in this pernicious enactment?

Mr. Chairman, the wool feature of this bill is incomplete, inadequate, inequitable, and iniquitous. At the risk of repetition, I reaffirm that it is unfair in its provisions and seemingly recklessly inconsiderate of the interests of that foundation of our national fabric—the American farmer.

Mr. Chairman, if one can view with equanimity the situation of this forlorn flock master, I believe he could have witnessed without emotion the pressing of the crown of thorns upon the head of the Nazarene, the stretching of His body on the cross, the driving of each nail through His limbs, the dipping of the soldier's sponge into a tankard of vinegar mingled with gall, and the putting of it to His parched and quivering lips, and, following His last cry of agony, see deliberately scrawled above His head the words, "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews." [Applause.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR]. [Applause.]

[Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER]. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, you do me great honor to permit me to close the debate on this important measure, but as the hour is fast approaching the midnight meridian and as this beautiful Hall is gradually becoming depleted, it would be cruel to tax the patience of those who are here with a long drawn-out speech, going into details. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will, therefore, content myself by noticing the salient points of objections made by the opponents of this bill. Were I not a new Member, standing in need of experience in debate, and were it not a fact that no one can become useful in this life without taking an active part in the business in which he is engaged, I would not pretend to discuss this question at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, everybody knows to-day that a tariff is a tax and everybody knows that wherever a tariff is placed upon an article of consumption it gives a chance to increase the price of that article to the consumer in proportion to the amount of the tariff, especially in those cases where there is no competition. For this reason I have never been a believer in high taxation of any kind, but owing to the inequality in the distribution of wealth among men I have always advocated the idea that the larger burdens of taxation ought to be placed upon those who are most able to bear them and the lighter burden should be placed upon those who are least able to bear them, taxing the luxuries most heavily and placing a correspondingly low rate upon the necessaries of life.

There are two great struggling forces among men to-day. One is the capital, controlled by the few, and the other is that great active industrial army of labor, the basis of all productive wealth. I would have no one believe that I entertain ulterior designs against honest capital. He who thinks that a great civilization can be built up without capital makes a mistake, the same as he who thinks a great civilization can be built up without labor. They are counterparts of a great busy commercial world, and must work in harmony in order to produce the greatest results; but the one should be just as honest as the other, and in the adjustment of tariff taxation the one should not be preferred at the expense of the other.

Yet it is a significant fact that for the last 50 years those who have been in control of capital have become immensely rich and those who have been controlling labor have remained poor. There may be more than one cause for this, but everybody knows that the chief cause is the advantage afforded by a high protected tariff, which tends to destroy foreign competition, and with foreign competition out of the way the home industries have pooled their interests and destroyed home competition, thereby giving them an opportunity to prey upon the daily earnings of the masses at their pleasure.

After the fall of the Roman Empire history tells us that the barbarians overran the civilized world and that that portion of land lying along the Mediterranean Sea and the Straits of Gibraltar to the Atlantic Ocean fell into the hands of the Moors. At the ocean end of these straits there is a rocky promontory, called the Pillar of Hercules. At a point on this promontory, called Tarifa, we are told that these Moorish robbers took their stand and collected a toll from every vessel which passed through the Straits of Gibraltar. This toll was called a tariff, which found its way into the civilized world; but the application of this term by our forefathers was never intended to aid anyone in the commission of crime, but, instead thereof, it was intended by them to assist the Government in raising revenue to defray the expenses of the General Government.

Mr. Chairman, when we examine the present wool schedule as it stands to-day under the Payne law, and as it has stood under other acts ever since the year 1864, except the Wilson law, and when we listen to the arguments of certain gentlemen on the floor of this House, offering one excuse after another for the purpose of preventing a change in these high rates of duty, we are forced to conclude that there are now and have been for a long time in America strong advocates of the doctrine of the Moorish barbarians, whose methods were indefensible—robbery by brutal force. Who will say that the present rates on the finished product of wool, averaging nearly 100 per cent, is not robbery? The President of the United States has said more than once that it is indefensible. Who will deny that proposition?

The Sherman antitrust law was intended to protect the consumer from the ravages of high taxation, but the tariff barons have recklessly disregarded its provisions, and until recently the Federal courts have been very slow to enforce it, thereby encouraging unlawful combinations of capital in restraint of trade, until to-day we find a few criminal combines controlling capital stock aggregating nearly $40,000,000,000. How can we best relieve ourselves from these threatening conditions is the great question before the American people to-day. By the enforcement of the antitrust law we can break up unlawful combinations of capital and thereby stimulate competition. We can reduce the tariff taxation, which will aid competition and save to the people vast future fortunes which would otherwise be piled up in the hands of the already rich few. What Congressman will shun his duty to the people in this great contest? Who will stand upon the floor of this Chamber and declare himself a disciple of the Moorish pirates?

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us proposes to reduce the tariff on wool from a duty of 44.31 per cent to 20 per cent. It further proposes to reduce the tariff on the finished product of wool from an average of 90.10 per cent to 42.55 per cent. I am aware that it is not good policy to make radical changes, ordinarily speaking, but the present rate of duty on wool and woolen goods

is so unreasonably high that it takes a radical change to bring it down to a decent and common-sense basis. I think all honest statesmen now agree that the primary object of a tariff is to raise revenue to defray the expenses of government. In his report as Secretary of the Treasury in 1845, Robert J. Walker said:

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 the maximum revenue should be imposed on luxuries. 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.

That strikes me, Mr. Chairman, as being sound doctrine. I think the committee in framing this bill must have been guided by the light of these wholesome principles, for they have more than cut the present rates in two, and at the same time it has been estimated that the bill will raise nearly as much revenue as the present law. In 1910 the present law yielded a revenue from imports on raw wool in the sum of $21,128,728.74 and from imports on the finished products of wool the sum of $20,775,820.76, making a total of $41,908,549.50. Under the proposed law it is estimated that we will get a revenue from the imports on raw wool in the sum of $13,398,200 and from the imports on the finished product the sum of $27,158,000, making a total of $40,556,200.

The greatest fight made against the passage of this measure is waged against that part of the bill dealing with raw wool, yet it is true that a few gentlemen on the other side of the House, belonging to the reactionary school of the Republican Party, such men as PAYNE, of New York, and DALZELL, of Pennsylvania, have made a stubborn fight against the whole of the bill. They remind me of a story I once heard of a church, met in council for the purpose of settling the question relative to the building of a new church house. One of the gentlemen offered a resolution in favor of erecting a new building. The motion carried. Then another gentlemen, wanting to be economical, made a motion that in the construction of the new building the workmen should use the material in the old building in so far as it was fit for such use. This motion carried also, whereupon another gentleman, desiring to keep up the accustomed meetings for worship, made a motion that the church use the old building as a place of worship while the new building was under construction. The motion carried. [Laughter.]

The haunts of high protection, to enrich the few, are very sacred to these gentlemen. They love to worship within the old walls, decorated with the pictures of their masters, whom they have served so long and so well, and they refuse to surrender them without a desperate struggle. And now, Mr. Chairman, they come here and advance a most ingenious argument—the argument of procrastination—in order to prevent the passage of this bill. They claim that we should take no action in the revision of this schedule until the Tariff Commission has made its report, which, they admit, will not be until next winter. This claim is made in the face of the fact that this commission has been at work for 15 months, and, on request, furnished the Ways and Means Committee all the facts in their possession, to be used in the construction of this bill. This is the burden of the speech of the distinguished gentleman [Mr. MANN], my colleague from Illinois, who opened the argument on his side of this Chamber for the discussion of this bill. He has been followed by every standpatter who has taken a part in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, this is the argument advanced by the criminal when indicted for a felony. If it were left to him, he never would be tried. The first thing he does is to enter court with an application for a continuance in order that he may be permitted to hunt up new evidence. It is a trick to deceive the people and should be tolerated by no one who is in favor of honest tariff reduction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There are other gentlemen on both sides of this House, I understand, who would be glad to see wool placed on the free list. It is claimed by some that the doctrine of free raw material is Democratic and for that reason we ought to admit raw wool free of duty into the United States. I do not so understand that the Democratic Party is committed to that doctrine. While it is true that Mr. Cleveland once advocated freer raw materials and his friends succeeded in having this sentiment incorporated in the Democratic platform in 1892, yet never before nor since has this idea found its way into a Democratic platform. Raw material is owned in the first instance by individuals and produced by individual labor—men who are at most only ordinary livers. It passes from their hands into the hands of the corporations for a finishing touch. Inasmuch as we have seen that a tariff tends to enhance the value of the article upon which it is placed, and inasmuch as the primary object of a tariff is for revenue, I can see no good reason why, in adjusting tariff rates, Congress should discriminate between raw material, which will yield a revenue, and the finished product, which will yield a revenue. I am aware that in this country we have men who preach a strange doctrine, a doctrine for the benefit of the classes as against the masses, but this doctrine can not be justified by the golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

The poor man is just as much entitled to the benefit of a tariff which will enhance the price of his product as is the rich man. While a tariff can not be justified for protection alone, yet we all know that in the adjustment of a tariff for revenue it gives an incidental protection, and the poor man is just as much entitled to its benefits as the rich man.

The production of wool is one of the oldest industries known to man. It is coeval with civilization. Abraham was a herder of sheep. It was the shepherd on the mountain who first discovered the Star of Bethlehem, which pointed to the manger-cradle of our Savior. It was the shepherds who met in a distant land to determine how they might best preserve the life of that Savior child. Wool has always played a conspicuous part in furnishing raiment to mankind. He who can live in a cold climate without wool is an animal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that hand in hand with the shepherd of old comes the farmer of to-day, and with the farm goes the flock. It is an incident to the farm throughout the Union and throughout the world. I do not subscribe to the doctrine urged here by some of my friends that sheep raising in America is gradually dying out. You had just as well say that farming is gradually dying out. There is no more reason for the one than for the other. Sheep will always be raised on the farm, because of its usefulness to the farmer, not only in furnishing him with food and raiment, but in destroying the annual shrubbery in old fields and for the further reason that its habits of repose is upon the highest and poorest points of the farm, furnishing a rich fertilizer, to be carried down the hillside by future rains as an alluvial deposit.

Mr. Chairman, it is urged with great force here that the present rate of 44.31 per cent duty on wool is not too high, and that if a reduction be made, it will destroy the sheep industry in this country. Now, I wish to repeat that the sheep is incidental to farming. You show me a territory where sheep raising is an industry to itself, and I will point you to a territory which is fit for nothing else except grazing. Yes; in the mountains of Wyoming, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona, where nothing else can be raised, we find great flocks of sheep, raised for the sole purpose of making money. With the advantage of the cheap, wild western lands and sheltered by the high protection on wool, many men have grown rich, and to-day we have wool kings the same as we have ironmasters. One gentleman began business in 1894 with a capital of $960. Prior to that he had been herding sheep for others, but now he embarks in the sheep-raising business for the purpose of making money. He paid $2 a head in 1894, which is shown by his answer in volume 5 of the Tariff Hearings, page 5113, which is as follows:

Mr. HILL (of the Ways and Means Committee). What did you give for your sheep apiece when you started into it and had your 2,500?
Mr. DELFELDER. $2 per head.
Mr. HILL. $2 apiece?
Mr. DELFELDER. Yes, sir.

Within 14 years he made out of this business $100,000, which is shown from his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, in volume 5, page 5110:

Mr. CLARK. How much money did you have then and how much were you worth in property when you went into the sheep business in 1894?
Mr. DELFELDER. $960.
Mr. CLARK. How much are you worth now?
Mr. DELFELDER. That would depend entirely upon conditions.
Mr. CLARK. You are worth over $100,000, are you not?
Mr. DELFELDER. Yes, sir; I think that would be a safe estimate.

What is true of Mr. Delfelder is true of many other gentlemen who have made sheep raising a business in the western mountains.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that if I had been drawing this bill I would have placed the rate on raw wool a little higher than 20 per cent. I prepared an amendment in our caucus to make it 25 per cent, but the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] took it away from me before I could get recognition. But after this bill had been reported out from the Ways and Means Committee I trembled at the thought of placing my judgment above that of gentlemen who have served here for many years, fighting to give the toiling millions relief from burdensome taxation which has been placed upon them, not by the votes of all the Republicans, but by the votes of standpatters. I do not desire to denounce any of my Republican friends in bitter terms, for I do not believe in radical partisan speeches; I love all mankind and would not say a word to wound the feelings of my Republican friends any sooner than that of my Democratic friends. I love them both alike, but when it comes to have a certain

school of men say to me that I shall pay a tribute to those who are already rich, a tribute so high that I can not pay it without depriving myself of the necessaries of life and subjecting my family to a beggarly living, then I come to the parting of ways with these gentlemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I take it that when the gentleman believes in the high tariff on raw wool he believes in protection. Is that true?

Mr. FOWLER. I tried to make my position clear. Whenever a tariff is placed upon any article of consumption, it amounts to a protection in a sense, not, however, in the same sense that my standpat friends on the other side think of protection, but it amounts to an incidental protection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If my friend will yield further I will say to him that a Democrat who is advocating a protective tariff reminds me of a bow-legged man, without any athletic experience, trying to walk a tight rope. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I know very well that I am weak enough to be bow-legged, but I am strong enough to stand by the right of the helpless in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And I say, Mr. Chairman, that if a tariff placed upon an article of consumption amounts to incidental protection, I am just as much in favor of giving the producer the benefit of it as I am the man who makes the finished product.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOWLER. In justice to the House at this late hour, I feel that I ought to decline. Mr. Chairman, the strongest argument offered in opposition to the 20 per cent on raw wool, as proposed by this bill, is that it is too low to foster the sheep industry in America. This is the Ohio idea. I desire to examine the argument of my Ohio friend. I listened to a speech of one of them [Mr. WILLIS] a few days ago with much interest. He is one of the best looking as well as one of the most intelligent gentlemen on that side of the House. I understand that he is a new Member, but I fear he will not grow much older in this House if he continues to advocate the doctrine which he preached in that speech, although I should like to see him come back for many years. [Applause and laughter.] This distinguished gentleman said that a 20 per cent tariff would not be sufficient to protect the woolgrowers of this country, and declared with much emphasis that the passage of this bill would destroy the sheep industry in Ohio. He cited figures to show how Ohio sheep raising had suffered under free wool during the life of the Wilson law. Then followed the speech of another distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who, in more bitter terms, denounced the 20 per cent rate on raw wool. He, too, cited tables showing a much more alarming condition in Ohio during the life of the Wilson law than those cited by Mr. WILLIS.

He declared upon high authority that Ohio had 4,000,000 head of sheep when the Wilson bill became a law, and that three years thereafter, on its repeal, Ohio had but little over a million sheep. He also declared that the sheep in Ohio were worth but 50 cents a head. Where on earth these gentlemen got these figures is a mystery to all of us. We all know that Ohio sheep are among the largest, as well as the highest-priced, sheep in this country. We have already seen that Mr. Delfelder paid $2 a head in 1894 for New Mexico sheep, which are much smaller and much more inferior than the Ohio sheep.

I hold in my hand Bulletin No. 64 of the Bureau of Statistics of the United States Department of Agriculture, which gives the number and value in gold of the sheep in Ohio from 1867 to 1910, inclusive. I am informed by the Department of Commerce and Labor that it is the most authentic table extant. I invite the attention of my Ohio friends to this table. It shows that in 1867 Ohio had 7,159,177 sheep; that in 1894, the year in which the Wilson tariff bill was passed, Ohio had 3,765,704 sheep. I wish you gentlemen would tell me what became of that three and one-half million of sheep during those 27 years of high protection. During the entire life of the Wilson bill you lost less than one and one-half million sheep. In 1869 you had 6,300,000 head, valued in gold at $7,898,230—a little over a dollar and a quarter a head. Under the worst year of the Wilson law, in 1896, you had 2,754,613 sheep, valued in gold at $5,247,538, or nearly $2 per head.

These figures show the most alarming condition to sheep raising in Ohio, and if argument could be adduced to support the contention of my Ohio friends, these figures are the most convincing; and why they did not cite them in their argument I am at a loss to know, unless they wanted their constituents to believe that the Democratic Party and its policies have always stood against the interest of sheep raising. And again my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] would have his constituents believe that sheep in Ohio during the life of the Wilson bill were worth only 50 cents a head, whereas as a matter of fact the bulletin from which I have read shows that they were worth nearly $2 per head during that period. I offer this bulletin for the benefit of my friends, and ask that it be printed in full:

Number and farm value of sheep on farms in Ohio Jan. 1, 1867, to 1910, inclusive.

[Bulletin No. 64, Bureau of Statistics, United States Department of Agriculture.]

Years.	Number.	Farm value.[1]
1867	7,159,177	$16,461,852
1868	6,730,126	11,856,769
1869	6,300,000	7,898,230
1870	6,250,000	10,201,978
1871	4,641,000	9,474,851
1872	4,548,100	12,964,795
1873	4,639,000	12,486,435
1874	4,639,000	11,892,709
1875	4,592,600	11,430,106
1876	4,546,600	10,857,551
1877	3,900,000	9,168,434
1878	3,783,000	10,230,292
1879	4,040,000	9,767,031
1880	4,080,400	11,547,532
1881	4,243,616	13,070,337
1882	4,951,511	15,349,684
1883	5,050,541	15,707,183
1884	5,000,036	14,650,105
1885	4,900,035	12,250,088
1886	4,753,034	9,918,156
1887	4,562,913	11,533,675
1888	4,106,022	10,714,177
1889	4,065,556	11,017,657
1890	3,943,589	11,927,384
1891	4,061,897	13,189,386
1892	4,468,087	14,724,581
1893	4,378,725	13,900,263
1894	3,765,704	8,506,725
1895	3,577,419	6,139,924
1896	2,754,613	5,247,538
1897	2,368,967	5,877,171
1898	2,416,346	8,274,777
1899	2,730,471	9,680,885
1900	2,839,690	10,535,250
1901	3,627,721	12,899,451
1902	3,591,444	10,705,735
1903	3,447,786	10,743,991
1904	3,171,963	10,158,528
1905	2,601,010	8,865,284
1906	2,991,162	13,400,406
1907	3,140,720	15,119,427
1908	3,110,000	13,933,000
1909	3,110,000	12,751,000
1910	3,203,000	15,374,000

[1] Values, 1867 to 1878, reduced to gold basis.

I submit the following table, which shows that Ohio had but 2,600,000 sheep in 1910 of shearable age. This is Bulletin No. 75 of the Agricultural Department. The other table, to wit, Bulletin No. 64, includes lambs:

[Bulletin No. 75.]

Wool production, calendar year 1910, by States and Territories.

[From the Bulletin of National Association of Wool Manufacturers.]

State or Territory.	Quality.	Sheep of shearing age, Apr. 1, 1909.	Sheep of shearing age, Apr. 1, 1910.	Average weight of fleece, 1910.	Per cent of shrinkage, 1910.	Wool, washed and unwashed, 1910.	Wool, scoured, 1910.	Average value per scoured pound, Oct. 1		Total value, Oct. 1, 1910.[1]
								1909	1910	
				Pounds.		*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*
Alabama	Medium	170,000	160,000	3.5	40	560,000	336,000	56	41	137,760
Arizona	Fine, fine medium, and medium	825,000	825,000	6.0	65	4,950,000	1,732,500	67	53	918,225
Arkansas	Medium	220,000	200,000	4.0	40	800,000	480,000	55	40	192,000
California	33 per cent fall, 67 per cent spring	1,900,000	1,900,000	7.0	66	13,300,500	4,522,000	64	46	2,080,120
Colorado	Fine, fine medium, and medium	1,450,000	1,400,000	6.5	65	9,100,000	3,185,000	68	47	1,496,950

Wool production, calendar year 1910, by States and Territories—Continued.

State or Territory.	Quality.	Sheep of shearing age, Apr. 1, 1909.	Sheep of shearing age, Apr. 1, 1910.	Average weight of fleece, 1910.	Per cent of shrinkage, 1910.	Wool, washed and unwashed, 1910.	Wool, scoured, 1910.	Average value per scoured pound, Oct. 1[1]—		Total value, Oct. 1, 1910.[1]
								1909	1910	
				Pounds.		*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Dollars.*
Connecticut	Medium	38,000	35,000	5.25	42	183,750	106,575	56	45	47,959
Delaware	do	6,900	7,000	5.5	45	58,500	21,175	55	46	9,741
Florida	do	110,000	115,000	3.25	40	373,750	224,250	56	41	91,943
Georgia	do	225,000	225,000	3.0	40	675,000	405,000	57	41	166,050
Idaho	Fine, fine medium, and medium	2,800,000	2,600,000	7.3	65	18,980,000	6,643,000	67	52	3,454,360
Illinois	25 per cent fine, 75 per cent medium	700,000	700,000	7.0	50	4,900,000	2,450,000	56	46	1,127,000
Indiana	15 per cent fine, 85 per cent medium	850,000	900,000	6.5	45	5,850,000	3,217,500	57	46	1,480,050
Iowa	30 per cent fine, 70 per cent medium	700,000	800,000	6.75	48	5,400,000	2,808,000	58	46	1,291,680
Kansas	Fine, fine medium, and medium	170,000	175,000	7.5	64	1,312,500	472,500	66	52	245,700
Kentucky	Medium	750,000	800,000	4.75	38	3,800,000	2,356,000	58	46	1,083,760
Louisiana	do	155,000	155,000	3.7	41	573,500	338,365	57	41	138,730
Maine	do	210,000	210,000	6.0	40	1,260,000	756,000	55	45	340,200
Maryland	do	125,000	130,000	5.2	43	676,000	385,320	55	45	173,394
Massachusetts	do	35,000	35,000	6.2	42	217,000	125,860	56	45	56,637
Michigan	25 per cent fine, 75 per cent medium	1,500,000	1,700,000	6.75	50	11,475,000	5,737,500	58	49	2,811,375
Minnesota	20 per cent fine, 80 per cent medium	375,000	375,000	6.8	48	2,550,000	1,326,000	55	42	556,920
Mississippi	Medium	150,000	150,000	4.0	42	600,000	348,000	56	41	142,680
Missouri	15 per cent fine, 85 per cent medium	873,860	860,000	7.0	47	6,020,000	3,190,600	56	45	1,435,770
Montana	Fine, fine medium, and medium	5,000,000	4,800,000	7.0	64	33,600,000	12,096,000	68	56	6,773,760
Nebraska	do	275,000	250,000	6.5	60	1,625,000	650,000	66	52	338,000
Nevada	Fine, fine medium, and medium	875,000	850,000	7.0	68	5,950,000	1,904,000	70	54	1,028,160
New Hampshire	25 per cent fine, 75 per cent medium	70,000	70,000	6.0	50	420,000	210,000	57	49	102,900
New Jersey	Medium	44,000	50,000	5.5	47	275,000	145,750	55	46	67,045
New Mexico	Fine, fine medium, and medium	3,200,000	3,200,000	6.0	65	19,200,000	6,720,000	65	51	3,427,200
New York	33 per cent fine, 67 per cent medium	825,000	825,000	6.0	48	4,950,000	2,574,000	58	50	1,287,000
North Carolina	Medium	204,000	204,000	3.75	42	765,000	443,700	56	42	186,354
North Dakota	Fine, fine medium, and medium	275,000	270,000	6.5	60	1,755,000	702,000	65	54	379,080
Ohio	60 per cent fine, 40 per cent medium	2,500,000	2,600,000	6.5	51	16,900,000	8,281,000	64	55	4,554,550
Oklahoma	Fine, fine medium, and medium	80,000	80,000	6.5	67	520,000	171,600	67	48	82,368
Oregon	do	1,850,000	1,750,000	8.25	68	14,437,500	4,620,000	70	53	2,448,600
Pennsylvania	60 per cent fine, 40 per cent medium	1,000,000	1,050,000	6.0	48	6,300,000	3,276,000	59	55	1,801,800
Rhode Island	Medium	7,500	7,500	5.3	42	39,750	23,055	56	45	10,375
South Carolina	do	50,000	50,000	3.75	42	187,500	108,750	56	41	44,588
South Dakota	Fine, fine medium, and medium	650,000	625,000	6.5	60	4,062,500	1,625,000	65	54	877,500
Tennessee	Medium	291,000	291,000	4.25	40	1,236,750	742,050	57	43	319,082
Texas	25 per cent fall, 75 per cent spring	1,325,000	1,325,000	6.75	67	8,943,750	2,951,438	64	55	1,623,291
Utah	Fine, fine medium, and medium	2,200,000	2,100,000	6.75	66	14,175,000	4,819,500	65	52	2,506,140
Vermont	20 per cent fine, 80 per cent medium	180,000	180,000	6.5	51	1,170,000	573,300	57	49	280,917
Virginia	Medium	365,000	365,000	4.5	37	1,642,500	1,034,775	57	47	486,344
Washington	Fine, fine medium, and medium	450,000	450,000	9.0	69	4,050,000	1,255,500	67	54	677,970
West Virginia	75 per cent fine, 25 per cent medium	587,945	600,000	5.75	49	3,450,000	1,759,500	64	57	1,002,915
Wisconsin	20 per cent fine, 80 per cent medium	850,000	900,000	6.75	47	6,075,000	3,219,750	56	42	1,352,295
Wyoming	Fine, fine medium, and medium	4,800,000	4,650,000	7.75	68	36,037,500	11,532,000	67	55	6,342,600
Grand total		42,293,205	41,999,500	6.7	60	281,362,750	112,605,813			57,479,838
Pulled wool						40,000,000	29,200,000			15,010,000
Total product, 1910						321,362,750	141,805,813			72,489,838

[1] Market value in Boston.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the argument that a high tariff will foster the sheep industry and that a low tariff or no tariff at all will destroy it. Wool was on the free list under the Wilson law, but we must remember that the greatest panic which ever visited this country was on before this bill was passed, the effects of which lasted until after its repeal. Let us compare sheep raising during two great panics—the one of the early seventies, under high protection, and the other in the nineties, under free wool—and see how the sheep fared in Ohio. At the beginning of the panic of 1870 Ohio had 6,250,000 sheep and in 1872 she had 4,548,100 sheep. In two years, under the pressure of that panic, with a high-protective duty on wool, Ohio lost over 1,700,000 head of sheep. At the beginning of the panic of 1891 Ohio had 4,061,197 sheep, and in 1897 she had 2,368,967 sheep, a loss of a little over 1,600,000 head, with wool on the free list, thus showing that these two panics operated about equally upon the sheep industry of Ohio. These figures show conclusively that it was the panic and not the tariff which was so disastrous to the sheep of Ohio.

In 1905 Ohio had 2,601,010 sheep, notwithstanding she had had the benefit of a protective tariff for eight years on wool, at an average rate of 44.31 per cent. I desire to say to my Ohio statesmen friends that in the light of these figures you will be compelled to revise the figures in the tables which you have submitted and look to another cause affecting the fluctuation of sheep raising in your State.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. I have left but a few minutes, but the gentleman was so kind in yielding to me I feel as though I would commit a crime not to yield to him.

Mr. WILLIS. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman what year it was that we had 7,000,000 sheep?

Mr. FOWLER. In 1867.

Mr. WILLIS. There must have been a remarkable decline, because in 1860 we had 3,500,000 sheep and in 1870 we had only 4,000,000 sheep.

Mr. FOWLER. In 1867 you had 7,159,177 sheep. In 1870 you had 6,250,000 sheep. Coming on down to 1894 you had 3,765,704, when you say the Wilson bill destroyed the sheep industry in the great State of Ohio. Now, in 1910, you have but little over 3,000,000. Can you tell me what became of the difference between 3,000,000 and 7,000,000 sheep—a difference of nearly 4,000,000?

But, Mr. Chairman, I was comparing sheep raising during panics in America. Now, let us compare the total number of sheep in the United States during these two great panics. In 1870 the United States had 40,853,000 sheep, in 1872 we had 31,679,300 sheep, a loss within two years of 9,173,700 sheep, under a high protective tariff. At the beginning of the panic of 1891 we had 43,421,136 sheep, in 1897 we had 36,818,643 sheep, leaving a difference of 6,602,393 sheep, showing a loss of 2,571,307 more sheep during the panic under high protection than was lost during the panic with free wool. Let us compare the consumption of wool in this country during these two panics: In 1872 we consumed 274,022,957 pounds, about 50,000,000 pounds more than had ever been consumed before and which was not equaled until the year 1880. In 1897 we consumed in this country 601,306,208 pounds, the greatest amount ever consumed in any one year in this country.

These comparisons show that during panics, whether under high protection or under free wool, our sheep decline in number, and our consumption of wool materially increase over that of other years.

I submit the following table, *Bulletin* No. 68, from the United States Department of Agriculture, which is regarded as the very highest authority upon this subject.

Wool produced, imported, exported, and retained for consumption during 1840, 1850, 1860, and from 1863 to 1897.

Year ending June 30—	Production.[1]	Exports of domestic.	Domestic retained for consumption.	Imports.	Exports of foreign.	Foreign retained for consumption.	Total consumption, domestic and foreign.	Per cent of consumption, foreign.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	
1840 [2]	35,802,114	.....	35,802,114	9,898,740	85,528	9,813,212	45,615,326	21.5
1850	52,516,959	35,898	52,481,061	18,695,294	.....	18,695,294	71,176,355	26.3
1860	60,264,913	1,055,928	59,208,985	26,282,955	157,064	26,125,891	85,334,876	30.6
1863	106,000,000	355,722	105,644,278	75,121,728	708,850	74,412,878	180,057,156	41.3
1864	123,000,000	155,482	122,844,518	91,250,114	223,475	91,026,630	213,871,157	42.6
1865	142,000,000	466,182	141,533,818	44,420,375	679,281	43,741,094	185,274,912	23.6
1866	155,000,000	973,075	154,026,925	71,287,988	852,045	70,435,943	224,462,868	31.0
1867	160,000,000	307,418	159,692,582	38,158,382	619,614	37,538,768	197,231,350	19.0
1868	168,000,000	558,435	167,441,565	25,467,336	2,801,852	22,665,484	190,107,049	11.9
1869	180,000,000	444,387	179,555,613	39,275,926	342,417	38,933,509	218,489,122	17.8
1870	162,000,000	152,892	161,847,108	49,230,199	1,710,053	47,520,146	209,367,254	22.7
1871	160,000,000	25,195	159,974,805	68,058,028	1,305,311	66,752,717	226,727,522	29.4
1872	150,000,000	140,515	149,859,485	126,507,409	2,343,937	124,163,472	274,022,957	45.3
1873	158,000,000	75,129	157,924,871	85,496,049	7,040,386	78,455,663	236,380,534	33.2
1874	170,000,000	319,600	169,680,400	42,939,541	6,816,157	36,123,384	205,803,784	17.5
1875	181,000,000	178,034	180,821,966	54,901,760	3,567,627	51,334,133	232,156,099	22.1
1876	192,000,000	104,768	191,895,232	44,642,836	1,518,426	43,124,410	235,019,642	18.3
1877	200,000,000	79,599	199,920,401	42,171,192	3,088,957	39,082,235	239,002,636	16.3
1878	208,250,000	347,854	207,902,146	48,449,079	5,952,221	42,496,858	250,399,004	16.9
1879	211,000,000	60,784	210,939,216	39,005,155	4,104,616	34,900,539	245,839,755	14.2
1880	232,500,000	191,551	232,308,449	128,131,747	3,648,520	124,483,227	356,791,676	34.9
1881	240,000,000	71,455	239,928,545	55,964,236	5,507,534	50,456,702	290,385,247	17.3
1882	272,000,000	116,179	271,883,821	67,861,744	3,831,836	64,029,908	335,913,729	19.0
1883	290,000,000	64,474	289,935,526	70,575,478	4,010,043	66,565,435	356,500,961	18.7
1884	300,000,000	10,393	299,989,607	78,350,651	2,304,701	76,045,950	376,035,557	20.6
1885	308,000,000	88,006	307,911,994	70,596,170	3,115,339	67,480,831	375,392,825	18.0
1886	302,000,000	146,423	301,853,577	129,084,958	6,534,426	122,550,532	424,404,109	28.9
1887	285,000,000	257,940	284,742,060	114,038,030	6,728,292	107,309,738	392,051,798	27.4
1888	269,000,000	22,164	268,977,836	113,558,753	4,359,731	109,199,022	378,176,858	28.9
1889	265,000,000	141,576	264,858,424	126,487,729	3,263,094	123,224,635	388,083,059	31.8
1890	276,000,000	231,042	275,768,958	105,431,285	3,288,467	102,142,818	377,911,776	27.0
1891	285,000,000	291,922	284,708,078	129,303,648	2,638,123	126,665,525	411,373,603	30.8
1892	294,000,000	202,456	293,797,544	148,670,652	3,007,563	145,663,089	439,460,633	33.1
1893	303,153,000	91,858	303,061,142	172,433,838	4,218,637	168,215,201	471,276,343	35.7
1894	298,057,384	520,247	297,537,137	55,152,585	5,977,407	49,175,178	346,712,315	14.2
1895	309,748,000	4,279,109	305,468,891	206,033,906	2,343,081	203,690,825	509,159,716	40.0
1896	[3] 272,474,708	6,945,981	265,528,727	230,911,473	6,026,236	224,885,237	490,413,964	49.0
1897	[3] 259,153,351	5,271,235	253,882,016	350,852,026	3,427,834	347,424,192	601,306,208	57.8
1898	266,720,684	121,139	266,599,545	132,795,202	2,504,832	130,290,370	396,889,915	32.8
1899	272,191,330	1,683,419	270,507,911	76,736,209	12,411,916	64,324,293	334,832,204	19.2
1900	288,636,621	2,200,309	286,436,312	155,928,455	5,702,251	150,226,204	436,662,516	34.4
1901	302,502,328	199,565	302,302,763	103,583,505	3,590,502	99,993,003	402,295,766	24.9
1902	316,341,032	123,278	316,217,754	166,576,966	3,104,663	163,472,303	479,690,057	34.1
1903	287,450,000	518,919	286,931,081	177,137,796	2,992,995	174,144,801	461,075,882	37.8
1904	291,783,032	319,750	291,463,282	173,742,834	2,863,053	170,879,781	462,343,063	37.0
1905	295,488,438	123,951	295,364,487	249,135,746	2,437,697	246,698,049	542,062,536	45.5
1906	298,915,130	192,481	298,722,649	201,688,668	5,450,378	196,238,290	494,960,939	39.6
1907	298,294,750	214,840	298,079,910	203,847,545	3,231,908	200,615,637	498,695,547	40.0
1908	311,138,321	182,458	310,955,863	125,980,524	5,684,357	120,296,167	431,252,030	27.9
1909	328,110,749	28,376	328,082,373	266,409,304	3,495,599	262,913,705	590,996,078	44.5
1910	321,362,750	47,520	321,315,230	263,928,232	4,007,953	259,920,279	581,235,509	44.7

[1] From estimates of the Department of Agriculture.
[2] Year ending Sept. 30.
[3] Estimated by S. N. D. North, secretary National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

ANOTHER REASON FOR LOSS OF SHEEP, 1893–1897.

In addition to the reasons heretofore given for the loss of sheep at various periods of our history there is the further reason of sales and killings for mutton at periods when the price of mutton is abnormally high. One of these high-priced mutton periods came in 1894, 1895, and 1896, and brought about a loss of nearly 2,000,000 sheep, just at the time that Republicans were charging a loss of sheep to the Wilson bill. The following is taken from the Yearbook of 1896 and is another answer to misleading statements of Republicans:

British imports of sheep.

1893	62,682
1894	484,597
1895	1,065,470
1896 (9 months)	614,855

American sheep during the last three years of this period were landed in Liverpool in greater numbers than in any preceding year. The profitable market for mutton appears to have encouraged sheep growing and fattening in many of the Western States.

American yearlings and 2-year-olds commanded practically the same price as English sheep, and were sold during the year 1896 at from 14 to 16 cents a pound.

This trade might have gone on indefinitely, but for the fact that the scab appeared among one lot of sheep from America in the latter part of the year, which broke up the British importation of sheep from the United States, at about the same time that Republicans were passing the Dingley law. The exportation to Great Britain ceased, because of British antagonism to diseased American sheep, and these sheep were retained in American folds, to swell the number of sheep and indirectly aid the new tariff to make a greater showing for the American sheep industry.

The British market might have been lost under any circumstances, for it was certainly more profitable to grow sheep for the 11 and 12 cents a pound on wool, added to the price of wool for five or six years, than to grow sheep for mutton, even at advanced prices. The question remains, however, Why should 80,000,000 of people tax themselves 11 and 12 cents a pound for the sheep growers, who produced 300,000,000 pounds of wool? Why should all industries be taxed enormously and outrageously in order to foster sheep raisers? Why should the people pay sheep men a bounty on sheep and wool?

I submit the following table from the Agricultural Department of the United States, showing the number of sheep and the production of wool in this country since the year 1840:

Number of sheep and production of wool in the United States since 1840.

Years.	Farm animals Jan. 1.				Production of principal commodities.	
	Horses.	Sheep.	Mules.	Swine.	Wool.[1]	Wheat.[1]
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Pounds.*	*Bushels.*
1840	4,335,669	19,311,374	.....	26,301,293	35,802,114	84,823,272
1850	4,336,719	21,773,220	559,331	30,354,213	52,516,959	100,485,944
1851	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1852	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1853	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1854	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1855	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1856	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1857	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

[1] Calendar years.

Number of sheep and production of wool, etc.—Continued.

Years.	Farm animals Jan. 1.				Production of principal commodities.	
	Horses.	Sheep.	Mules.	Swine.	Wool.[1]	Wheat.[1]
	Number.	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Number.*	*Pounds.*	*Bushels.*
1858						
1859						
1860	6,249,174	22,471,275	1,151,148	33,512,867	60,264,913	173,104,924
1861					75,000,000	
1862					90,000,000	
1863					106,000,000	
1864					123,000,000	
1865					142,000,000	
1866					155,000,000	151,999,906
1867	5,401,263	39,385,386	822,386	24,693,534	160,000,000	212,441,400
1868	5,756,940	38,991,912	855,685	24,317,258	168,000,000	224,036,600
1869	6,332,793	37,724,279	921,662	23,316,476	180,000,000	260,146,900
1870	8,248,800	40,853,000	1,179,500	26,751,400	162,000,000	235,884,700
1871	8,702,000	31,851,000	1,242,300	29,457,500	160,000,000	230,722,400
1872	8,990,900	31,679,300	1,276,300	31,796,300	150,000,000	249,997,100
1873	9,222,470	33,002,400	1,310,000	32,632,050	158,000,000	281,254,700
1874	9,333,800	33,938,200	1,339,350	30,860,900	170,000,000	308,102,700
1875	9,504,200	33,783,600	1,393,750	28,062,200	181,000,000	292,136,000
1876	9,735,300	35,935,300	1,414,500	25,726,800	192,000,000	289,356,500
1877	10,155,400	35,804,200	1,443,500	28,077,100	200,000,000	364,194,146
1878	10,329,700	35,740,500	1,637,500	32,262,500	208,250,000	420,122,400
1879	*10,938,700*	38,123,800	1,713,100	34,766,100	211,000,000	448,756,630
1880	11,201,800	40,765,900	1,729,500	34,034,100	232,500,000	498,549,868
1881	11,429,626	43,569,899	1,720,731	36,247,683	240,000,000	383,280,090
1882	10,521,554	45,016,224	1,835,169	44,122,200	272,000,000	504,185,470
1883	10,838,110	49,237,291	1,871,079	43,270,086	290,000,000	421,086,160
1884	11,169,683	50,626,626	1,914,126	44,200,893	300,000,000	512,765,000
1885	11,564,572	50,360,243	1,972,569	45,142,657	308,000,000	357,112,000
1886	12,077,657	48,322,331	2,052,593	46,092,043	302,000,000	457,218,000
1887	12,496,744	44,759,314	2,117,141	44,612,836	285,000,000	456,329,000
1888	13,172,936	44,544,755	2,191,727	44,346,525	269,000,000	415,868,000
1889	13,663,294	42,599,079	2,257,574	50,301,592	265,000,000	490,560,000
1890	14,213,837	44,336,072	2,331,027	51,602,780	276,000,000	399,262,000
1891	14,056,750	43,421,136	2,296,532	50,625,106	285,000,000	611,780,000
1892	15,498,140	44,938,365	2,314,699	52,398,019	294,000,000	515,949,000
1893	16,206,802	47,273,553	2,331,128	46,094,807	303,153,000	396,131,725
1894	16,081,139	45,048,017	2,352,231	45,206,498	298,057,384	460,267,416
1895	15,893,318	42,294,064	2,333,108	44,165,716	309,748,000	467,102,947
1896	15,124,057	38,298,783	2,278,946	42,842,759	272,474,708	427,684,346
1897	14,364,667	36,818,643	2,215,654	40,600,276	259,153,251	530,149,168
1898	13,960,911	37,656,960	2,190,282	39,759,993	266,720,684	675,148,705
1899	13,665,307	39,114,453	2,134,213	38,651,631	272,191,330	547,303,846
1900 [2]	13,537,524	41,883,065	2,086,027	37,079,356	288,636,621	522,229,505
1901	16,744,723	59,756,718	2,864,458	56,982,142	302,502,328	748,460,218
1902	16,531,224	62,039,091	2,757,017	48,698,890	316,341,032	670,063,008
1903	16,557,373	63,964,876	2,728,088	46,922,624	287,450,000	637,821,835
1904	16,736,059	51,630,144	2,757,916	47,009,367	291,783,032	552,399,517
1905	17,057,702	45,170,423	2,888,710	47,320,511	295,488,438	692,979,489
1906	18,718,578	50,631,619	3,404,061	52,102,847	298,915,130	735,260,970
1907	19,746,583	53,240,282	3,816,692	54,794,439	298,294,750	634,087,000
1908	19,992,000	54,631,000	3,869,000	56,084,000	311,138,321	664,602,000
1909	20,640,000	56,084,000	4,053,000	54,147,000	328,110,749	737,189,000
1910	21,040,000	57,216,000	4,123,000	47,782,000	321,362,750	695,443,000

[1] Calendar years. [2] Exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii.

I have always believed that the higher the rate of duty on wool and woolen products the less wool is used in making the finished product, and the high rate does not necessarily stimulate the production of wool.

I quote from the evidence of Andrew J. Solis before the Tariff Commission in December, 1908, volume 5, page 5036:

The Dingley tariff law has given the woolgrower one of the highest duties on wool ever carried by a tariff bill. With what result? In 1893 the wool clip was 348,000,000; in 1908, 298,000,000, a decrease of 50,000,000 pounds.

With reference to the use of wool in clothing, Mr. Solis said:

It may not be generally known, but it is a fact, that buyers of manufacturers establish prices which manufacturers must meet. The clothier demands cloth out of which to make a suit which he can sell at $10, and a boy's suit that he can sell for $5. The hosiery manufacturer must meet the demand for hosiery that he can sell for a certain fixed price. The underwear manufacturer must make his shirts and drawers at a given price, and so on along the line. How can it be done with wool advanced to a price equaled only since there was a premium on gold? The problem was solved by the increased use of cotton. The manufacturers of men's wear, in order to make cloth to make the suits at the price laid down by the clothiers, used pure cotton yarn and made the cloth known as cotton worsted, and for the better grade made mercerized cloth 50 per cent wool worsted yarn and 50 per cent cotton yarn. Where all-worsted yarn made entirely from wool was used the weight of the cloth has been reduced; 8, 9, 12, and 13 ounce cloth has been substituted for the regular regulation 16-ounce for the light weights; and for heavy weights, for which the regulation weight was 20 ounces, 16-ounce cloth is used; and in order to make up the lost weight in the cloth, in making the suit, heavy lining packed with cotton wadding and other substances were added, and even 13-ounce cloth has been used for heavy-weight clothing for winter. The light weights are only paper coverings, and have no wear whatever. You have heard Mr. Whitman's statement regarding cotton-warped dress goods. That means they are 50 per cent cotton and 50 per cent wool.

The hosiery manufacturer in order to meet his buyer's prices made his hosiery out of 50 per cent black-dyed cotton and 50 per cent white wool, or with one thread of cotton and one thread of worsted. The length of the hosiery has been clipped wherever possible.

This shows that the manufacturers in order to run either reduce the weight of their cloths or make them out of cotton, and the higher wool is the less wool is used. I think it is no exaggeration of fact to say that during this high-priced wool under the Dingley bill 75 per cent of the people have been clad from head to foot and from skin out in cotton, and the other 25 per cent have been cheated by having to wear paper in summer and lightweight clothes in winter.

Further on he says:

To my mind more wool will be used with wool on an 8-cent-per-pound duty basis than at 11 cents per pound duty, because prices will then be down to the established price level, and instead of woolen manufacturers being forced to use cottons all will be able to use wool.

In volume 5 of the tariff hearings, page 5276, Mr. Peter B. Worrell, a member of a large importing house, which deals also in domestic textiles, said:

I beg to call the attention of Messrs. E. T. Steel & Co. to the fact that a $12 suit under the Wilson bill is now about $16, and a $15 suit of the Wilson tariff bill is now about $20.

I quote from the tariff hearings, volume 5, page 5626, from the testimony of Edward Moir, of Marcellus, N. Y., who is a manufacturer of woolens:

The CHAIRMAN. Then you are expecting us to go it blind?

Mr. MOIR. Well, you know how it is, Mr. Chairman. A 40-cent piece of goods manufactured and sold with a profit would probably have anywhere from 10 to 15 or 20 per cent of cotton in it. It might have 30 per cent of shoddy, it might have 40 per cent of shoddy, and it might have the balance of a reasonably defective wool.

In the same tariff hearings, volume 5, page 5185, Mr. Sidney Blumenthal, of New York, submits the following statement as his views upon the question of the use of wool in the manufacture of woolen goods, which he has copied from The Textile World for January, 1909:

Examples of adulteration.

1. 28-ounce stuff, cotton-warp beaver, 75 cents a yard:
   10,000 yards, making 17,500 pounds, make up—

	Pounds.
Raw cotton	3,611
Cotton warp	1,309
Shoddy	22,123
Fine wool	4,886
Coarse wool	1,187

2. 34-ounce Irish frieze, $1 a yard:
   10,000 yards making 21,250 pounds—

Grease wool	23,625
Shoddy and waste	17,719

3. 25-ounce piece-dyed kersey, $1.25 a yard:
   10,000 yards making 15,625 pounds; back warp, 40 per cent; Oregon, 60 per cent shoddy; face warp and filling, 50 per cent; California, 50 per cent shoddy—

Grease wool	32,426
Shoddy	13,167

4. 15¼-ounce cotton-warp casket cloth, 50 cents a yard:
   10,000 yards making 9,688 pounds—

Cotton warp	2,375
Grease wool	1,600
Raw cotton	1,125
Shoddy	9,563

To make these 40-cent goods—the popular class—there must, on account of the high tariff rates, be an adulteration. A lowering of the tariff will permit the use of more grease wool, which is the same thing as a lowering of price. It will give the people better woolens for the same money.

These gentlemen from whom I have been quoting are men of experience in the manufacture of woolens and know full well what they are talking about. It is quite evident to all who lived during the life of the Wilson law that much more wool was used in the manufacture of woolen goods than there has been at any time since. In 1897 the statistics from the Department of Agriculture state that we consumed 601,205,008 pounds of raw wool. At that time the population of the United States, in round numbers, was about 65,000,000. Since that time we have added to our population more than 25,000,000 people, a little less than one-half of the population during the three years of the Wilson law. Add to the consumption during the life of this bill a ratio equal to the increase in population, and this would bring our consumption of wool up to between 800,000,000 and 900,000,000 pounds, whereas, as a matter of fact, in 1910 we consumed a little over 581,000,000 pounds. The difference between these figures shows how much cotton and shoddy is being sold to the people to-day for wool. Supporting the argument that the consumption of wool increases as the price of wool decreases, I submit the following table.

Quantities of wool produced, imported, exported, and retained for consumption: 1840 to 1910.[1]

Period.[2]	Production.[3]	Exports of domestic.	Domestic retained for consumption.	Imports.	Exports of foreign.	Foreign retained for consumption.	Total consumption, domestic and foreign.	Per cent of consumption, foreign.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	
1840[4]	35,802,114	.....	35,802,114	9,898,740	85,528	9,813,212	45,615,326	21.5
1850	52,516,959	35,898	52,481,061	18,695,294	.....	18,695,294	71,176,355	26.3
1860	60,264,913	1,055,928	59,208,985	26,282,955	157,064	26,125,891	85,334,876	30.6
1862-1870[5]	142,888,889	507,442	142,381,447	53,138,126	918,949	52,219,177	194,600,624	26.8
1871-1880[5]	186,275,000	152,303	186,122,697	68,030,280	3,938,616	64,091,664	250,214,361	25.6
1881-1890[5]	280,700,000	115,025	280,584,975	93,194,903	4,294,346	88,900,557	369,485,532	24.1
1891	285,000,000	291,922	284,708,078	129,303,648	2,638,123	126,665,525	411,373,603	30.8
1892	294,000,000	202,456	293,797,544	148,670,652	3,007,563	145,663,089	439,460,633	33.1
1893	303,153,000	91,858	303,061,142	172,433,838	4,218,637	168,215,201	471,276,343	35.7
1894	298,057,384	520,247	297,537,137	55,152,585	5,977,407	49,175,178	346,712,315	14.2
1895	309,748,000	4,279,109	305,468,891	206,033,906	2,343,081	203,690,825	509,159,716	40.0
1896	272,474,708	6,945,981	265,528,727	230,911,473	6,026,236	224,885,237	490,413,964	45.9
1897	259,153,251	5,271,535	253,881,716	350,852,026	3,427,834	347,424,192	601,305,908	57.8
1898	266,720,684	121,139	266,599,545	132,795,202	2,504,832	130,290,370	396,889,915	32.8
1899	272,191,330	1,683,419	270,507,911	76,736,209	12,411,916	64,324,293	334,832,204	19.2
1900	288,636,621	2,200,309	286,436,312	155,928,455	5,702,251	150,226,204	436,662,516	34.4
1901	302,502,328	199,565	302,302,763	103,583,505	3,590,502	99,993,003	402,295,766	24.9
1902	316,341,032	123,278	316,217,754	166,576,966	3,104,663	163,472,303	479,690,057	34.1
1903	287,450,000	518,919	286,931,081	177,137,796	2,992,995	174,144,801	461,075,882	37.8
1904	291,783,032	319,750	291,463,282	173,742,834	2,863,053	170,879,781	462,343,063	37.0
1905	295,488,438	123,951	295,364,487	249,135,746	2,437,697	246,698,049	542,062,536	45.5
1906	298,915,130	192,481	298,722,649	201,688,636	5,450,378	196,238,290	494,960,939	39.6
1907	298,294,750	214,840	298,079,910	203,847,545	3,231,908	200,615,637	498,695,547	40.0
1908	311,138,321	182,458	310,955,863	125,980,524	5,684,357	120,296,167	431,252,030	27.9
1909	328,110,749	28,376	328,082,373	266,409,304	3,495,599	262,913,705	590,996,078	44.5
1910	321,362,750	47,520	321,315,230	263,928,232	4,007,953	259,920,279	581,235,509	44.7

[1] Does not include data with respect to commerce between the United States and its insular possessions after June 30, 1900.
[2] The periods relate to years ended June 30.
[3] From estimates of the Department of Agriculture prior to 1896; from 1896 to date estimated by the secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
[4] Year ended September 30.
[5] Average for the period.

Mr. Chairman, another favorite argument of the high protectionist and of these gentlemen who are opposing this bill is that of protecting American labor. We have been a long time in trying to get them to define just what they mean by the term "protection to American labor," and it was not until the campaign of 1908 that we were able to get them to define their position upon that question in writing. I quote from the Republican platform of 1908, as follows:

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

Will anyone contend that 20 per cent on raw wool is not sufficient to make up for the difference between the cost of raising wool in America and abroad? Is there a man here who will say that 42.55 per cent is not enough to make up the difference between the cost of labor in the manufacture of woolens abroad and in America? If there is, I would like for him to stand up so that I can see the color of his hair. You give me 50 yards the advantage of an automobile and I can beat it in a foot race of 100 yards. But, in fact, was the tariff on Schedule K intended to benefit American labor? Let us see what Andrew J. Solis, a woolen manufacturer, says about that. In volume 5, page 5037, of the tariff hearings before the Ways and Means Committee in December, 1908, he said, with reference to this proposition:

Who have been the real beneficiaries of the Dingley wool schedule? It has not been American labor, because many of the mills have been filled from top to bottom with foreigners, many of whom could not even speak the English language. That is why wages did not materially increase. It has not been those on fixed salaries, because no advance has been given, and instead of being better situated they were in a worse condition, because the cost of living was forced up to such an extent that the ordinary individual just about made both ends meet and had hard work at that.

This shows how much these disciples of Moorish barbarians love labor; and what is true of their practices in filling up the woolen mills with cheap foreign labor is true to a greater or less extent in all of the manufacturing centers. Instead of being a friend to American labor, these protected combines have become its worst enemies by importing the cheap pauper labor of other countries to our country to compete with the intelligent American laborer. I quote from the testimony of Henry J. MacFarland, president of M. D. Wells Co., Chicago, Ill., which is found in volume 7 of the tariff hearings, page 6869, November 28, 1908. He was asked a question by the next President of the United States, CHAMP CLARK. [Applause.]

Are you in accord with taking the tariff off of leather?
Mr. MACFARLAND. I am, sir; absolutely.
Mr. CLARK. And on boots and shoes?
Mr. MACFARLAND. I am not an exporter. The exporters have a different opinion from what I hold. I believe that this country can manufacture shoes in competition with any country on earth.

Further on he was interrogated by Mr. RANDELL of Texas, as follows:

You do not just confine that to this country, the home market, but you mean the markets of the world?
Mr. MACFARLAND. I mean the skill with which shoes are manufactured. The skilled workmen of this country can overcome the handicap of the price of foreign labor.

Again, we had distinguished gentlemen in the manufacture of iron and steel before this same committee, such as Andrew Carnegie and Charles Schwab, in which they declared that iron and steel could be manufactured in the United States cheaper than it could be in any country in the world. Now, could you have it made any broader than what these gentlemen say about the matter? Yet, in the light of this testimony, and of the long experience of men skilled in the production of the finished product in America and familiar with the cost of labor, both in America and abroad, these gentlemen here on the floor of this Chamber—gentlemen who are still wedded to the belief that they have a right to pass a law to permit a few thousand men to levy tribute upon more than 90,000,000 of intelligent people in America—stand here and try to convince us that the high rates imposed by the Payne law upon the articles made from wool are just and right. The people at the polls condemned this bill and sent new men to the Sixty-second Congress for the purpose of giving them relief, and I predict that he who fails to vote for this measure will be brought to the bar of justice at the polls in November, 1912, to answer to his constituents for his misdeed. By your conduct in the last Congress you sent many of us here to take the places of men who failed to stand up for the cause of the people, and, if you continue your policy of high protection, you will send many more men here to take your places in the Sixty-third Congress. You can't fool the people any longer. It used to be that the masses waited for their Congressman to come home to tell them what had happened in Congress, but now the intelligent masses are directing their Congressmen how to vote upon every public question which comes up affecting their interests, long before the measure comes to a vote.

Mr. Chairman, I promised not to detain these good people very long, but I fear I have not kept my word very well. I will tell you one more story, which illustrates how these fellows are trying to do the people. I once heard a story of a storekeeper who had a Swede clerk. The Swede was sent out one day to collect the bills, and when he came back the storekeeper said, "Well, Rudolph, how did you get along?" He replied, "Vell, me do purty good; me go to Shon Shones, and Shon Shones, he pay me. Me go to Sam Reynolds, and Sam Reynolds, he pay me, but me go to Patrick Malony, and Patrick Malony, he no pay me." Storekeeper: "What did Pat say about that bill, anyway?" Swede: "Vell, I dink he pay you all right." Storekeeper: "When did he say he would pay me?"

Swede: "Vell, I dink he pay you in Yanuar." Storekeeper: "Did he say he would pay me in January?" Swede: "No; he no say he pay you in Yanuar, but he say it be a damn cold day ven he pay you." [Laughter.]

So I say, Mr. Chairman, to these gentlemen who are clamoring here for time in order to defeat this bill, they are just like Patrick—it will be a cold day when they frame a bill in the interest of the people of this country. I thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the gentleman to have one more minute in order that I may make an explanation of my question. It was not my intention to intimate that the gentleman was either a protectionist or bowlegged.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not need to make any apology. It was granted long before he asked for it. He is my friend.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BOOHER, 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. 11019, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 23. An act to authorize the extension of Underwood Street NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 238. An act to authorize the extension of Lamont Street NW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2224. An act to amend an act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2532. An act providing for an increase of salary for the collector of customs for the district of Montana and Idaho; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1524. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dam or dams across the Kansas River, in western Shawnee County, or in Wabaunsee County, in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2052. An act relating to the removal of the North Point light station, Wisconsin, to another site; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes a. m., on Sunday, June 18, 1911) the House adjourned to meet on Monday, June 19, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11671) granting pay to Faver Cason; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11675) granting a pension to George Stephens, sr.; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11678) granting a pension to Andrew J. Smith; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 11821) to raise revenue from persons engaged in and carrying on certain occupations within the District of Columbia, and to create a fund to pay compensation to public servants injured on post roads, and to change the general law heretofore enunciated in actions for the recovery of damages for personal injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 11822) to promote the safety of passengers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to use cars constructed of steel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WARBURTON: A bill (H. R. 11823) to place sugar and molasses on the free list, and to provide for an internal-revenue tax on chewing and smoking tobacco, snuff, cigars, and cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11824) to amend section 113 of the act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary, approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 11825) to promote pharmacists to the grade of chief pharmacist in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11826) to class mates in the Navy as warrant officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 11827) for the establishment of an experimental auto-post-coach rural service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 211) requesting the Attorney General to inform the House what action has been taken to prosecute the carriers who have been violating the commodities clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 10) to investigate the condition of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Memorial from the General Assembly of Colorado asking for the cession of 1,000,000 acres of land under the Carey Act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (by request): Memorial from the General Assembly of Colorado asking for the cession of 1,000,000 acres of land under the Carey Act; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature asking Congress to cause all dams owned by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River to be equipped with fishways; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LENROOT: Memorial from Wisconsin Legislature asking Congress to cause all dams owned by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River to be equipped with fishways; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a memorial from Wisconsin Legislature in regard to passports issued by the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: A memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to cause all dams owned by the United States across Fox River to be equipped with fishways; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 11828) for the relief of Commander William S. Hogg, United States Navy, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11829) for the relief of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11830) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Quinton, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11831) for the relief of Capt. Charles W. Kennedy, United States Army, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11832) for the relief of Capt. W. W. Wright and Capt. Claude B. Sweezey, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11833) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11834) to credit certain officers of the Medical Department, United States Army, with services rendered as acting assistant surgeons during the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 11835) granting a pension to Mary C. Wyckoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11836) granting an increase of pension to William H. Beare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11837) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Scrivner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 11838) granting a pension to Joseph J. Held; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11839) for the relief of Sarah J. Norcross; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11840) for the relief of J. Ballard Taylor; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11841) granting an increase of pension to George E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 11842) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Junkens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11843) granting an increase of pension to Frank Offenstein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11844) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Mahannah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to Elias Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11846) for the relief of Martha H. Hamlin, widow of John H. Hamlin; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. UTTER: A bill (H. R. 11847) granting an increase of pension to John Hamil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 11848) granting an increase of pension to William T. Williams; 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. ANDERSON of Minnesota: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension for William T. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: Petition of residents of northern part of New York City, in favor of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Retail Druggists' Association of Fond du Lac County, Wis., remonstrating against the passage of House bill 8887, providing for a stamp tax on proprietary and patent medicines and certain druggist sundries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, affidavits in support of House bill 11423, granting an increase of pension to Marcus L. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, affidavits accompanying bill granting an increase of pension to William H. Beare; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying bill for increase of pension to Arthur Scrivner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYTON: Statement of C. M. D. Browne, Alonzo O. Bliss, Elizabeth C. Allen, Shelton T. Cameron, Ephraim J. Totten, Nettie B. Browne, Edward J. Taylor, and S. Fay Harper, alleging that certain streets of the city of Washington, D. C., are being obstructed by private persons without authority of law, and protesting against such obstruction; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, letter accompanied by printed statement from John Norris, chairman of committee on paper of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, alleging that if certain information should be obtained that it would show the International Paper Co. to be an illegal combination and has repressed competition by stopping and dismantling paper machines, and alleging that the Root amendment to the reciprocity bill aims to fasten permanently upon the consumers of news-print paper in every State of the Union the tax of at least $6,000,000 per annum, which that consolidation of 30 antiquated mills in New England and New York State has made possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Petitions of numerous citizens of Weeks and Caulksville, Ark., asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of 13 citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., asking for reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Papers to accompany bill No. 8809; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions adopted by the Milwaukee Clearing House Association, relating to proposed legislation affecting the cold-storage industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of George Hobbs & Sons and other citizens of Alice, Tex., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petitions of numerous citizens of Waco, Tex., and of the Litchfield (Ill.) Merchants' Association, requesting a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Snohomish, Wash., protesting against Senate bill 237, for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of H. Slippern, A. Hostmark, and Paul Palmer, of Poulsbo, Wash., asking for reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Ashley R. Farless, of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Senate joint resolution 3; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Tillman & Bendel, of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of F. J. Ackermann, Bay City, Mich., for reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution by Pawtucket (R. I.) Business Men's Association, favoring the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill without amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 97, Patriotic Order Sons of America, and numerous other petitions, all of Pennsylvania, relating to the question of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of William H. Reeser and others, of Reading, and Wilson Kunkel, of Albany, Pa., in favor of a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the United German-American and United Irish-American Societies of New York, urging the rejection of the proposed new arbitration with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Alexandria and Logansport branches of the Alliance of German Societies of the State of Indiana, favoring House bill 166, providing for an investigation of the administration of the immigration office at Ellis Island, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of western Washington, urging Congress to ratify proposed arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Petitions of 1,672 citizens of the twenty-seventh congressional district of New York, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UTTER: Papers to accompany bills granting an increase of pension to John Hamil, Elizabeth F. Taylor, and James M. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., favoring a general arbitration treaty with Great Britain, France, and other countries, as proposed by President Taft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Greystone Republican Club of Rhode Island, favoring political union between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June 19, 1911.*

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

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

CLAIMS OF LABORERS IN NAVY YARDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chief Justice of the Court of Claims, transmitting information relative to the duplication of certain cases relating to claims of laborers in navy yards transmitted to the Senate in the findings by the court and requesting the return to the court of the findings in which duplications appear, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 50.)

ERSKINE R. K. HAYES V. UNITED STATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court and the opinions of Judges Barney and Howry in the cause of Erskine R. K. Hayes *v.* United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed. (S. Doc. No. 51.)