Also, a bill (H. R. 13736) for the relief of the heirs at law of James E. Wilson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13737) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of A. L. P. Green; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13738) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Baxter Smith, administrator of estate of Hugh C. Jackson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13739) for the relief of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of Clarksville, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13740) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of J. Minnick Williams, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 13741) granting an increase of pension to Peter Stuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13742) granting an increase of pension to Mordica Lincoln; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAUGHERTY: A bill (H. R. 13743) granting a pension to Alvah H. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 13744) granting a pension to Mary Colby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13745) granting a pension to Ann Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13746) granting a pension to Margaret Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13747) granting a pension to John Zanger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13748) granting a pension to Frederick Leidenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13749) granting a pension to William J. Allmand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13750) granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Falvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13751) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Roos; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13752) granting an increase of pension to James M. Cartel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13753) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Patton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13754) granting an increase of pension to Pleasant P. Jordan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13755) granting an increase of pension to John Travis, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13756) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Luntsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13757) granting an increase of pension to Arnold Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 13758) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert L. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 13759) for the relief of the legal representatives of Needham Bullard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 13760) granting an increase of pension to Henry Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: A bill (H. R. 13761) granting a pension to Henry Petring; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 13762) granting an increase of pension to John R. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 13763) granting an increase of pension to William Y. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 13764) granting an increase of pension to Adelbert B. Crampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13765) granting an increase of pension to Julia T. Caulkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 13766) granting an increase of pension to John O. Ockerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 13767) granting an increase of pension to Naaman R. Aller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 13768) granting a pension to Mary E. Shay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13769) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; 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 the SPEAKER: Petitions of numerous residents of Chicago, Ill., asking for an investigation of the administration of the immigration office at Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers to accompany bills granting increases of pension to John Ross, Robert Schumann, and Joseph Spehn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: Papers to accompany House bills 11893, 11894, and 13372; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Caleb C. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of John M. Mott, favoring the abolishment of duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Resolutions of Lincoln Post, No. 1, Department of California and Nevada, protesting against the erection of a Confederate naval monument in the Vicksburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Memorial of Gov. Oswald West and several thousand citizens of Oregon, asking that a law be enacted establishing an Alaska coal mining commission for the purpose of mining the public coal lands in Alaska, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Papers in support of House bills 7573 and 7574; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *August 17, 1911.*

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. BROWN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 943) for the improvement of navigation on the Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 306. An act to confirm the name of Commodore Barney Circle for the circle located at the eastern end of Pennsylvania Avenue SE., in the District of Columbia;

S. 1785. An act to amend section 647, chapter 18, Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to annual statements of insurance companies;

S. 2055. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Bangor, Me.; also for the sale of the site and ruins of the former post-office building;

S. 3052. An act granting leave of absence to certain homesteaders;

H. R. 4682. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Glenhayes Station, in Wayne County, W. Va.;

H. R. 8146. An act to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois; and

H. R. 11723. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between Burnett County, Wis., and Pine County, Minn.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Baptist Vineyard Association of Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of 331 employees of the firm of Rambo & Regar (Inc.), of Norristown, Pa., remonstrating against a reduction in the duty on hosiery, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of the congregation of the High Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Muncie, Ind., and a petition of the congregation of the Mennonite Church, of Berne, Ind., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the ratification of the treaties of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

Mr. BROWN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) for appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It appoints Gen. P. H. Barry, of Nebraska, as a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers of the United States, to succeed Capt. Henry E. Palmer, deceased, whose term of office would expire April 21, 1916.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT GETTYSBURG, PA.

Mr. HEYBURN. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably the bill (H. R. 13277) to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at Gettysburg, Pa. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to increase from $100,000 to $117,000 the limit of cost fixed by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, for the erection and completion of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other governmental offices at Gettysburg, Pa.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETIT JEAN RIVER, ARK.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3253) to authorize the counties of Yell and Conway to construct a bridge across the Petit Jean River.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It authorizes the counties of Yell and Conway, bodies corporate under the laws of the State of Arkansas, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a steel drawbridge and approaches thereto across the Petit Jean River, a navigable stream, at or near Pontoon, Ark., along the Yell and Conway County lines, in the State of Arkansas, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable streams," approved March 23, 1906.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3261) to provide for designating and addressing staff officers of the Navy in the same manner that staff officers of the Army are designated and addressed; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRINTING OF VETO MESSAGE—NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. SMOOT. Yesterday, on my request, the special message of the President of the United States, returning without approval the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 14) to admit the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona as States into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, was ordered to be printed as a public document, but I notice, on an examination, that last evening the House of Representatives had already ordered it printed as a public document. Therefore I ask that the order made by the Senate be annulled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order made yesterday for printing the President's message will be annulled. No objection is heard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I have received a telegram from the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] stating that he is sick and requesting the Senate to grant him a leave of absence for the remainder of the session on account of sickness. I therefore present the request in his behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Maryland will be complied with. No objection is heard.

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12812—the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 12812) to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment. I expect to divide it and offer it when the bill reaches the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No action has been taken that requires unanimous consent. The Senator from Iowa withdraws his amendment. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and still open to amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. If we are going to vote on amendments, I think there ought to be a quorum present, and I suggest the want of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bacon	Cullom	Lorimer	Smith, S. C.
Bailey	Cummins	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Bankhead	Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Borah	Dillingham	Myers	Swanson
Bourne	Dixon	Nixon	Taylor
Brandegee	Fletcher	Oliver	Thornton
Briggs	Foster	Overman	Townsend
Brown	Gamble	Page	Warren
Burton	Guggenheim	Penrose	Watson
Chilton	Heyburn	Perkins	Wetmore
Clapp	Johnston, Ala.	Pomerene	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Reed	
Crawford	Kern	Root	
Culberson	La Follette	Simmons	

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. BRYAN] is necessarily absent on account of the death of his father. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. JONES. My colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is absent from the city, and therefore can not be present.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to make the announcement that my colleague [Mr. KENYON] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is in attendance on a session of the Committee on Territories at this time, and is therefore unavoidably absent.

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to state that the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is unavoidably absent from the city. I will let this announcement stand for the several calls that may be made during the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is out of the city. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. I will let the announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill, and I desire to say a word before the amendment is read. I wish to prevent any possible misconstruction, and I now make the statement that I do not claim the credit of being the author of what is contained in the amendment. It is true that it is my property, as it was thrown overboard by the author of it; and, under the law of jetsam and flotsam, I believe, as I am the finder of it, I am the owner of it.

When the Senator from Iowa asked the leave of the Senate to withdraw his amendment I was about to object, when the Chair ruled that no consent was needed. Therefore the Senator was at liberty to withdraw it, and he did withdraw it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has pressed the amendment with so much earnestness and has explained it as a proper and necessary measure with so much precision and elaborate care that I have been greatly impressed with the importance of it, and I am unwilling that it should be thrown away. While it does not entirely meet with my approval, and is much higher in the rates than I think it ought to be, still it is very much better than the present law; and while, if I were drawing an amendment and had the votes behind me to carry it according to my wishes, I would make the rates much lower, I have accepted what was formerly the proposition of the Senator from Iowa, and now offer it as my own. I shall at the proper time ask for a vote on it as an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section to the bill, as follows:

SEC. —. The Act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out paragraph 121 of Schedule C thereof and inserting the following:

"121. Beams, girders, joists, angles, car-truck channels, T. T. columns and posts, or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, or whether assembled and manufactured, one-quarter of 1 cent per pound."

The said Schedule C in the act aforesaid, being paragraphs 117 to 199, both inclusive, is hereby further amended as follows, to wit:

"From and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles mentioned in paragraphs 117 to 151, inclusive, 159 to 163, inclusive, and 171 of said Schedule C, when imported from any foreign country into the United States, or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), 60 per cent only of the rates of duty which are in and by said paragraphs of said schedule prescribed; but the foregoing shall not apply to paragraph 121, which is hereinbefore repealed and a substitute reenacted therefor."

That from and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles mentioned in paragraphs 152 to 158, inclusive, 164 to 170, inclusive, 172 to 199, inclusive, of said Schedule C, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), 70 per cent only of the rates of duty which are in and by said paragraphs of said schedule prescribed: *Provided, however*, That if any article embraced in said schedule shall by an act of Congress passed by the Sixty-second Congress, second session, be placed on the free list, this act shall not apply thereto.

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

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I need hardly say that I am heartily in favor of the proposition contained in this amendment, as I myself drew it. I withdrew the amendment, as I stated, intending to divide it, and to offer it to the bill when the bill reached the Senate. I withdrew it in order to enable the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to offer, first, his amendment by way of substitute for the cotton bill passed by the other House. I think all Senators understand that I did not withdraw the amendment because I had lost faith in its merits. I expect and hope to see it adopted before the bill passes from the Senate.

I wanted simply to make this explanation as to my reason for withdrawing it, which was solely to divide it first into two parts. It would be divisible anyway on the request of any Senator—first, that part which covers what is ordinarily known as tonnage iron and steel, upon which I seek to reduce the duties 40 per cent; then upon the remaining paragraphs of the metal schedule, which relate to other metals and to the finer forms of manufactured iron and steel, upon which I seek to reduce the duty 30 per cent.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa did not, in withdrawing his amendment, propose simply to make a modification. It is true he said something about what he had in view for the future; but, so far as the bill now pending before the Senate is concerned, it was an absolute withdrawal of the amendment. The party with which I am associated has been impressed with the conviction that the metal schedule should be amended, and that the opportunity should be taken advantage of in the pendency of the present cotton bill to offer this as an amendment to the bill. When the Senator from Iowa withdraws it as an amendment, there is nothing for us to do but either to see the bill acted upon without that amendment being offered or to ourselves offer it.

Mr. President, the Senator alludes to what his purpose is when the bill gets into the Senate. I think we all understand what that means—that the Senator is assuming that this bill is to be defeated, and after it has been defeated it is going to be presented in another shape, and that then the Senator will give it his support in the offering of an amendment. That does not satisfy those of us who think as I do. We think that the amendment should be offered to the bill now pending. What shall become of that bill afterwards is another question. For myself, I am not voting for this bill to put myself on record, but I am voting for it in the effort to pass it. Therefore I submit amendments to it in good faith, as if the bill is to pass. If it is not to pass, it shall not be my fault nor the fault of those who think as I do. If the amendment which I have offered is not attached as an amendment to the bill as it now stands, it will not be our fault. We have offered the amendment in good faith; we propose to vote for it; and we shall be very glad for all of those who believe in the amendment to vote for it, and not run the risk of having a chance to vote for it when something which they anticipate may not occur.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Georgia, does the amendment which he offers relate to the chemical schedule or any part of it?

Mr. BACON. No, sir. I will state to the Senator, and also for the information of other Senators who may not have been present when the amendment was first offered and when I stated the nature of it, that it is an amendment to Schedule C of the tariff law, to wit, the metal schedule—the iron and steel schedule. It is in terms the amendment which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] formerly presented, offering it as an amendment to the bill, and which he withdrew this morning, and which, as I have said, became flotsam and jetsam. As the finder of it, I became the owner of it, and I have introduced it in my own name and in my own right as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator, is he offering the amendment because it relates to cotton itself or its uses, or does he offer it as a separate matter referring directly and only to commodities covered in another schedule?

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will repeat that question, because the first part of it was stated in such a low tone that I did not catch it.

Mr. WARREN. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he offers that amendment because it has a particular reference to the cotton bill or the cotton industries, or whether he offers it because he wishes to re-form another and entirely different schedule?

Mr. BACON. I want to re-form the schedule.

Mr. WARREN. As a separate measure?

Mr. BACON. I want to re-form that schedule; and, as the Senator asks the question, I will state very frankly what our attitude is in regard to the matter. The information is within our possession, entirely reliable and definite, that the House of Representatives now has in course of preparation an amendment to the iron and steel schedule which is not yet entirely completed. On account of the shortness of the session, as they may not have the opportunity to complete their bill in the other House and send it to us in time for us to act on it, without keeping us here for a much longer time than most of us desire to remain, it is deemed wise and opportune to take advantage of the pending measure—the cotton bill—and engraft upon it legislation which shall greatly reduce the tariff duties upon the iron and steel products coming into this country. It is for that reason, in good faith, not as a matter of form and not for the purpose of embarrassing the measure, but for the purpose of expediting legislation upon this most important matter, the importance of which has been most earnestly and deeply and graphically impressed upon us by the Senator from Iowa—it is for the purpose of securing it as a piece of legislation that it is now offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have no doubt whatever about the good faith of the Senator from Georgia. I withdrew this as an amendment to the cotton bill, which is now before the Senate, because I do not intend to vote for that cotton bill. I intend to vote for the cotton bill that will be proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. But I assure the Senator from Georgia, as well as all Senators, that there will be ample opportunity to vote for the reduction of the duties on iron and steel before we have finished the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BACON. What is the bill to which the Senator alludes? I did not know that it was within the power of a Senator here to introduce a bill in regard to revenues. The Senator says "the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin."

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Georgia, I suppose, understands that the Senator from Wisconsin will offer it. It is now on the table.

Mr. BACON. The Senator means an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. An amendment by way of a substitute to the cotton bill passed by the House. It is that bill for which I intend to vote, and I desire this metal schedule to be attached to that bill, if it receives the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator repeats over and over again the word "bill." The Senator means amendment, does he not?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; I mean an amendment, although it is in itself a complete revision of that schedule.

Mr. BACON. That is the reason I made the inquiry of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In the absence of that Senator on account of illness, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CULBERSON (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I desire to announce that I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. If he were present, I should vote "nay." I make this announcement of the pair for the day.

Mr. MYERS (when the name of Mr. DAVIS was called). I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. If the Senator from Arkansas were present, he would vote "yea" on this amendment. I make this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair I have with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], who is necessarily detained from the Senate. I make this announcement for the entire day. Upon this question I vote "nay."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GALLINGER] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I desire to announce that I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who is necessarily absent. I assume that if present the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. NIXON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and so I withhold my vote.

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. STONE] is unable to be present on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], who is absent on account of illness. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to say that the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY]. If the Senator from North Dakota were present, he would vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS] is recorded as voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he is not recorded.

Mr. WATSON. Then I desire to withdraw my vote and to announce a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a pair with that Senator and therefore withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bacon	Culberson	Martin, Va.	Reed
Bailey	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Bankhead	Johnson, Me.	Myers	Simmons
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	Jones	Owen	Swanson
Clapp	Kern	Paynter	Thornton
Clarke, Ark.	Lea	Pomerene	Works

NAYS—25.

Borah	Crawford	La Follette	Root
Bourne	Cullom	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Cummins	Lorimer	Townsend
Bristow	Dillingham	Nelson	Wetmore
Brown	Dixon	Oliver	
Burnham	Gamble	Page	
Burton	Heyburn	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—36.

Bradley	Gallinger	Newlands	Smoot
Briggs	Gore	Nixon	Stephenson
Bryan	Gronna	O'Gorman	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Guggenheim	Penrose	Sutherland
Crane	Hitchcock	Percy	Taylor
Curtis	Kenyon	Poindexter	Tillman
Davis	Lodge	Rayner	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Richardson	Watson
Foster	McLean	Smith, Md.	Williams

So Mr. BACON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending, which I think comes first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is an amendment pending. I hold it in my hand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered, or it should have been voted upon before the last amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. "In the Senate of the United States, August 12, 1911. Amendments intended to be proposed"——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Intended to be proposed——

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to my colleague if he desires to proceed.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; go ahead.

Mr. SIMMONS. I offer the following amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will offer my amendment at the proper time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

17. On all machines and parts of machines, used for carding, drawing, slubbing, roving, spinning, doubling, weaving, and knitting cotton, and all other machines and parts of machines used in the manufacture of cotton goods, 30 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

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

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will again report the amendment.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on the question of agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is detained from the Senate by illness. I desire that this announcement shall stand for the day.

Mr. CULBERSON (when his name was called). I make this statement for the day: I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BURNHAM (when Mr. GALLINGER's name was called). I make the same announcement in regard to my colleague as before, and I desire this announcement to stand for the day. If my colleague were present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McLEAN (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. NIXON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] for the day. I will not make any further announcement of the pair.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware

[Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer it to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I desire to again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE], and that he is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. I do not know how he would vote upon this amendment.

Mr. FOSTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who is absent. If he were present, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	Clapp	Kern	Pomerene
Bailey	Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Reed
Bankhead	Crawford	Lea	Shively
Borah	Culberson	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Bourne	Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Dixon	Myers	Swanson
Brown	Fletcher	Overman	Thornton
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Watson
Chilton	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Works

NAYS—22.

Brandegee	Gamble	Nelson	Smoot
Briggs	Guggenheim	Oliver	Stephenson
Burnham	Heyburn	Page	Townsend
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Wetmore
Cullom	Lippitt	Root	
Dillingham	Lorimer	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—31.

Bradley	Gallinger	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Gore	Nixon	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Crane	Hitchcock	Penrose	Taylor
Curtis	Kenyon	Percy	Tillman
Davis	Lodge	Poindexter	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Rayner	Williams
Foster	McLean	Richardson	

So the amendment of Mr. SIMMONS was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to offer an amendment. In offering this amendment I want to say that I have had an expert of the Treasury Department to reduce everything in this schedule to an ad valorem basis 25 per cent—not down to 25 per cent, but 25 per cent less than the rates in the Payne-Aldrich bill. If anybody desires to inquire as to a reduction, I have it here in figures.

I have also a glossary prepared by the Treasury Department showing each article and what it is used for, and if any Senator desires to inquire about it, he may. I will have the Clerk read that after he gets through reading the amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. In addition to having that glossary read, I ask that it be printed as a public document. Those matters are very useful.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes. It only shows what these different articles are used for.

Mr. BAILEY. Precisely so; but that is very useful to every man who seeks to familiarize himself with the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order to print asked for by the Senator from Texas will be entered. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section in the bill, to follow the amendment just agreed to, on page 7, as follows:

SEC. —. The act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out all of Schedule A thereof, being paragraphs 1 to 83, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SCHEDULE A. CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

1. Acids: Acetic or pyroligneous acid, not exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 10 per cent ad valorem—

Mr. OVERMAN. For the benefit of the Senate I will say that is reduced from 13 per cent to 10 per cent.

The Secretary read as follows:

Exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is reduced from 24.87 per cent.

The Secretary read as follows:

Acetic anhydrid, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is reduced from 13.05 to 10.

The Secretary read as follows:

Boracic acid, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. OVERMAN. In the Payne-Aldrich bill it is 92 per cent.

The Secretary read as follows:

Chromic acid, 10 per cent ad valorem; citric acid, 15 per cent ad valorem; lactic acid, containing not over 40 per cent by weight of actual lactic acid, 15 per cent ad valorem; containing over 40 per cent by weight of actual lactic acid, 25 per cent ad valorem; oxalic acid, 25 per cent ad valorem; salicylic acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; sulphuric acid, or oil of vitriol, not specially provided for in this section, 5 per cent ad valorem; tannic acid or tannin, 50 per cent ad valorem; ballic acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; tartaric acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other acids not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. OVERMAN. Unless some Senator desires the reading of the whole amendment, I will state, so that everybody may understand it, that the rates are reduced 25 per cent. I ask that the further reading be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the further reading of the amendment will be dispensed with.

Mr. JONES. What is the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. OVERMAN. Unless some Senator desires the further reading of the amendment, I do not insist upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. HEYBURN. If it is to appear in the RECORD——

Mr. JONES. I want to ask if this amendment has ever been read in the Senate?

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. OVERMAN. Read it, then.

Mr. HEYBURN. Unless that request is coupled with the request——

Mr. OVERMAN. I withdraw the request.

Mr. HEYBURN. That it be printed in the RECORD——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. HEYBURN. We will never know what the amendment is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn. The Secretary will continue the reading of the amendment.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment, as follows:

2. Vegetable, animal, or mineral objects immersed or placed in, or saturated with, alcohol, not specially provided for in this section 35 per cent ad valorem; all other alcoholic compounds not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem.

3. Alkalies, alkaloids, distilled oils, essential oils, expressed oils, rendered oils, and all combinations of the foregoing, and all chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts, and all greases not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent; chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts containing alcohol or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, and not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

4. Alumina, hydrate of, or refined bauxite, containing not more than 64 per cent of alumina, 15 per cent; containing more than 64 per cent of alumina, 5 per cent ad valorem. Alum, alum cake, patent alum, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, containing not more than 15 per cent of alumina, and not more than three-tenths of 1 per cent of iron oxide, 20 per cent; alum, alum cake, patent alum, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, containing more than 15 per cent of alumina, or not more than three-tenths of 1 per cent of iron oxide, 30 per cent ad valorem.

5. Ammonia, carbonate of, 25 per cent; muriate of, or sal ammoniac, 10 per cent; liquid anhydrous, 30 per cent ad valorem.

6. Argols or crude tartar or wine lees crude, 5 per cent; tartars and lees crystals, or partly refined argols, containing not more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash, and tartrate of soda or potassa, or Rochelle salts, 20 per cent; containing more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash, 20 per cent; cream of tartar and patent tartar, 40 per cent ad valorem.

7. Blacking of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem; creams and preparations for cleaning or polishing boots and shoes, 20 per cent ad valorem.

8. Bleaching powder or chloride of lime, 20 per cent ad valorem.

9. Blue vitriol or sulphate of copper, 3 per cent ad valorem.

10. Charcoal in any form, not specially provided for in this act; bone char, suitable for use in decolorizing sugars; and blood char, 15 per cent ad valorem.

11. Borax, 10 per cent; borates of lime, soda, or other borate material not otherwise provided for in this section, 14 per cent ad valorem.

12. Camphor, refined and synthetic camphor, 15 per cent ad valorem.

13. Chalk, when ground, bolted, precipitated naturally or artificially, or otherwise prepared, whether in the form of cubes, blocks, sticks, or disks, or otherwise, including tailors', billiard, red, or French chalk, 25 per cent; manufactures of chalk, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

14. Chloroform, 5 per cent ad valorem.

15. Coal-tar dyes or colors, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes and not medicinal, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

16. Cobalt, oxide of, 20 per cent ad valorem.

17. Collodion and all compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid or by any other name, 35 per cent; if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms, not polished, wholly or partly, and not made up into finished or partly finished articles, 35 per cent; if polished, wholly or partly, or if finished or partly finished articles, except moving-picture films, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 40 per cent ad valorem.

18. Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors, 35 per cent ad valorem.

19. Copperas, or sulphate of iron, 3 per cent ad valorem.

20. Drugs, such as barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, excrescences, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, dried insects, grains,

gums and gum resin, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, nutgalls, roots, stems, spices, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), seeds of morbid growth, weeds, and woods used expressly for dyeing or tanning; any of the foregoing which are natural and uncompounded drugs and not edible, and not specially provided for in this section, but which are advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the drugs and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol, or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, shall be classified for duty in this paragraph.

21. Ethers: Sulphuric, 25 per cent; spirits of nitrous ether, 25 per cent; fruit ethers, oils, or essences, 100 per cent; ethers of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent; ethyl chloride, 20 per cent ad valorem.

22. Extracts and decoctions of logwood and other dyewoods, and extracts of bark, such as are commonly used for dyeing or tanning, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent; extract of nutgalls, aqueous, 10 per cent; extract of Persian berries, 15 per cent; chlorophyll, 15 per cent; extracts of quebracho, not exceeding in density 28° B., 10 per cent; exceeding in density 28° B., 15 per cent; extracts of hemlock bark, 15 per cent; extracts of sumac, 10 per cent; and of woods other than dyewoods, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent; all extracts of vegetable origin suitable for dyeing, coloring, staining, or tanning, not containing alcohol and not medicinal, and not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

23. Gelatin, glue, isinglass, or fish glue, including agar-agar, or Japanese isinglass, and all fish bladders and fish sounds other than crude or dried or salted for preservation only, valued at not above 10 cents per pound, 25 per cent; valued at above 10 cents per pound and not above 35 cents per pound, 20 per cent; valued above 35 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; gelatin in sheets, emulsions, and all manufactures of gelatin, or of which gelatin is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem; glue size, 20 per cent ad valorem.

24. Glycerin, crude, not purified, 10 per cent ad valorem; refined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

25. Indigo extracts or pastes, 5 per cent ad valorem; indigo, carmined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

26. Ink and ink powders, 20 per cent ad valorem.

27. Iodine, resublimed, 5 per cent ad valorem.

28. Iodoform, 15 per cent ad valorem.

29. Licorice, extracts of, in paste, rolls, or other forms, 15 per cent ad valorem.

30. Chicle, 20 per cent ad valorem.

31. Magnesia, and carbonate of, medicinal, 35 per cent ad valorem; calcined, medicinal, 35 per cent ad valorem; sulphate of, or Epsom salts, 35 per cent ad valorem.

32. Alizarin assistant, sulpho-ricinoleic acid, and ricinoleic acid and soaps containing castor oil, or any of the foregoing in whatever form, in the manufacture of which 50 per cent or more of castor oil is used, 40 per cent ad valorem; in the manufacture of which less than 50 per cent of castor oil is used, 35 per cent ad valorem. All other alizarin assistants and all soluble greases used in processes of softening, dyeing, or finishing, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

33. Castor oil, 25 per cent ad valorem.

34. Cod-liver oil, 20 per cent ad valorem.

35. Flaxseed, linseed, and poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxydized, 20 per cent ad valorem.

36. Fusel oil, or amylic alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem.

37. Hempseed oil, 25 per cent ad valorem; rapeseed oil, 15 per cent ad valorem.

38. Olive oil, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem; in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, or other packages, containing less than 5 gallons each, 25 per cent ad valorem.

39. Peppermint oil, 5 per cent.

40. Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including sod oil, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent.

41. Opium, crude or unmanufactured and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, 30 per cent; opium of the same composition, dried, powdered, or otherwise advanced beyond the condition of crude or unmanufactured, 30 per cent; morphia or morphine, sulphate of, 25 per cent ad valorem; all alkaloids of opium and salts and esters thereof, 40 per cent ad valorem; cocaine, ecgonine, and all salts and derivatives of the same, 70 per cent; coca leaves, 30 per cent; aqueous extract of opium for medicinal uses, and tincture of, as laudanum and other liquid preparations of opium, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent; opium containing less than 9 per cent of morphia, 60 per cent; but preparations of opium deposited in bonded warehouses shall not be removed therefrom without payment of duties, and such duties shall not be refunded: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to repeal or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of an act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes," approved February 9, 1909.

42. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, 45 per cent; manufactured, 40 per cent.

43. Blues, such as Berlin, Prussian, Chinese, and all others, containing ferrocyanide of iron, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 30 per cent.

44. Blanc fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes, and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 30 per cent.

45. Black, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable substance, by whatever name known, including bone black and lampblack, dry or ground in oil or water, 20 per cent.

46. Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in the manufacture of which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are used, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 20 per cent.

47. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths, not specially provided for in this section, when crude or not powdered, washed, or pulverized, 8 per cent; if powdered, washed, or pulverized, 35 per cent; if ground in oil or water, 15 per cent.

48. Orange mineral, 45 per cent.

49. Red lead, 50 per cent.

50. Ultramarine blue, whether dry, in pulp, or mixed with water, and wash blue containing ultramarine, 25 per cent.

51. Varnishes, including so-called gold size or japan, 20 per cent; enamel paints made with varnish, 25 per cent; spirit varnish containing 5 per cent or more of methyl alcohol, 50 per cent; spirit varnish containing more than 5 per cent of methyl alcohol, 100 per cent ad valorem.

52. Vermilion reds, containing quicksilver, dry or ground in oil or water, 10 per cent ad valorem; when not containing quicksilver but made of lead or containing lead, 20 per cent ad valorem.

53. White lead and white pigment containing lead, dry or in pulp or ground or mixed with oil, 30 per cent ad valorem.

54. Whiting and Paris white, dry, 30 per cent ad valorem; ground in oil, or putty, 40 per cent ad valorem.

55. Zinc, oxide of, and white pigment containing zinc, but not containing lead, dry, 10 per cent ad valorem; ground in oil, 15 per cent ad valorem; sulfid of zinc, white, or white sulfid of zinc, 30 per cent ad valorem; chloride of zinc and sulphate of zinc, 30 per cent ad valorem.

56. All paints, colors, pigments, stains, lakes, crayons, including charcoal crayons or fusains, smalts, and frosting, whether crude or dry or mixed, or ground with water or oil, or with solutions other than oil, not otherwise specially provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem; all glazes, fluxes, enamels, and colors used only in the manufacture of ceramic, enameled, and glass articles, 25 per cent ad valorem; all paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists' paints or colors, whether in tubes, pans, cakes, or other forms, 25 per cent ad valorem.

57. Paris green and London purple, 10 per cent ad valorem.

58. Lead: Acetate of, white, 40 per cent ad valorem; brown, gray, or yellow, 30 per cent ad valorem; nitrate of, 30 per cent ad valorem; litharge, 40 per cent ad valorem.

59. Phosphorus, 30 per cent ad valorem.

60. Bichromate and chromate of potash, 35 per cent ad valorem.

61. Caustic potash, or hydrate of, refined, in sticks or rolls, 10 per cent ad valorem; chlorate of potash, 20 per cent ad valorem.

62. Hydriodate, iodide, and iodate of potash, 10 per cent ad valorem.

63. Nitrate of potash, or saltpeter, refined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

64. Prussiate of potash, read or yellow, 30 per cent ad valorem; cyanide of potassium, 10 per cent ad valorem.

65. Medicinal preparations containing alcohol, or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem; calomel, corrosive sublimate, and other mercurial medicinal preparations, 25 per cent ad valorem; all other medicinal preparations not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That chemicals, drugs, medicinal, and similar substances, whether dutiable or free, imported in capsules, pills, tablets, lozenges, troches, or similar forms, and intended for medicinal purposes, shall be dutiable at not less than the rate imposed by this section on medicinal preparations.

66. Plasters, healing or curative, of all kinds, and court-plaster, 20 per cent ad valorem.

67. Perfumery, including cologne and other toilet waters, articles of perfumery, whether in sachets or otherwise, and all preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentifrices, including tooth soaps, pastes, including theatrical grease paints and pastes, pomades, powders, and other toilet articles, all the foregoing; if containing alcohol, or in the manufacture or preparation of which alcohol is used, 60 per cent ad valorem; if not containing alcohol, or in the manufacture or preparation of which alcohol is not used, 50 per cent ad valorem; floral or flower waters, containing no alcohol, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

68. Santonin, and all salts thereof, containing 80 per cent or over of santonin, 5 per cent ad valorem.

69. Castile soap, 10 per cent ad valorem; medicinal or medicated soaps, 50 per cent ad valorem; fancy or perfumed toilet soaps, 35 per cent ad valorem; all other soaps not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

70. Bicarbonate of soda or super-carbonate of soda, or saleratus, and other alkalies containing 50 per cent or more of bicarbonate of soda, 15 per cent ad valorem.

71. Bichromate and chromate of soda, 35 per cent ad valorem.

72. Crystal carbonate of soda, or concentrated soda crystals, or monohydrate or sesquicarbonate, 10 per cent ad valorem; chlorate of soda, 15 per cent ad valorem.

73. Hydrate of or caustic soda, 12 per cent ad valorem; nitrite of soda, 30 per cent ad valorem; yellow prussiate of soda, 25 per cent ad valorem; sulphide of soda, containing not more than 35 per cent of soda, 10 per cent ad valorem; and hyposulphite of soda, 20 per cent ad valorem; sulphide of soda, concentrated or containing more than 35 per cent of soda, 45 per cent ad valorem.

74. Salsoda or soda crystals, not concentrated, 20 per cent ad valorem.

75. Soda ash, 20 per cent ad valorem; arseniate of soda, 25 per cent ad valorem.

76. Silicate of soda or other alkaline silicate, 25 per cent ad valorem.

77. Sulphate of soda, or salt cake, or niter cake, 8 per cent ad valorem.

78. Moss and seagrass, eel grass, and seaweed, if manufactured or dyed, 8 per cent ad valorem.

79. Sponges, 15 per cent ad valorem; manufactures of sponges, or of which sponge is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

80. Strychnia or strychnine, and all salts thereof, 25 per cent ad valorem.

81. Sulphur, refined, 12 per cent ad valorem; sublimed, or flowers of sulphur, 10 per cent ad valorem.

82. Sumac, ground, 10 per cent ad valorem.

83. Vanillin, 65 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. OVERMAN. In order that Senators may know what these articles are used for, I ask the Secretary to read the paper I send to the desk, so that every Senator may understand the amendment. Nearly all the articles are used in dyeing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROOT in the chair). Without objection, the paper will be read.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will just ask that it be put in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senator how he expects anyone to understand it if, before we vote on the amendment, it is printed in the RECORD without reading?

Mr. OVERMAN. It is not an amendment. It is an explanatory paper, showing that nearly everything in the list is used in dyes.

Mr. JONES. I do not object to it. I merely asked the Senator how he expects us to understand it without its being read?

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina now request that the paper be read?

Mr. OVERMAN. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the paper will be read to the Senate.

The Secretary read as follows:

ARTICLES USED IN DYEING AND MANUFACTURING.

Acetic acid, used in calico printing.
Chromic acid, used in calico printing and in dyeing and tanning.
Lactic acid, used in dyeing woolens.
Sulphuric acid, used in manufacturing artificial manure.
Tannic acid, used in color fixing and in dyeing and tanning.
Ammonia, carbonate of, used in manufacture of baking powder and for scouring wool.
Argols, or crude tartar, used in making baking powder.
Bleaching powder, used in bleaching.
Blue vitriol, used in calico printing and in manufacture of paint.
Bone char, used in the manufacture of sugar.
Borax, used as dryer for paint.
Camphor, used in the manufacture of celluloid and in making explosives.
Coal-tar dyes, used in dyeing.
Cobalt, used in dyeing.
Copperas, used in dyeing.
Drugs, such as barks, etc., some used in dyeing and tanning.
Extracts and decoctions of logwood and other woods, used for dyeing.
Gelatin, used in photography and in coating paper.
Glycerin, used in soap making, etc.
Indigo, used in dyeing.
Ink, used in printing.
Iodine, used in photography and in the preparation of coal-tar products.
Magnesia, used in the manufacture of paper from wood pulp.
Alizarin assistant, used in the process of dyeing.
Castor oil, used in cotton dyeing.
Cold liger oil, used in the preparation of leather.
Flax, linseed oil, used in varnishes.
Fusel oil, used in wool scouring.
Hempseed and rapeseed, used in india-rubber factories.
Olive oil, used in manufacturing.
Seal and other oils, used in manufacturing.
Baryta-barytes, used in cotton and other manufactures; blues, used in dyeing.
Blanc fixe, used in paper manufacture and in filling for cotton.
Bichromate and caustic potash, used in calico printing.
Hydroate iodide, used in printing.
Prussiate of potash, used in dyeing.
Castile soap, used in dyeing.
Bicarbonate of soda, used in printing.
Bichromate, used in dyeing, bleaching, and tanning.
Crystal carbonate of soda, used in the manufacture of cotton and wool.
Hydrate of, or caustic, soda, used in dyeing and printing.
Soda ash, used in bleaching.
Silicate of soda, used in manufacture of textiles.
Sulphate of soda, used in dyeing and printing.
Sponges, used in manufactures.
Sulphur, used in bleaching.
Sumac, ground, used in dyeing.

Mr. OVERMAN. On the adoption of the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HEYBURN. Before the question is put I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina whether he has had an estimate as to the effect on the revenues that this reduction would make?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have not. I only know that it is a reduction of 25 per cent. That is all I know about it.

Mr. HEYBURN. Still, this is one of the largest revenue-producing schedules, and 25 per cent would amount to a good bit of money. I did not know but that the Senator was prepared to state the amount which the revenues would be affected by the reduction.

Mr. JONES. In the statement read I did not hear anything about any investigation having been made as to differences in the cost of production in this country and abroad, or the effect of this reduction upon the revenues or upon the industries; but it seemed to be simply a statement showing what the various articles are used for. Has the Senator any statement showing the effect of the amendment?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no statement, except I know that it is a horizontal reduction of 25 per cent, after having been reduced to an ad valorem basis.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that his amendment is on purely revenue lines?

Mr. OVERMAN. I mean that it is a reduction from the Payne-Aldrich law of 25 per cent. That is all it is.

Mr. JONES. Without investigating it, the Senator has arbitrarily made a——

Mr. OVERMAN. Twenty-five per cent.

Mr. JONES. A 25 per cent reduction without any consideration as to its effect upon the industries of the country or the revenues of the country.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Washington will permit me a moment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JONES. I yield the floor. I simply desired to have some information.

Mr. BACON. I wish to make a reply to the Senator.

Mr. JONES. The Senator can do that in his own time.

Mr. BACON. Before he yields the floor, I wish to state the purpose of the Senator who proposed the amendment, as I have been informed, in consultation had with his colleagues. Congress has already acted upon what we know as the wool bill, and it is proposed to act upon the cotton schedule, in the manufacture of which most of these articles enter. The purpose is to reduce the cost of the manufacture at the same time that we are endeavoring to reduce the cost to the consumers of the articles which they use.

Mr. JONES. As I understand it, this proposition has never been considered by any committee, and the amendment was never read in the Senate until to-day. No explanation has ever been given of it. I simply thought that that would indicate, at least, to the country the very careful consideration that this great legislative body is giving to these propositions which affect a tremendous industry of the country.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I wish to inquire whether this amendment has ever been printed.

Mr. BACON. Oh, yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. It has been printed and laid upon the desks of Senators.

Mr. DIXON. How long has it been printed?

Mr. OVERMAN. It was introduced August 12.

Mr. BACON. Five days.

Mr. OVERMAN. Five days.

Mr. DIXON. There has been no explanation of it or debate until this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has been fully explained. It is a 25 per cent reduction. That is a sufficient explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, upon which he demands the yeas and nays. Is there a second?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, before the demand for the yeas and nays is acted upon, I think Senators want to express themselves on this subject and to have some explanation of it. I know others do and I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I simply desire to say, so far as the cotton schedule is concerned, that is a matter which has been the subject of very careful consideration; the steel schedule, which was originally offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], has been a matter of very careful consideration; the sugar schedule, which is also expected to be offered as an amendment, has also been the matter of very careful consideration; but here is a measure which has had no consideration. While I voted for the other amendments, I for one would not vote for a schedule as broad and as far-reaching as this without some time, either to give it consideration myself, or that it should have consideration at the hands of those who have made it their business to give it consideration, so that their assurance might go with the bill with reference to its probable effect.

Mr. BACON. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

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

Mr. CLAPP. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. I want to say, Mr. President, that I have heard the Senator from Minnesota for several years in the most elaborate manner discuss the enormities of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and I think, from the views I know that Senator has had with reference to that law, that he would very readily recognize that a cut of 25 per cent on the rates of any of those schedules would not be a very dangerous thing to undertake or to carry into execution.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, one trouble with the Payne-Aldrich law was that it struck down some interests with as ruthless a hand as it did, with a greedy purpose, raise other schedules and other items. There are some things in that law that are very plainly and manifestly unjust. Take the wool schedule, and it is absolutely indefensible; and every Member of the Senate, it seems to me, must have known that; but the wool schedule, at least, was thoroughly debated by men who had made it a study. The cotton schedule was thoroughly debated by men who had made it a study; the enormities of the sugar schedule had been exposed here, and no effort has ever been made to answer those exposures. I would be ready to-day to vote on the wool schedule, on the sugar schedule, on the cotton schedule, on the lumber schedule, or on the steel schedule, all of which were thoroughly considered and some of which have been again thoroughly considered at this session of Congress.

As I recall it, the schedule covered by the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] did not receive that consideration. I for one do not believe in voting blindly upon measures here. So far as the wool schedule is concerned, there never has been any question, nor has there been in regard to the sugar schedule, nor has there been in regard to the cotton schedule, nor has there been in regard to the steel schedule, or the lumber schedule. While as to those matters which were thus debated and gone into we may not reduce to the lowest basis to which they could be safely reduced, we may very safely make reductions; and that is what we have done and what we propose to do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator think it will injure anybody to reduce the duty on chloroform from 6 per cent to 5 per cent?

Mr. CLAPP. I have no idea about that, and that is why I do not want to vote for it. I am not familiar with the subject of chloroform. For one I never have had it administered to me. I believe there was some reference two years ago to its use here in the Senate, some reference to its being administered to some Senators. It may be that chloroform needs no duty, but what I object to with reference to this schedule is that we are dealing with something that we have not had any consideration of as to whether or not it needs a duty. I do believe that before men vote upon a question they ought to be satisfied that it is at least reasonably safe to do so. I am simply speaking for myself; I do not know how others propose to vote on this matter. I voted without any hesitation to put the steel schedule on the bill, and I will vote to put the sugar schedule on the bill, because those are matters which have been gone over time and time again here until it is patent to every man that there is injustice in those two schedules that ought to be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has demanded the yeas and nays on the amendment. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I do not want it to appear from the statement read, with reference to the use made of these chemicals, that that is a complete statement as to the purpose for which these chemicals are used. I followed as closely as I could the rapid reading. The occasion does not seem to demand a review of the statement in detail, but I think in a few minutes, were I to take the time, I could point out that the uses indicated by the statement read are of minor importance. I think I will base the accuracy of my statement upon this, that not 10 per cent of the chemicals, including the list read, are used in any way in connection with the cotton or woolen industry. I make that statement with some knowledge of the facts.

In view of the fact that this is one of the most important of all the tariff schedules, so far as revenue is concerned, it is a pretty reckless proposition to reduce the duty 25 per cent, regardless of the effect that it may have upon the revenues alone; and if it were to go out from this body as an accurate statement that only those purposes were served by the use of these chemicals, it would be a misleading statement. I have the figures, and they fully sustain my statement, if any Senator controverts it. I have the returns under Schedule A before me, including the quantity and value of the importations and the amount of duty collected. The value of the importations in 1909, covered by the chemical schedule, was $37,063,773, and the amount of duty collected was more than $10,000,000.

I will not pursue it further than to make the general statement as given in the summary of Schedule A. There is also something over $30,000,000 in the wage item alone.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I desire to add one word to what I have previously said. Of course we are dealing here with the cotton schedule. The duties on chemicals in a measure affect that schedule, and I can readily understand how a revision of the cotton schedule, perhaps, would require a modification of the chemical schedule; but I want to say to those interested in the cotton schedule that, so far as I am personally concerned, I am ready to stay here, and I believe it is our duty to stay here, and take these things up. My objection is to voting for a measure of this magnitude without knowing the details of it. Nor do I think we should be deterred from voting and passing these schedules because of any talk as to what will be the fate of these bills. That is none of our business. It is our concern to perform our business as Members of the Senate, and, for one, I am willing to stay here until we can take these things up and give them consideration and study.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the pending amendment proposes a revision of the entire chemical schedule. When the so-called reciprocity bill was pending I offered an amendment to the woolen schedule and an amendment to the cotton schedule. At that time I proposed no reductions in the chemical schedule, although chemicals are used in both cotton and woolen manufacture. I felt at the time that perhaps some explanation was due to the Senate, but as no question was raised regarding it, I did not then discuss the matter.

In the preparation of the amendments reducing the duties on woolen and cotton manufactures it led to the consideration of reductions in Schedule A as to certain chemicals and dyes. I took counsel of the best expert assistance I could find. It at once became clear that the chemical schedule is perhaps the most difficult schedule in all the tariff upon which to attempt revision. You can scarcely change a single duty of that schedule without its necessitating a nice readjustment of very many, if not all, of the other items of the schedule. Whether working out a revision as a protectionist or upon a revenue basis, the responsibility is the same.

But, Mr. President, in dealing with the woolen and cotton schedules the whole matter was simplified when I learned from the experts that the chemicals employed by the manufacturer would be less than a fraction of 1 per cent of the cost of the finished product. That very greatly relieved my mind, and knowing, as I do, that the duties of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law are excessive throughout those schedules, I felt perfectly sure, Mr. President, that no one need concern himself about the necessity of reducing the duties upon chemicals that entered into the process of manufacture both in the woolen and cotton industry. For that reason, sir, and because, as I said before, you can not deal with the chemical schedule without the most extensive and elaborate study, with the aid of the very best experts, I shall vote against the amendment.

Now, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has stated that he reduces the duties here but 25 per cent. I am confident that many of the duties in the chemical schedule would stand a reduction very much more than that.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree to that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe there are items in that schedule which would not stand even as much reduction. There may be some items in that schedule that could not be reduced at all without impairing that measure of duty which I believe should be maintained in order to put the labor employed in the industry in this country on a basis of equality with that of other countries.

But the whole subject of the chemical schedule is one so intricate and so complicated, and its relation to the cotton schedule is such that I have no hesitation whatever in voting to reject the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on the question of agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I have been notified that my colleague the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] has been called away on business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. If present, my colleague on this question would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I make the announcement again that I am paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FOSTER. I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Bacon	Fletcher	Myers	Simmons
Bailey	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Paynter	Thornton
Chilton	Lea	Pomerene	Watson
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Reed	Williams
Culberson	Martine, N. J.	Shively	

NAYS—22.

Borah	Clapp	Gamble	Perkins
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Root
Brandegee	Cullom	Jones	Townsend
Bristow	Cummins	La Follette	Works
Burnham	Dillingham	Lippitt	
Burton	Dixon	Page	

NOT VOTING—40.

Bradley	Gallinger	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Gore	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Brown	Gronna	Nixon	Smoot
Bryan	Guggenheim	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Oliver	Stone
Crane	Kenyon	Penrose	Sutherland
Curtis	Lodge	Percy	Taylor
Davis	Lorimer	Poindexter	Tillman
du Pont	McCumber	Rayner	Warren
Foster	McLean	Richardson	Wetmore

So Mr. OVERMAN's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WATSON. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia offers an amendment which the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. Add a new section to read as follows:

SEC. —. That the articles mentioned in the following paragraph, the growth, produce, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), shall be exempt from duty, namely:

Coal, bituminous, round, and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter-inch screen: *Provided*, That the articles in the paragraph enumerated, the product, growth, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the articles in this paragraph enumerated, the product, growth, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri offers an amendment which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 2 insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That if the duties above provided to be collected and paid shall as to any article or articles be greater than that provided to be paid by the present existing law less 30 per cent, then in every such case the duty or duties which are hereby levied and which shall be collected and paid on said article or articles shall be a sum equal to the duties provided to be levied, collected, and paid by the present existing law less 30 per cent, and not greater.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I call for the yeas and nays on the last amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. REED. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri offers another amendment, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 20, after the word "are," insert "in so far as they conflict with this act," so that it will read if amended:

SEC. 3. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are, in so far as they conflict with this act, hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] here. The Senator from Kansas has proposed an amendment in reference to the sugar schedule. It is a proposition for which I voted heretofore when the Payne-Aldrich bill was under consideration. I believe in it.

I am convinced that that amendment ought to be adopted. I do not see the Senator from Kansas here. So I propose to offer this amendment myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which the Secretary will report.

The SECRETARY. Insert the following as a new section:

SEC. —. That on and after the day following the taking effect of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the following articles, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), the following rates of duty, namely:

Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test up to 98°, thirty-five one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; and above 98° by the polariscopic test, 1 cent and seven hundred and fifty-five one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound; molasses testing not above 40°, 20 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40° and not above 56°, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56°, 6 cents per gallon. Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test: *Provided*, That nothing in this section contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the 11th day of December, 1902, or the provisions of the act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same.

Mr. JONES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think we are on the eve, at any rate, of doing some very dangerous things without due consideration. The Constitution did not ill-advisedly provide that revenue measures should originate in the House of Representatives. There is a House over there, and its committees are working just as rapidly as can be upon the various schedules of the tariff bill. I am willing to vote upon anything which has been considered there or is being considered there, so that by the time a bill with an amendment from here gets there, they will have considered the subject matter of the amendment.

For that reason I wanted to put the metal and steel schedule upon the present bill, because the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has considered that and will have a metal schedule ready by the time the bill gets to them; so that it will have received due consideration.

I do not believe that any one man can give due consideration to any great schedule of the tariff bill, no matter how able he is. I have had some experience serving upon committees dealing with tariff questions, and I have for the most part found that my own opinion, when I first went into the consideration of a question, became modified very much by the information and the suggestions I obtained from 13 or 14 other men serving upon committees.

Speaking for myself, therefore, I am not willing to be put on record as indorsing amendments containing page after page of tariff schedules, when I know that they neither have been considered at the other end of the Capitol nor can be considered by the time the amendment reaches the other end of the Capitol.

The rubber schedule is very iniquitous in many regards. I could go out and draw up in a half hour amendments satisfactory to me, at any rate, concerning it. The sugar schedule, especially that part of it which deals with differentials, is very obnoxious to me. But for myself, I shall not vote to put upon this bill anything except things that either have been considered in some committee somewhere, especially at the other end of the Capitol, or such things as we know will be considered by the time the amendment dealing with the subject reaches the House of Representatives.

I wanted to make that statement in justification of the votes I am to cast from this time on. In illustration of how rapidly and how inconsiderately we are going, we a moment ago adopted an amendment saying, after we had fixed the schedules on a certain subject, "if anything in this schedule is not 30 per cent less than existing law, it shall be reduced to 30 per cent." It passed when Senators were not listening.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. DIXON. Does the Senator apply that same yardstick to the chemical schedule which he just voted for?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not apply it to the chemical schedule, but I ought to have done it, to be frank with the Senator. But the chemical-schedule amendment was one which could be easily understood.

Mr. DIXON. It is the most difficult in the whole law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a reduction of 25 per cent; and I was of the opinion, from the information I have concerning the existing chemical schedule, that there is no item in it that could not stand a 25 per cent reduction without doing detriment to justice or fairness. I therefore voted for it; but I confess I was partially led to vote for it by the circumstances under which it was offered. While it is a chemical schedule, the amendment was offered because of its connection with the cotton goods, the dyes, and things used in connection with cotton manufacture, and was germane and relative to the question. In a certain sense it might be considered as a part of the cotton schedule—I mean in a legislative sense. I did vote for it, and I am inclined to think that I made a mistake when I did it, not because it could not stand the 25 per cent reduction, but because it broke the precedent of requiring some committee consideration somewhere of these great questions before they are hastily put through.

Of course, when a man offers here to put coal on the free list that requires no committee consideration. I know what it is; everybody can understand it; it is a simple and plain proposition, and requires no investigation of schedules or comparison of schedules or any nice distinction between one duty and another. So, if propositions of amendments are presented, I may vote for them, but I am not going to vote to put three or four pages on the statute book of schedules which have been considered by nobody completely except the proponent of the amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I understand that while I was downstairs at the lunch room for a few moments the amendment which I offered some days since, and is on the table, providing for the reduction of duty on sugar has been offered by the senior Senator from Washington. Of course, I am very anxious that there should be reductions made in the duties on sugar and that the amendment should be adopted, but I do not wish to have it attached to a bill that I can not vote for. I had hoped that when the cotton bill was considered here by the Senate the Senators who believed in a reduction of duties could get together and make reductions in the excessive duties that now exist and also take out of the tariff law some of the iniquities of which we have all complained. But it is clearly manifest here this morning that it is not the intention of the Senators on the other side of the Chamber to support measures which can receive the support of the Republicans who are commonly called "insurgents" or "progressives." There is an effort here to embarrass some of us by attaching to a bill that we can not support amendments to the tariff law which we earnestly desire to have passed.

I want to say, for one, that the Democratic Senators and the regular Republican Senators in this Chamber can not embarrass me in that way. I stand here—and, I believe, consistently—for a reduction of excessive duties; and in advocating that I have pursued a consistent course; at least, I think I have. I will not be a party to any cheap political trick to accomplish anything that I am earnestly desiring, especially when the apparent accomplishment means its certain defeat.

I believe in the principle of protection. I believe it has developed the industrial life of this country in a marvelous way. I believe that without it our country's industrial condition would have been far lower than it is now. But I believe that while we have been enjoying the benefits of a protective tariff there have been worked into that tariff duties that contribute not to the welfare of our industrial life, but to the exorbitant profits of many concerns that do not need it and should not have it.

Whenever there is an honest effort here to get at these iniquities and take them out of the tariff law, I will be found voting to help to do it; but there is an effort here now to prevent a reduction in the duties on cotton by presenting a bill that, if passed, will be passed because Senators believing in excessive and exorbitant duties refused to vote in order that the bill may pass in a form that it will be impossible for it to become a law. I do not propose to be a party to any such scheme as that. I am going to vote against this amendment because it will not be put upon this bill in the interest of tariff reduction, but to prevent a reduction in the important tariff schedules that Senators on the other side are now undertaking to protect.

Embarrass me! No. I can vote against this amendment as readily as I would vote for it if there was an honest purpose to enact it into law.

I believe that we ought to meet this proposition fairly. A majority of the Senators in this Chamber believe in the principle of protection. A minority do not, but believe in a tariff for revenue. A minority believe in as high duties as the "traffic will bear." A small minority believe in the protective principle that shall carry duties that measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. The progressive Republicans stand here ready to vote for such duties, whether they are offered by Republicans or Democrats, provided they carry out that principle, which is the policy that was declared for in the Republican national platform. We will stand for it whether it affects industries in our own States or not. We do not undertake to disguise our purpose. For one I will vote against any tariff duty that does not measure up to that standard, if I know it. I will vote against any tariff duty that goes beyond it in an excessive degree.

If there is a majority here who believe that such duties are better than those that now exist, they ought to be adopted. It is known that a majority of Senators in this Chamber do not believe in a tariff for revenue only.

I do not think it is necessary for me to go into any elaborate discussion. I have tried to make myself understood by this plain statement. I had hoped that before this day passed we should have secured some substantial reduction in a number of excessive duties in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law; but to start out on a haphazard, ill-devised reduction of every duty, whether it has been considered by a committee or by the Senate, regardless of the effect it may have upon the industries of the country or its revenues—to start out on such a program as that, if that is the purpose, I must be counted out, for I am not in favor of that kind of a tariff revision.

Though I shall vote against this amendment because it is offered as an amendment to a bill which I can not vote for if the amendment was adopted, so that I would have to vote against it at some time, I prefer to do it now.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned, I have not offered this amendment for the purpose of embarrassing any Senator. I sent for the Senator from Kansas and inquired whether he expected to offer the amendment, and he said he did not expect to offer the amendment. Therefore I thought the amendment ought to be offered, because I believe in it.

When I was a Member of another body of Congress I voted to remove the sugar differential. I went so far as to overrule a decision of the chairman, who is now the honored Vice President and presiding officer of the Senate. When the Payne-Aldrich bill was under consideration I was convinced that the substance of this amendment should be adopted, not only that the differential should be removed, but that the Dutch standard proposition should be done away with. I was convinced of that very largely by the arguments of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. I voted to remove it when that bill was under consideration. So I am in favor of this amendment. There is only one bill pending before the Senate to which the amendment can be offered, and that is House bill 12812, the bill to which it was proposed by the Senator from Kansas that the amendment should be offered.

I did not know why the Senator from Kansas had concluded not to offer the amendment. The reasons which are good to him and appeal to him now were sufficient, so I offered the amendment upon my own responsibility, because I believe in it, and because the only bill to which it is very likely it can be offered is the bill now under consideration.

I do not say I will not vote for the pending cotton bill, but I do propose to vote for every amendment that I think will improve the measure. It seems to me that the only theory upon which we can consider a measure before the Senate is that when germane amendments are presented to it those amendments should be considered on their merits, even though we may be opposed to the original proposition. Every amendment that we think will improve the measure should command our support. Upon that theory I propose to vote for it.

I have voted for some amendments that have been offered to the bill because I believe they improve the measure. If this legislation is to become a law—and it is not for us to say here except by our votes that it is not—then it should be made as nearly perfect as possible. I voted for the steel amendment because I believe in it, because the reasons that have been presented here and the investigations convinced me that that was a good amendment and ought to be adopted. For the same reason I have offered this amendment, and I propose to vote for it.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I regret very much the difference of opinion upon this question. I think if there was ever an iniquity perpetrated in legislation it was the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, and I have never missed an opportunity to aid in the amendment of that law within the limit of what I was satisfied was a safe change.

When it comes to a tariff schedule, I undertake to say that a Senator called upon to vote on the question has after all to depend very largely upon his own convictions as to whether it is a safe rate or an unjust rate. There are certain broad fundamental principles that can be applied. We can take the condition at the close of the depression which existed from 1893 to 1897, and, measuring the increased consumption by the American people with the increased exportation as against our own consumption, we can within some degree of safety say whether the duty on that article is sufficient or not.

I have always maintained that it is the duty of a Senator to use his best efforts to perfect a measure whether in the last analysis he could vote for the measure or not. Whether I shall vote for this bill or not will depend upon what may yet be done with the bill. But if there is one thing with reference to the American tariff that I am absolutely satisfied of it is that of the iniquity of 1909 the sugar schedule stands out almost without a peer. It is a subject that has been so thoroughly discussed, not only at this session, but at that session, that for one I am ready to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] and now offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

I believe it is my duty as a Senator to perfect this measure just as far as possible. It is the only measure pending to-day upon which we can attach a measure to remedy the iniquities of the sugar schedule under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law.

Therefore, differing, as I must, from some of my colleagues, I believe it is my duty to vote to put this amendment upon the pending bill. If the bill with that amendment and no additional amendment comes to a vote I believe I shall then vote for the bill. The only thing upon the bill up to this point that I would hesitate upon is the chemical schedule, not because I apprehend that it is a mistake, but for want of more definite information as to what it will do. The American people are expecting relief upon the cotton schedule, and I would afford that relief even though it involved voting for something which as an independent proposition I would not vote to put upon the bill.

So primarily believing that it is the duty of a Senator to assist in perfecting the bill, I shall vote to add the sugar schedule as I voted to add the steel schedule, and with reference to those things which enter into the machinery for the making of cotton goods. In all probability, unless the bill be still further amended in some way which I can not accede to, I shall vote for the bill itself.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I appreciate the position which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] takes. He always does what he thinks is the right thing, and he is a man of fine judgment. But when I sit here on this side of the Chamber and a leading Senator on the Democratic side comes over here and suggests to the Republican regulars that they abstain from voting so that the Democratic measure will carry, and when I know that that Senator is bitterly opposed to the reduction of the duty on steel and on cotton, it exposes an arrangement here that I do not intend to be a party to, directly or indirectly.

I propose to vote against any amendments from now on upon this bill as it is now. When leading stand-pat Senators on this side of the Chamber tell me that they do not intend to vote in order that the Democrats may carry their revision through, knowing that it is the best way to prevent a reduction of duties that they want to maintain, and when Senators on the Democratic side who are interested in maintaining high duties on cotton and steel cooperate in the way I have just described, you must count me out of the proposition; I am not into the scheme.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to say just one word. Of course I take nothing the Senator said to myself, because, fortunately, I have not been on the other side of the Chamber to-day, but I want to say it is well known that the rates of duty the Senator from Kansas and those who are cooperating with him wish to have incorporated in this bill are much higher than the rates of duty in the bill as it came from the House, which we support.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas has made a declaration here that is very startling to some of the Members on this side.

Mr. CLAPP. Will the Senator pardon me an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KERN. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. If the Senator had been here two years ago, this statement would not have been startling nor would the facts have been startling. It is an old experience to those who have been here before.

Mr. KERN. I hope by the time I have been here two years I will be wise enough to observe for myself any such conduct as has been indicated by the Senator.

But I want to know at this stage from the Senator from Kansas whether it is possible that he has personal information that any such arrangement or conference has been had and made between any Senator on this side and the leading Republican stand-pat Senators on the other. If he has, it is but fair to those of us who honestly desire a reduction of the steel schedule, and who honestly desire a reduction of the schedules all along the line that he make known any such arrangement.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will say to the Senator from Indiana——

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Kansas will excuse me, I will suggest that having made that statement, he owes it to the Senate to name the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will state to the Senators from Mississippi and Indiana that the Senator on the Democratic side I referred to was the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON], and he had the conversation I referred to with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I can plead an alibi to the charge the Senator from Kansas refers to.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] came over to the Republican side not long since and suggested to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] that if the Republican regulars abstained from voting the Democratic bill would carry. The Republican regulars abstained from voting, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] was one of them.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I believe that after the dreadful performance, if the so-called regulars had not voted, there was a comment made of that kind, but it occurred after the vote. It could not have occurred during the vote or before it, because as soon as I answered to my name and explained that I could not vote on account of my pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] I went out to the telephone and talked with a party in Pennsylvania. So the Senator is laboring under a serious hallucination and his embarrassment is extremely painful to his brother Senators. He voted to enact into law a measure which is neither protective nor free trade, which is neither a revenue producer nor one thing or the other. It must necessarily have brought the Senator from Kansas to this lamentable condition, and it is a lamentable one before the people of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I am stating the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I desire to affirm what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has said. I desire to say in addition that so far as I am concerned I desired to vote for the House cotton-schedule bill, and did so; and so far as the iron and steel schedule is concerned, I intended to vote for it in the shape that it was offered or in any other shape that would reduce the duties, because I am not only in favor of a reduction of those duties to a revenue basis, but I am heartily of the opinion that in the Birmingham district where we produce iron and steel, and produce it cheaper than in any other section of this country or the world, if we went to a free-trade basis our industries would prosper.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator from Alabama pursued a very strange course and has formed a strange alliance for one who is anxious to have the duties on those articles reduced. The statement I made a few moments ago in regard to the arrangement I stand by. The conversation was overheard in this part of the Chamber by Senators other than myself, and a number of Senators, in harmony with the understanding among the Republican regulars, have abstained from voting, and have given the reason suggested to a number of their colleagues for their action. The RECORD will show whether or not they voted.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to contribute what little I know with respect to this alleged transaction. After the conference took place between the two Senators, which I saw, but did not hear, I heard the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] immediately afterwards say to another Senator on this side of the Chamber, "We do not want to vote on this proposition."

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, the Senator from California is entirely correct in his statement. I have not participated personally in any of these proceedings for the last 10 days, and have so advised my colleagues who were in sympathy with me. I did not sign the report of the conferees, nor did the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. I have been entirely willing to see this bill perfected by the friends of the measure, who have been the Democratic Party and the so-called insurgents.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, just to change the subject before it gets to be too broad and vitriolic, I will say I noticed the remarks of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON], and, if I understood him aright, his statement was that he felt that the iron industry in the locality which is nearest home to him would be able to manufacture its product and deliver it at lower prices than any other locality, and that it needed no protection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I want to remind the Senator that two years ago we heard very much such talk as that from the shoe manufacturers in this country—that, if they had free hides, they would lower the price of shoes, and would need no protection. I want to ask the Senator from Alabama if he has not since then observed the agony with which they seem to be enveloped now when it is proposed to make boots and shoes free? And did he observe the fact that prices were not reduced on shoes when they got free hides, but were raised instead?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I have heard some remarks of that kind. I only want to say that my judgment is that the

Birmingham district does not require any protection to the manufacturer of iron or steel, but we can go on and compete with England or any other foreign nation and prosper in the industry.

Mr. WARREN. And does the Senator feel that those manufacturers will not flood the mails with literature and letters and be found in the corners of the Capitol to wait upon Senators, as the shoe manufacturers have been regarding their products when reduction or abolition of protective tariff is proposed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I do not know exactly what will be the result, but I am not for free trade at all in any respect.

Mr. WARREN. If I felt that we had a great locality that could produce the iron and steel product we need without protection, it would be an agreeable assurance, and it would give me great pleasure if I could be sure that the afterclap, the second thought and remorse after it was done, would not pursue us, as has been the case on the occasion to which I have referred and in regard to the duty I have mentioned, as well as some others.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I think if all the duties were taken off it would result in lower prices to the consumer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I am requested to again announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence on account of sickness of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], and state the fact that he is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present the senior Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I again make the announcement that I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The roll having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bailey	Crawford	Kern	Owen
Brown	Culberson	Lea	Pomerene
Chamberlain	Cullom	Martin, Va.	Reed
Chilton	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Clapp	Johnson, Me.	Myers	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Overman	Watson

NAYS—33.

Bacon	Dillingham	Page	Thornton
Borah	Foster	Paynter	Townsend
Bourne	Gamble	Penrose	Warren
Brandegee	Guggenheim	Perkins	Wetmore
Briggs	Heyburn	Root	Williams
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Mich.	Works
Burnham	La Follette	Smith, S. C.	
Burton	Lippitt	Smoot	
Cummins	Oliver	Stephenson	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bankhead	du Pont	McCumber	Rayner
Bradley	Gallinger	McLean	Richardson
Bryan	Gore	Nelson	Shively
Clark, Wyo.	Gronna	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Crane	Hitchcock	Nixon	Stone
Curtis	Kenyon	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Davis	Lodge	Percy	Taylor
Dixon	Lorimer	Poindexter	Tillman

So the amendment of Mr. JONES was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there other amendments to be offered as in Committee of the Whole? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to offer an amendment to the bill as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, including the amendments adopted, and to insert as an amendment what I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to know whether it is competent or permissible to strike out, while the Senate is in Committee of the Whole, amendments that have just been adopted as in Committee of the Whole, and which can not be amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. As a substitute, it is permissible. If the substitute had been offered before the bill was amended, the original text would then have been open to amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; but I was under the impression that while we call it a substitute it is really an amendment, and that we can not strike out that which we have just adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment can be offered as a substitute for the whole bill striking out all after the enacting clause. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill as amended and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 1. The act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out all of Schedule I thereof, being paragraphs 313 to 332, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SCHEDULE I. COTTON MANUFACTURES.

313. Cotton card laps, roping, sliver, roving, and cotton thread and cotton yarns of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem; cotton waste and flocks, manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 20 per cent ad valorem.

314. Cloth made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not bleached, 20 per cent ad valorem; bleached, 21 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 22 per cent ad valorem.

315. The term cotton cloth, or cloth, wherever used in the paragraphs of this schedule, unless otherwise specially provided for, shall be held to include all woven fabrics of cotton in the piece, or cut in lengths, and shall not include any article, finished or unfinished, made from cotton cloth.

316. Cloth, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber and silk, or artificial silk, whether known as silk striped sleeve lining, silk stripes, or otherwise, of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is a component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

317. Handkerchiefs, or mufflers composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, whether in the piece or otherwise, and whether finished or unfinished, hemmed or not hemmed, 30 per cent ad valorem; if embroidered in any manner, or tamboured, appliquéd, or trimmed wholly or in part with lace or with tucking or insertion, 35 per cent ad valorem.

318. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

319. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

320. Curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value; tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, composed wholly of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value; any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

321. Stockings, hose and half hose, made on knitting machines or frames, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, and not otherwise specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

322. Stockings, hose and half hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half hose, all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

323. Men's and boys' gloves, knitted or woven, made of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

324. Shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers, and all underwear of every description composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

325. Bone casings, garters, tire fabric, or fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires, suspenders and braces, and tubing, any of the foregoing made of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; spindle banding, woven, braided, or twisted; lamp, stove, or candle wicking made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; loom harness, healds, or collets made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; boot, shoe, and corset lacings made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; labels for garments or other articles composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value; mats, matting, rugs, carpets, and carpeting made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem. Laces, lace window curtains, and all other lace articles; napkins, wearing apparel, and all other articles made wholly or in part of lace or laces, or in imitation of lace; nets, nettings, veils, veilings, neck ruffling, ruchings, tuckings, flutings, quillings, embroideries, trimmings, braids, featherstitch braids, edgings, insertings, flouncings, galloons, gorings, bands, bandings, belts, belting, bindings, cords, ornaments, ribbons, tapes, webs, and webbing; wearing apparel and other articles or fabrics embroidered

in any manner, or tamboured, appliquéd, or scalloped, or from which threads have been drawn, cut, or punched to produce open work, ornamented or embroidered in any manner herein described; hemstitched or tucked flouncings or skirtings; all of the foregoing, composed of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem. Belting for machinery, made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 30 per cent ad valorem.

326. Cotton table damask and manufactures of cotton table damask, or of which cotton table damask is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

327. All articles made from cotton cloth, whether finished or unfinished, and all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

328. All artificial or imitation silk or artificial or imitation horsehair, by whatever name known or by whatever process made, and all fabrics and articles composed wholly or in chief value of artificial or imitation silk, or artificial or imitation horsehair, shall be subject to the same rates of duty as like articles or manufactures made of cotton.

SEC. 2. The act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended as follows:

Strike out the word "cotton" whenever used in Schedule J, entitled "Schedule J. Flax, Hemp, and Jute, and Manufactures of."

Strike out all of paragraph 350.

Strike out all of paragraph 405.

SEC. 3. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported, and hereinbefore enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to the duties imposed by this act and no other duty, upon the entry or the withdrawal thereof.

SEC. 4. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed. This act shall take effect and be in force on and after the 1st day of October, 1911.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered proposes reductions in existing duties, and, on the whole, reductions less than those proposed in the House bill. It is well for us, Mr. President, at the outset of whatever discussion there may be before the final vote is taken in Committee of the Whole, to speak plainly.

The Democrats, contending for a reduction of the tariff to a revenue basis, are in control of the House of Representatives; they are not in control of the Senate; they are a minority here; and they can not hope to enforce upon this body a tariff bill based upon a tariff for revenue principle. They have had the opportunity to demonstrate in the House of Representatives the line to which they would reduce the tariff if they controlled both branches of Congress. They have sent to the United States Senate a bill revising the cotton schedule. It comes here to a body in which there is a diversity of views. The Democrats are in the minority; the Republicans are in the majority; but upon the tariff question the Republicans are divided. A majority of the Republicans in the United States Senate would not—and I think I do not misrepresent their position—make any reduction in the duties as they are fixed by the Payne-Aldrich law. There are a few Republicans here, 12 or 13, who believe that the increased duties made in the tariff revision of 1909 were a violation of the Republican platform pledges; who believe that tariff duties should in no case be greater than the difference in the cost of production here and abroad; taking into consideration always the differences existing in the condition of labor in this country as compared to that of competing foreign countries.

Capital can well take care of itself, but the laborer is powerless, is helpless, and upon him falls the first tariff reductions that go below the line of the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. Capital is strong enough to protect itself always. If anybody suffers it is the laborer. Believing, as the group of men in the Senate called Progressives believe, that a tariff is necessary to the preservation of the higher condition of life which surrounds labor in this country as compared with competing countries, we can not consent, Mr. President, to a reduction of tariff duties below what we believe a safe margin, measuring the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

That difference in cost is chiefly, almost wholly I believe, the difference in the labor cost. It is not so great as has been represented. The data bearing upon this point has been largely furnished heretofore by interested parties. During the consideration of tariff bills they have appeared before the congressional committees and, as a rule, their statements as to the difference in the cost of labor in this and the competing point abroad have been accepted.

Mr. President, two years ago I was amazed to find that many of the same statistics that had been used before the McKinley Ways and Means Committee, of which I was a member, away back in 1889 and 1890, were given weight in the last Congress in the hearings before the House committee; and yet the wage scale of foreign labor has been steadily advancing through all those years. But, Mr. President, the most authentic information available bearing on the question proves that there is a difference in labor cost. The report of the Moseley Commission, which visited this country a few years ago—a commission composed of representatives of the different industries of Great Britain, disinterested men, who themselves worked in the factories and who were sent here on a tour of inspection—shows that the difference in labor cost measures the difference in production cost in this and competing countries. Recognizing this difference the progressive Republicans on this side can not consent to a tariff reduction which cuts below the line fixed by such information as we have at the present time.

I confess that this is not all that can be said with reference to the cost of production. Many complex questions enter into an accurate determination of production cost, and it is for that reason that progressive Republicans here and in the other branch of Congress contended in the last session and have urged for years the establishment of a tariff commission, clothed with adequate power, a permanent nonpartisan commission composed of experts competent to determine the question. But, as I say, Mr. President, we know from the information that is available that in order to protect the laborer of this country we must preserve a line of difference. The Republicans upon this side, standing for tariff reductions—in so far as we have offered amendments reducing tariff schedules—have sought to frame them in the light of the best information existent at the present time. We believe that we have done that; and it finds us on a different tariff level than that fixed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, first of all let us consider our responsibility to the public. It is to be determined here within the next hour or two whether the Democrats and the progressive Republicans can agree upon some measure that will offer relief to the people of this country upon the cotton schedule and such additions to it as we may be able to make. The Democrats have demonstrated their position according to principle on the bill which they have passed through the Democratic House of Representatives and now before the Senate. They can go to the country and say, "These are the tariff reductions which we would give the people if we had the majority power in both branches of Congress. The bill we have passed in the House of Representatives indicates the level at which we would fix duties upon our first tariff revision, but being a minority in the Senate we could accomplish no legislation excepting as we joined with those who were in favor of reducing the present high duties, and thus did our part toward lifting some of the burdens from the people of this country."

Mr. President, the Democrats have demonstrated their adherence to the tariff principle. The progressive Republicans have their principle, and must demonstrate here on this floor and in their vote upon this schedule, their adherence to that principle. And we ask you to join with us and to support this great reduction provided for in the amendment which I have submitted, a reduction which in round numbers amounts to 48 per cent below existing duties. In view of the Democratic platform which pledged, as I remember it, gradual tariff reductions, you would be entirely consistent, it seems to me, in giving your support to this very material reduction in the existing duties of the cotton schedule.

Mr. President, I would not mislead any of my friends upon the Democratic side. In my amendment I have not sought to effect a compromise between a tariff for revenue and a protective tariff. I have no duty fixed in this proposed amendment lower than what I believe will be necessary to measure the difference represented in the level of the conditions surrounding labor in this and competing foreign countries.

Now, I wish to speak more definitely as to the amendment proposed.

According to the preliminary report of the Census Bureau for 1910 the value of products, exclusive of knit goods and hosiery, manufactured in the cotton industry was $616,297,000, as against $442,451,000 in 1905 and $332,806,000 in 1900, or an increase of 85 per cent during the last decade and nearly 40 per cent during the last five years.

The cotton industry in this country has enjoyed such protection of its markets that it has gone on and on expanding and filling the field of production until in 10 years it shows an increase of 85 per cent.

The wages paid out in the cotton industry in the year 1909 were $129,768,088. That is to say, the labor cost constituted 21 per cent of the total cost of the products. This bears out the generally accepted estimate that the labor cost does not exceed 25 per cent of the total cost of cotton goods. With free

raw material, even if providing for a protection of 100 per cent on the labor cost, this could not justify a duty higher than 25 per cent ad valorem.

For the reasons which I indicated when discussing my amendment to the woolen schedule I propose in the amendment that I offer at this time to err on the safe side and to give the manufacturer the benefit of any doubt, thus preventing the possibility of too sudden a change in the condition surrounding the cotton manufacturing industry.

Even if we knew the exact line of difference in the American and foreign production cost, with the excessive duties we have maintained in this country so many years, it might produce too great a transition and result in too great a shock at one step to make the complete reduction necessary to come to the proper level of duties. But I do not think there should be any extended interval between these reductions, and I think we should act with all possible haste, considering economic and financial conditions in this country. Reductions in duties should be made step by step until we reach a basis measuring the exact difference in the cost of production.

The amendments submitted by me, therefore, are designed to provide for a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on cotton yarns and thread; 20 per cent on unbleached cotton cloth; 21 per cent on bleached; 22 per cent on dyed, printed, and otherwise finished cotton cloth, and 35 per cent ad valorem on manufactured articles made from cotton cloth.

The present average rate on cotton yarns and thread is a fraction over 32 per cent, representing a range of from 10 per cent to 76 per cent. The rate proposed would, therefore, result in an average reduction of 12 per cent ad valorem. Thus the effect of the proposed amendment would be to raise the duty on certain kinds of yarn, and to lower it on many kinds of which this country produces but little, if at all. In the case of the large and prosperous mills which spin their own yarn, the change in the duty will have no effect, since they are not obliged to buy their yarn in the market. As regards the smaller mills and most of the knitting mills which buy their yarns in the market, the reduction of 12 per cent ad valorem of the average duty on yarns should be of advantage. There is no reason why it should affect detrimentally the interests of the yarn spinners, since the proposed rate is more than sufficient to cover the difference in the cost of production in this country and abroad.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, we imported less than $10,000,000 worth of cotton cloth of all kinds and exported over $20,000,000 worth. The cloth exported was sold in oriental and South American countries in competition with England, Germany, and other leading European countries under conditions of absolute equality where the American manufacturers had no tariff to protect them from the competition of those countries. It can not be contended that the American manufacturer, protected by a duty of 22 per cent ad valorem on the finished cloth, in addition to the cost of freight which the foreign manufacturer has to bear in shipping his goods to this country, and by his proximity to the domestic consumer, his knowledge of his tastes, and complete command of the market, can be in the slightest danger of losing the American market to foreign competitors.

The average duty under the present act on cotton cloth is a fraction over 43 per cent. The proposed rates, speaking of the one item in the bill, would represent an average reduction of 21 per cent ad valorem. The loss in revenue under the proposed rates, on the basis of the importations for the year 1910, would amount to less than $900,000 in the case of cloth and some $200,000 for thread and yarn, or a total loss of $1,100,000, or about one-third of 1 per cent of the total revenue collected from customs.

The adoption of the proposed amendment introducing an ad valorem rate for all cotton cloths would eliminate at one stroke the complex cotton-cloth schedule which has given rise to endless litigation in the past, involving the Government and the importers in the expediture of millions of dollars, all of which is ultimately paid by the people of the country. It would expedite and simplify the collection of the revenue. The greater part of the present litigation over customs matters is caused by disputes over textile schedules, and especially the cotton schedule.

Coming down to the details of the amendments proposed:

Paragraph 313 is to be greatly simplified by providing for a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem on cotton card laps, roping, sliver, roving, and cotton thread, and yarns of all kinds. This eliminates paragraph 314 of the present act.

The exceedingly complicated classification of cotton cloth provided for in paragraphs 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, and 320 is to be done away with by the substitution of a simple provision which reads as follows in the proposed amendment:

Paragraph 314. Cloth made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not bleached, 20 per cent ad valorem; bleached, 21 per cent ad valorem; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 22 per cent ad valorem.

Paragraph 321 (new paragraph 316), referring to cloth composed of cotton and silk, but chiefly of cotton, is to be changed to provide a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem. This duty is to apply to articles containing silk in which cotton is the component material of chief value. If the silk added to it even as a minor element considerably raises its value, the duty will be correspondingly raised since the application of the ad valorem rate will automatically result in a much higher specific duty on this article than that on cloth composed entirely of cotton. In the second place, raw silk is admitted as freely to this country as is raw cotton. No question, therefore, of a compensatory duty is involved in this item. In the third place, the duty I propose would be uniform with the other rates of the cotton schedule.

Paragraph 322 (new paragraph 317) relates to handkerchiefs and mufflers composed of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value.

"Handkerchiefs" is but another form of cloth, and there is no reason why it should be subject to a different rate of duty than cloth. The present average ad valorem equivalent on handkerchiefs, according to the report of the Bureau of Statistics, from which I have already quoted, is 59 per cent. The proposed duty would therefore amount to a reduction of 29 per cent ad valorem, which is more than justified in the light of the insignificant importations, which amounted to $453,000 in round numbers in 1910. The amended paragraph also provides for a duty of 35 per cent on handkerchiefs and mufflers embroidered or trimmed with lace.

Paragraph 323 of the present act, which provoked so much indignation at the time of the enactment of the present tariff by providing for extra duties on mercerized cloth, extra duties for so-called lappets, or extra filling threads in forming a figure on the cloth, is to be entirely eliminated. With the tariff placed on an ad valorem basis, there is no necessity for specific provision to that effect. If the presence of lappets or mercerization increases the value of the cloth the same ad valorem rate will automatically yield a larger duty, as the value of the cloth is increased.

Paragraph 324 (new paragraph 318) which, in the present act, provides for a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem on clothing and wearing apparel made of cotton, is to be changed by providing for a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem, resulting in a reduction of 15 per cent ad valorem, or 30 per cent below the present duty.

Again, what I have said elsewhere as to the automatic increase of the duty under the ad valorem system with the increase in the value of the article on which it is imposed, applies in this case.

The same consideration applies to other manufactures of cotton, such as plushes, velvets, curtains, and tapestries, which are dealt with in paragraphs 319 and 320 in the proposed amendment.

We now come to hosiery, which in the present tariff act is provided for in paragraph 327, imposing a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem, and in paragraph 328, imposing various specific rates on hosiery classified according to value.

My amendment calls for a uniform duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on all hosiery under paragraph 328 (new paragraph 322) and leaves unchanged the 30 per cent duty under paragraph 327 (new paragraph 321).

Mr. President, I do not object to conversation in the Chamber, if it is just in a little lower tone; and I ask the Chair to suggest to Senators who are conversing that they speak in a little lower tone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is a very considerate suggestion on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin, and it should be complied with. All Senators desiring to carry on conversation kindly do so in the lowest possible tone of voice.

Mr. BORAH. Or not at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Or not at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The report of the census for 1909 shows that in hosiery, as in the case of other cotton goods, the wages do not exceed 25 per cent of the total value of the product. The proposed rate of 35 per cent ad valorem should therefore prove as amply protective in the case of hosiery as in that of cloths and other cotton goods. The same consideration applies to gloves, shirts, and other knitted underwear, for which I have provided in the amendment, under paragraphs 323 and 324.

Paragraph 330 of the present act (new paragraph 325), relating to a great variety of cotton wares and specialties, has retained on the whole the wording of that paragraph, but I have substituted a uniform duty of 35 per cent ad valorem on all articles, except belting for machinery, made of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, on which the present act imposes a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem and which I have retained intact.

To the articles already contained under the present wording of that paragraph I have added a provision that rugs, carpets, and mats made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, shall be dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem. At present these goods are provided for in paragraph 393 of the woolen schedule, where they do not logically belong, subject to a duty of 50 per cent ad valorem.

The proposed rate will therefore result in a reduction of 15 per cent ad valorem, or 30 per cent below the present rate. In addition to these, the amended paragraph enumerates specifically lace and articles made of or trimmed with lace and various trimmings and embroideries all made of cotton or in chief value of cotton to be dutiable at 35 per cent ad valorem. Under the present act these articles are dutiable under paragraphs 349 and 350 of the flax schedule at 60 per cent and 70 per cent ad valorem. There is no reason why goods made of cotton should be tucked away in the flax schedule, along with similar articles made of linen and silk. So far as the proposed rate of 35 per cent ad valorem is concerned, it is more than ample as a protection measure, if it is considered that the census of 1905 shows that the entire labor cost in the manufacture of lace is equal to 26 per cent of the total cost of manufacture of lace. In other words, the proposed rate, though cutting the present rates in half, is 9 per cent in excess of the total labor cost and exceeds by much more than that the difference in cost at home and abroad.

Paragraph 331 (new paragraph 326). For the reasons explained in connection with the other cotton goods, the present duty of 40 per cent on cotton table damask is reduced to 35 per cent in the proposed amendment of that paragraph.

The present duty of 45 per cent ad valorem on all manufactures of cotton provided for in paragraph 332 of the present act is likewise reduced to 35 per cent in paragraph 327 in the proposed amendements.

Finally, new paragraph 328 provides for the imposition of the same rate of 35 per cent ad valorem on all goods made of artificial or imitation silk or imitation horsehair. Neither imitation silk nor imitation horsehair belong logically to the silk schedule, to which they have been attached under the Payne-Aldrich Act in paragraph 405. It is more logical to class them with cotton, as they are made of a cheap fiber known as cellulose, artificially derived from wood or straw, and are made for people who can not afford to buy real silk.

It is just that thing, Mr. President, that is bringing the whole protective tariff system to the verge of destruction. Some of the worst enemies of a legitimate protective tariff are to be found within the Republican Party—the men who have imposed upon the people of this country exorbitant and extortionate duties, resorting to every trick of language in framing tariff schedules as to conceal here and there provisions that result in enriching manufacturers at the expense of the people of this country.

The transfer of these goods to the cotton schedule involves the repeal of paragraph 405, which is provided for in section 6 of the proposed amendment.

Without attempting to revise the flax schedule at this time, the overhauling of the cotton schedule makes it imperative to eliminate from the flax schedule all the provisions which subject cotton goods to duties originally meant for articles made of linen. Section 6 of my proposed amendment provides for striking out the word "cotton" wherever used in the flax schedule. This provision along with the amendments to the cotton schedule which I have proposed will restore all goods made of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value to the cotton schedule, known as Schedule I, where they belong.

The only other change proposed by me to Schedule J, or the flax schedule, is to strike out entirely paragraph 350, which provides for a duty of 70 per cent on all laces and embroideries made on the Lever or Gothrough machines. This provision was not contained in any of our older tariffs. Under the Dingley tariff all laces were subject to certain duties irrespective of the machines on which they were made. Neither the bill as introduced by Mr. Payne in the House nor as originally reported to the Senate by Mr. Aldrich contained that paragraph. At a later stage, however, it was inserted, providing for a duty of 70 per cent on laces made on the Lever and Gothrough machines, as against 60 per cent on those made on other machines or by hand, and an additional protection was offered to manufacturers of lace under paragraph 197, putting the Lever and Gothrough lace-making machines on the free list up to January 1, 1911. During the 17 months the machines have remained on the free list nearly three million dollars' worth of these machines were imported by American lace makers, but the extra duty of 10 per cent ad valorem over and above the duty on lace made on other machines or by hand still remains. There is no reason why extra protection should be granted on lace made on a machine which saves more labor than other machines. If anything, the duty should be less. The only favor the manufacturers can reasonably ask for is to be given access to these machines, which are not made in this country.

Mr. President, the changes which I have proposed with respect to flax and silk are not found in the pending House bill. It is a matter which, I presume, chanced to be overlooked there.

Now, summing up the proposed changes in just a few words, the average ad valorem rate on all cotton goods, including artificial silk, is to be reduced under the proposed amendments from 55.59 per cent under the present act to 28.94 per cent, representing a reduction of 26.65 per cent ad valorem and over 52 per cent below the present rate. It is difficult to estimate the effect these reductions would have upon the revenue derived by the Government from these sources. A reduction of duty may result in an increase of importations which will not only offset the reduction in rate but bring in a larger revenue than the old higher rate did. Of course this is not always the case, since the manufacturers may reduce their price to the consumer and thereby prevent increased importations from abroad. What usually happens and what would probably happen if the proposed amendments were adopted would be a combination of both conditions, and it is impossible to foretell what the ultimate effect upon the revenue would be.

As against a possible loss of revenue to the Government, what benefit awaits the consumer as a result of the proposed changes in duties?

I arrive at this reduction in the following manner: I have computed the foreign value, assuming that the domestic price was increased by the amount of the duty. Adding to the amount of our domestic production of cotton manufactures in 1909, as given by the Census Bureau, the amount of imports for the same year, and deducting from that the amount of our exports, we have a net consumption of cotton manufactures valued at $839,000,000. The proposed reduction of duty under the cotton schedule is 26.65 per cent ad valorem. Assuming that the price to the consumer is to be reduced to the same extent, this would give a reduction to the consumer of over $150,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, that, stated roughly, is the effect of the amendment which I propose. I think it has been rather a hopeful sign to the people of this country that after the Democratic Party had demonstrated its party principle in the House of Representatives as on the wool schedule, it joined in the Senate with those who stood ready to make reductions and go as low as they could possibly go in order to give the largest measure of relief attainable to the people of this country. I believe that the action of the Senate on the woolen schedule met with the approval of all right-thinking people in this country.

But, Mr. President, I regret that as we approach the consideration of the cotton schedule a different condition appears in the Senate. Woolen manufacture lies principally in the North—cotton principally in the South. A majority of the mills of this country are in the South.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not the spindles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. More than half of the cotton mills of this country, as shown by the census, are located in the South.

Mr. OVERMAN. I admit that, but I spoke as to the spindles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I speak as to the mills.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is, as to the number of mills?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, sir; I am giving the number of mills.

Mr. OVERMAN. But not as to the spindles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I heard no complaint, Mr. President, from anyone upon the Democratic side that we were making too great haste in reduction of the duties upon woolens. I heard no suggestion, sir, from anyone upon the Democratic side that we were not taking account of the cost of chemicals, in so far as chemicals are involved in the manufacture of woolens, and that there should be reductions in the chemical schedule at the same time and as a part of the reductions in the woolen schedule.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow an interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator if, in his wide experience in regard to these matters of wool and cotton, to which he has evidently given great attention, the woolen manufacturer does not have to use a larger proportion or a larger quantity in cost of chemicals than the cotton manufacturer in producing his product?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think, Mr. President, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. WARREN. It commences with the scouring of the wool and goes all the way through, and yet no effort in this direction was made to protect the woolen manufacturer.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It goes clear through the whole process.

Now, Mr. President, I do not propose to indulge in strictures. But I appeal to the Democratic side to support the proposed change in the cotton schedule exactly as you supported the wool schedule as a practical legislative proposition, notwithstanding the fact that there are in Alabama 51 cotton mills, in Georgia 116, in North Carolina 281, and in South Carolina 147. Out of a total of 1,323 cotton mills in this country there are 673, or more than one-half of them, located in Southern States.

Mr. President, I hope when the final vote is taken that the record of the Senate will not show the attitude of the Democratic Party to be different with respect to tariff affecting industries located in the South than their position regarding industries located chiefly in the North. We have an opportunity to make reductions here that will greatly relieve the people of this country from the extortionate duties imposed upon them under the Payne-Aldrich law—never justified, as we contend.

Mr. President, I appeal to the patriotism of Senators on this floor to unite upon some basis which will in a measure remove these excessive tariff duties.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator has it, he will give the whole number of spindles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The data furnished to me by the Census Bureau is as follows:

The number of cotton mills in the United States, according to the latest returns made to the Census Office, was 1,323 in the year 1909. Of these 673, or more than one-half, were located in the Southern States. The cotton mills located in the Southern States are as follows:

Alabama	51
Arkansas	2
Georgia	116
Kentucky	4
Louisiana	2
Maryland	16
Mississippi	14
North Carolina	281
South Carolina	147
Tennessee	17
Texas	13
Virginia	10

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On August 16, 1911:

S. 144. An act to legalize a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, in Stevens County, Wash.;

S. 850. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a pontoon railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874;

S. 1627. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Arkansas River, and for other purposes;

S. 2878. An act to authorize the Chicago, Lake Shore & Eastern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River, in the State of Indiana;

S. 2932. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to sell the old post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., and, in the event of such sale, to enter into a contract for the construction of a suitable post-office and courthouse building at Charleston, W. Va., without additional cost to the Government of the United States; and

S. 3152. An act extending the time of payment to certain homesteaders in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles; recedes from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate No. 8, and agrees to the same; and recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5 and 7, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE FREE LIST.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5 and 7 to the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, which were, in amendment No. 5, line 4, to strike out the word "corn," and in amendment No. 7, line 4, to strike out the word "corn."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN subsequently said: Mr. President, an hour ago, when the amendments to what is known as the farmers' free-list bill came from the House of Representatives and were presented to the Senate for its action, there was no roll call or demand for a roll call. I merely rise to register myself against the action that was taken, having had no opportunity to vote upon the question.

NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am directed by the Committee on Territories to report a joint resolution for the admission of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona as States into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

THE COTTON SCHEDULE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12812) to reduce the duties on manufactures of cotton.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, after what has transpired here this morning, as far as I am concerned, I do not propose to leave any possible implication that, if an arrangement was made with Senators upon the other side who are opposed to tariff reduction by the terms of which they were to absent themselves from the Chamber to the end that amendments might be adopted and the cotton bill finally killed, such arrangement was made with my knowledge or consent. I do not know what may have taken place, but I say to the progressive Republicans, and I say to the stand-pat Republicans and to the country, that so far as the Democrats are concerned—and I speak for every man on this side of the Chamber who attended our conferences—no such agreement or arrangement was authorized. Speaking for myself, if an agreement of the character indicated was entered into, I distinctly and unequivocally repudiate it.

I have noticed for some time in one of the Washington daily papers an attempt to fasten the name "the unholy alliance" upon the Democrats and the progressive Republicans. That statement, I presume, is based upon the fact that we have voted together in some instances when we had to vote together in order to accomplish anything. I never make complaint at the witticism of a newspaper writer, but I want to say now that if the press is looking for something in the nature of a real, simon-pure, blown-in-the-bottle, all-wool-and-a-yard-wide unholy alliance, it would be found in a combination between any living Democrat and those who are willing to perpetuate the enormities of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law.

I trust nothing of this kind has transpired; I trust that the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from California are mistaken in their inferences, and that in fact there has been no attempt made to kill this cotton bill by loading it down with any kind of amendments intended to kill it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. REED. I do; certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say to the Senator from Missouri that there is no possible mistake on my part. There are a number of Senators here who heard the conversation, and heard other Senators state why they were abstaining from voting.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas will pardon me, but I prefer to pass on without further reference to this very unpleasant subject.

Mr. President, what seems to me to be the plain duty of this Congress is to remain here in session and revise every schedule of the tariff with due deliberation, with the extremest care, but with a fixed determination to finish the work, and to do it at the present session of Congress. I say now to those Senators who pay me the compliment of their attention that the difficulty confronting us at this hour arises largely from the anxiety to quit a job when that job is half finished. It is true the President called this extra session because he wanted to have passed a reciprocity bill with Canada, but it is also true that the moment we were convened in session the responsibility devolved upon the two branches of Congress to perform their duty to the public with reference to any public business.

Every man who has studied the tariff at all knows that you can scarcely touch one schedule without making it necessary to revise other schedules. So every man understands that when we changed the tariff relations between ourselves and the Dominion of Canada it became necessary as a matter of justice and equity that we should go further and pass other measures as a complement to the reciprocity bill.

That meant, Mr. President, the enactment of the free list. Every man who voted for the free list knew that as he had put certain articles of manufacture upon the free list he ought to go further and at least reduce the tariff upon those materials used by the manufacturer, whose goods had been placed upon the free list. So having "put our hands to the plow" it was our duty to go on "without turning back."

Now, Mr. President, having accomplished a part of the work, anxiety to get away from this Chamber, to seek the cool lakes of the North or the seashores of the East, the desire to be relieved from labor that has, of course, been burdensome, is leading Members to undertake at this time to interfere with what they would otherwise have considered the orderly course of procedure.

Had we all been willing to remain, this is what would have occurred: The cotton bill would have reached here in due course. There would have been the certainty that it would be followed by other bills from the House. A bill reducing the steel and iron schedule would have arrived in due course. We would have known absolutely that it would be followed by a bill reducing the tariff upon chemicals. That would have arrived here in due course, and we would have known that it would be followed by other bills reaching all the other schedules of the tariff. And so we could have well sat here upon the Democratic side and asked the Democrats to support these House measures as they came, and insisted that the insurgent Republicans should do no more than to amend each measure so as to increase the tariff to a point where they could vote for the bill. They would have had no right to add to it other schedules and matters foreign to the subject matter of the bill before us.

But in order to get away, in order that we may lay down our duties, we are willing here now to add to the cotton bill a large number of schedules that ought to have received the distinct and careful consideration of each House and that ought to have been passed as separate measures. I protest against these methods. I protest against adjournment. I call upon every man who loves his country better than he considers his own ease, who would rather serve his people than consult his own convenience, to stay here and finish this work—to finish it now.

We are told that the President proposes to veto all tariff legislation that may be presented at this session. I do not speak as one having authority, for I am not in the confidences of the Chief Executive, but I apprehend that no Senator will rise in this Chamber and say that William H. Taft has ever declared that he will veto every tariff bill passed at this session of Congress, because, sir, if he were to make that assertion he would place himself in a position before the American people which could not be defended and would not be justified in the forum of American conscience.

Why, sir, it has been said that the reason to be assigned in these threatened vetoes is not that the present tariff bill is perfect. If that were the President's position, he might issue such an ultimatum and stand upon it. We are informed that the President declares there shall be no revision until five men constituting the Tariff Board shall render their conclusions. That statement, in its last analysis, is equivalent to a White House decree that the House of Representatives, with its 391 Members, fresh from the people; the Senate, with its 92 Members, bearing the commissions of their States and of their people, all these who represent the sovereign people of the United States, into whose keeping the Constitution has consigned the welfare of this Republic, shall halt and stand dead still until five men appointed by a President shall return their findings upon a question of fact.

If the President takes that indefensible position, and persists in it; if he has the temerity to say to the legislative branch of the National Government, "You shall not act on these great public matters until the good will and the good time of a board composed of five men shall permit you to act," he will condemn himself. If he stubbornly persists in thus placing a mere board above Congress, and refuses to allow the representatives of the Nation to proceed with the public business, such conduct would warrant his impeachment as the enemy of the American Constitution and the American Republic.

I, sir, give more credit to the President than to believe he will take so monstrous a position. If he does not, then what is our plain duty? It is to sit here in council and revise this tariff bill to the best of our ability; to send it to him schedule by schedule; and then, if he can send to us messages convincing us of our error, we will yield; or if he send to us a message that simply bars our progress on one reduction, we must stop on that one matter; but such a message furnishes no reason why we shall yield the duties, the prerogatives, and the rights of the Congress of the United States.

I have no patience with a man who will not fight until the last ditch on any proposition of right. I have nothing but contempt for any body of men who will go whining from the field of duty at the first sign of opposition.

Ah, there was a day, Mr. President, when men stood in this Chamber and in the other end of this Capitol who insisted that the legislative department of the Government was the department that created law and levied taxes. They stood here and contended without the permission of any President. They refused to surrender the rights of their people simply because a President dared to say them nay.

I appeal to the Democrats. You and I, sir, have gone up and down this country and on a thousand platforms have declared that the "special interests" wrote the Payne-Aldrich tariff law. We declared it to be a measure so iniquitous, so outrageous, so inexcusable, that it amounted to nothing more than legalized pocketpicking. We told the people they were the victims of this oppressive and dishonest scheme of plunder. We said to them, "If you do but give to us the badge of authority we will fight your battle for you." We did not say we will fight when the snow is on the ground and enlist for a winter campaign alone. We did not say we would contend only when the breezes were soft and sweet and scented with the breath of the flowers of springtime. We did not tell them we would be summer soldiers and sunshine patriots. We said we would stand and fight for them, and as they suffered we would suffer with them and contend for them to the end. And now you want to adjourn this body that you may go home to the fleshpots of your native States.

I say that, so far as I am concerned, I will vote to stay here until the people's wrongs are righted, even though this extra session should run into the regular session of next winter and that should extend until the law adjourns us on the 4th of March, 1913. Then I will be willing to quit and welcome the Democratic President, who shall come bearing deliverance in his hands.

There is another class of men who want to adjourn. They are those who are typified by the defendant of the criminal at the bar of justice. There has never been a lawyer yet who stood to defend a guilty wretch against the law's strong hand but always applied for a continuance. So the defenders of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law are asking for a continuance until next fall. These assign the flimsy pretext, the ridiculous pretense, that they can not possibly vote with intelligence until the Tariff Board shall shed upon the dark and shadowy questions of tariff schedules the light of its wondrous learning.

How did you vote before? Upon what information did you base your action when you plunged your hands deep into the pockets of the American people? Where is the information you then had that you do not now possess? What has wiped out the wondrous fund of knowledge that you then claimed to be masters of?

Why can you not do now as you did when you wrote the Payne-Aldrich bill—call in the protected manufacturers, have secret meetings with them, permit their experts to furnish you with information? You now admit this is the way the present tariff law was constructed. Why must you now wait for the Tariff Board? The answer is, because postponement of the day of trial means postponement of sentence, perhaps escape altogether. It also means the prolongation of the present scheme of legalized larceny. So you are asking for a continuance. And now they tell us the President, who denounced the woolen schedule of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law as an indefensible thing, insists we shall submit to being robbed and plundered for months, possibly years, longer in order that we may have the advice of a Tariff Board. We must not touch the

robber until alleged experts shall have advised us just how to take hold of his precious anatomy, lest we, peradventure, handle him too rudely.

So the President and all standpatters in chorus cry, "Softly, good friends, be gentle with the rogue."

Now, who are this Tariff Board? I would not cast a single reflection upon them. I trust and hope that they will bring to us some knowledge; and yet, sir, all they are for is to glean the facts. Not a single conclusion are they to draw. They are to find the cost of production here and the cost of production there; they are to ascertain the amount of goods that are manufactured here and the amount of goods manufactured there; and every single fact that they can glean lies at our door, and all men who have industry can acquire all this board will ever gather. When these five men are through with their labors, I venture the prediction that they will have found little we did not already know.

Ah, but some one says, we want to know the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. That theory, my good insurgent friends, is one that you will find, like the will-o'-the-wisp, flees and flits before you. You will never overtake it. It will evade your grasp, lead you into an intellectual quagmire, and vanish from your bewildered vision. The reason for it lies in the great fundamental fact that the cost of production in one mill in this country is frequently greater than the cost of production in another mill just across. The great Senator—and I love to call him that, and I mean what I say in its most complimentary sense—from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has demonstrated that in the paper business there are mills in the United States that can far undersell the mills of Canada, and that there were other mills in the United States in which the cost of production mounted above the Canadian cost. Difference in cost of production! Where will you place it, sir, and upon what will you base it? Will you by law represent the difference there is between the incompetency of B and the competency of A, between the well-organized factory of C and the badly organized business of D? You certainly can not compensate for incapacity or lay a tribute on the people because some man employs bad machinery or bad business methods. You must not tax A because B is a fool.

If, then, we come to the question merely of wages, the difference between wages here and abroad, if we get down to that, the La Follette amendment will cover the difference, if difference there be, three or four times over. The present House bill will cover that alleged difference two or three times over. So in the House bill we have a bill that does, two or three times over, represent all of the honest difference in the cost of production here and in Europe there can possibly be.

I stand here for the House bill, and will unless and until it goes down in defeat. If it goes down in defeat, I say to you progressive Republicans on the other side, if I can not get you entirely into the church, clear up to the chancel rail, clear to the mourner's bench; if I can not put the light of the grace of God into your hearts so that you shall see your way clearly to the perfect truth, I am willing, though you are going but halfway along the road, to travel with you as far as you are going in the right direction.

Democrats, we will contend to the end for the House tariff bill. We will seek to substitute it for the Payne-Aldrich iniquity; but if we are defeated, we must then choose between the bill offered by the Senator from Wisconsin with its substantial reductions and the infamies of the present tariff law.

If across the back of my good friend the wicked lash of injustice is being laid a hundred times each day, I would like to save him all the pain and all the agony of every blow; yet if I can do no better than to reduce the size of the whip and the number of the lashes, I will do that in the interest of humanity and of my friend.

So, if I can not give the people complete relief by the enactment of a Democratic tariff measure, then I will give to them such measure of relief as is afforded by the bill proposed by the insurgent Republicans. Better a little water for a fainting man than none at all. I will not deny to hungry lips the loaf of bread which I can give because I am not able to set forth a feast. I would rather consent to the robber taking half my goods than be compelled to yield all I possess.

So, if an unjust tax is to be wrung from me, I prefer to pay a burden of 30 per cent rather than one three times as great.

Because certain amendments originally offered by insurgent Republicans and temporarily withdrawn by them were offered without their consent by other Senators, these insurgents and their confrères are threatening to vote against the very amendments they have advocated, and upon the passage of which their hearts are really set. Republicans—those of you who are not like Ephraim, joined to your idols—I put this thing to you; I put it also to the Democrats; how can we hesitate to stand and do our duty, our whole duty, without petulance, without proceeding in temper to assassinate the measures we know are for the people's benefit? How can any of us refuse to vote for a proposition simply because it was presented by some other person than we desired to bring it forward? Can we refuse to support a good measure because the manner of its presentation clashed with our wishes and sense of good taste?

I appeal to insurgent Republicans and to Democrats to consider the fact that it has been admitted on this floor by a Republican member of the Finance Committee that for weeks the Republican members of that committee held secret sessions. It was admitted that at these secret sessions the men who were interested in the great protected industries were present. They were admitted in secret to construct a tariff bill in secret. They were admitted by the Republican portion of the committee, some of the members of which were directly and financially interested in making the tariff robbery as great as possible.

So, in secret, where no eye could observe their movements and no ear could hear their proceedings, they created a public law to be enforced against the public—the public which was not admitted and which was not permitted to be heard. They did all this in the darkness. Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil. Behind locked doors the Republican members of the Finance Committee joined in conspiracy with the men interested in despoiling the people. These conspirators brought forth a bill that taxes every infant in its cradle, every corpse in its coffin, every woman in her home, every man toiling in the field, sweating at the anvil, or laboring at the forge. Shall we hesitate to remain here until we have destroyed this legislative fraud? Shall we go home and say: "We just got tired and concluded to quit"?

I am in favor of amending this bill by adding not only the steel, not only the sugar, not only the chemical, but the rubber schedule as well and all other schedules which afflict the American people; and sending them to the House of Representatives for its consideration.

I break no confidence when I say that it is the desire of the leaders of the other House that we shall do that thing. What will be wrought out there I do not know; but this I do know, that men, earnest in their purpose to relieve the American people, will try to bring out a result that we can justly enact into law.

So, I want to say in conclusion, that I join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] in saying, we can not afford to vote down good measures because they may have been offered in a way we do not like. I say to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], who is my neighbor, and to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], whom I admire, and who has made many a brave fight on this floor, you can not afford, because you do not like the way a thing is done, to refuse to do your duty by the people. I am sure the Democrats will do theirs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEYBURN in the chair). The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for the bill as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to state briefly that I shall support the House bill. In the event of its defeat, I shall support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

I should deprecate seeing so many amendments put on this bill that it would lead to a loss of enough votes to prevent the passage of it. There is such a thing as loading down a bill until it will not float above water. I am willing to vote for proper reductions in any number that will receive a sufficient number of votes to be passed, but I think it is somewhat hazardous to put upon this cotton schedule, with the steel-schedule amendment, a series of schedules that may lose two or three votes here and there. For that reason I think it would be better not to load down the cotton schedule by too great a number of amendments. I desired to say that much before this vote was taken. I favor the amendments reducing the tariff on the steel schedule, sugar and rubber schedules, and will vote for them, but prefer supporting them as separate measures as to sugar and rubber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second to the demand for the yeas and nays by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BACON. I understand this is a vote upon the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for the bill as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote on the substitute.

Mr. BACON. For the entire bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the entire bill as amended. It was so held by the previous occupant of the chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I understand by that that if the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin is carried the work in the Senate in adding the metal schedule to the cotton schedule would be undone?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say, if I may be permitted, Mr. President, that if the amendment which I have offered in the nature of a substitute shall be carried there will then be offered the metal schedule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the metal schedule has already been adopted as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but I will offer it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why can not the Senator from Wisconsin offer his substitute to consist of the cotton schedule as he prepared it and the metal schedule, so that the fate of the metal schedule will not be involved in it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not think it will involve the fate of the metal schedule at all, Mr. President, if the course of procedure is taken which I anticipate will be taken and should my substitute amendment be adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me that we will have to do the metal-schedule work over again later.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I desire to announce that I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

Mr. CLAPP (when Mr. GRONNA's name was called). I desire to announce that the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] is necessarily absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I am requested to again announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], but I understand that, if present, he would vote "nay" on this proposition, and therefore I will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when Mr. POINDEXTER's name was called). The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] is paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. If the Senator from Washington were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I desire to again announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], occasioned by sickness. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I desire to state further that he is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise simply to announce that my colleague [Mr. KENYON] is unavoidably absent from the city. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—10.

Borah	Brown	Cummins	La Follette
Bourne	Clapp	Dixon	
Bristow	Crawford	Jones	

NAYS—51.

Bacon	Fletcher	Myers	Root
Bailey	Foster	Nelson	Shively
Bankhead	Gamble	Newlands	Simmons
Brandegee	Guggenheim	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Heyburn	Overman	Smoot
Burnham	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Stephenson
Burton	Johnston, Ala.	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Kern	Paynter	Thornton
Chilton	Lea	Penrose	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Percy	Watson
Culberson	Lorimer	Perkins	Wetmore
Cullom	Martin, Va.	Pomerene	Williams
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Reed	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bradley	Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Bryan	Gore	Nixon	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Crane	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Taylor
Curtis	Kenyon	Rayner	Tillman
Davis	Lodge	Richardson	Townsend
du Pont	McCumber	Smith, Md.	Works

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be offered to the pending bill as in Committee of the Whole? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the passage of the bill I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I had intended in Committee of the Whole to vote for this bill, but to protect a pair which has been intrusted to me, I will vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS (when Mr. LODGE's name was called). I wish to again announce that the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the transfer of that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I desire again to announce the necessary absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I desire to again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I inquire if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS] is recorded as having voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that he is not so recorded.

Mr. WATSON. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. NELSON. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] is paired with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY]. If the Senator from North Dakota were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Certain Senators who are present in the Chamber did not answer to their names when they were called. I refer the Chair to Rule XII, which provides:

1. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate.

I read from paragraph 2 of the same rule:

2. When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name, he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them, the Presiding Officer shall submit the question to the Senate: "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate.

I do not pretend to be well versed in the construction of the rules of the Senate or in parliamentary law, but it seems to me the portions of the rules I have read apply directly and immediately to the case now before the Senate. I know, and the Chair knows, that there are Senators sitting here at this moment in full view of the Chair and in full view of the Senate who, when their names were called, did not answer and did not vote. I believe they ought to be required to state their reasons for not voting, and then it ought to be submitted to the Senate whether those reasons are or are not sufficient to excuse them. I suggest that point of order, if it be a point of order, before the conclusion of the roll call is announced.

Mr. WATSON. I see that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS] is present. I therefore feel at liberty to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the name of the Senator from West Virginia.

The Secretary called Mr. WATSON's name, and he voted "yea."

Mr. OWEN. I ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to designate the Senators who are present and not voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the proper course to pursue is to call the names of all Senators who have not voted, and if the Chair's attention is called to the presence in the Chamber of a Senator whose name is called, the Chair will then request that Senator to vote——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Mississippi permit the Chair to finish his announcement? Or some Senator may make a motion, which would be in order, that the Senator be excused from voting.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it in order to make a motion to excuse from voting all Senators who did not vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it would be, although that is a little out of the usual order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, if it be in order, I make the motion now that all Senators who did not vote be excused from voting.

Mr. CUMMINS. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUMMINS. Under the rule no Senator——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will finish his point of order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Under the rule no Senator can be excused from voting until he has stated in the presence of the Senate his reasons for not voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule is explicit. The second clause of Rule XII says that when required to vote, the individual Senator shall assign his reasons, and that thereafter the Senate shall determine whether or not the reasons are sufficient. That rule being specifically invoked, the Chair thinks the motion of the Senator from Mississippi could hardly be entertained and that the proper course is for the Secretary to call the names of such Senators as did not vote.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, this rule has never been invoked, so far as my experience goes in the Senate. I doubt whether there is a Member of this body who has not exercised his judgment as to whether he should vote or not on a measure.

As far as I am concerned, I did not vote, and I will state candidly that the reason why I did not was that I have concluded to leave this measure to the Democrats of this body and to the so-called insurgents to perfect it in any way they may desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania is reached it will be for the Senate to determine whether the reasons the Senator has assigned are sufficient to excuse him from voting.

Mr. PENROSE. I shall ask the Senate to sustain me in those reasons when my name is called.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. POINDEXTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NIXON]. If present, my colleague would vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the names of such Senators as did not answer to the roll call.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. BRADLEY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from Kentucky in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. BRANDEGEE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from Connecticut in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. BRIGGS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from New Jersey in the Chamber.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from New Jersey, whose name has just been called, was in the Chamber a moment ago, when the discussion as to whether Senators should be excused from voting or not arose. I think he has doubtless——

Mr. PENROSE. He was called out, I think.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Retired to the cloak room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He is not in the Chamber. The Secretary will continue the roll call.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would suggest that a messenger be sent to ask him to return to the Chamber and to meet his obligations here upon this important question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows of no rule by which that can be accomplished.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That would be simply unheard of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. One moment. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say that I did not recall a rule under which that suggestion could be carried out, but I thought it pertinent to make the suggestion and let it go upon the record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have said what I wanted to say. I regard that as unheard of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the roll call of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. BRYAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from Florida in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. CLARK of Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. As heretofore announced by me, I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the Senator from Wyoming, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Wyoming is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. CRANE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. I announced, not when my name was called, but after the calling of the roll had been concluded, that I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. If he were present, I would vote "nay." I made that announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the reasons assigned by the Senator from Kansas, shall he be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Kansas is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. DAVIS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. DU PONT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. GALLINGER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is absent from the Chamber.

Mr. BURNHAM. I wish to state that my colleague is necessarily absent, and is paired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of the Senator from New Hampshire from the city is well known to the Senate.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. GORE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. GRONNA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is well known that the Senator from North Dakota is absent from the city.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. GUGGENHEIM.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to say that when the point of order was made by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] the Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] immediately left the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That relieves the Chair from announcing his absence from the Chamber. The Secretary will continue the call.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. HITCHCOCK.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. KENYON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is absent from the city.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. LODGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has been absent from the Chamber all day.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. LORIMER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from Illinois in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. MCCUMBER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is absent from the city.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. MCLEAN.

Mr. MCLEAN. I announced earlier in the day that I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and I requested that that announcement should stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the reason assigned, shall the Senator from Connecticut be excused from voting? [Putting

the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Connecticut is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. NIXON.

Mr. NIXON. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the reason assigned by the Senator from Nevada, shall he be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Nevada is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. O'GORMAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is absent from the city.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to make a part of the record of this particular proceeding the statement of fact that my colleague [Mr. O'GORMAN] and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are paired.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I was here when the roll was called, and I did not answer to my name. I did so advisedly. I had been led to believe—and I think I am right—that if this bill should be defeated by a vote, the same course would be pursued with regard to it that was pursued a few weeks ago with respect to another important measure relating to the tariff—that is, a motion to reconsider would be entered and an endeavor would be made to reframe it.

I do not propose by any affirmative action to be a party to any such proceeding. I think I have a right not to vote upon this bill, and I ask the Senate to excuse me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the reasons assigned by the Senator from Pennsylvania shall he be excused from voting?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is the question debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask for the yeas and nays——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order——

Mr. CUMMINS. Upon the question of excusing the Senator from Pennsylvania from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks for the yeas and nays upon the question whether the Senator from Pennsylvania shall be excused from voting.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll on the question, Shall the Senator from Pennsylvania for the reasons assigned by him be excused from voting?

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when Mr. BRYAN's name was called). As I before announced to-day, my colleague [Mr. BRYAN] is necessarily absent from the city, but in order that the record may be right on this proceeding, I repeat the statement that by a transfer he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I announced the pair earlier in the day, but owing to the fact that I was in the Chamber when the previous vote was taken, I desire to announce it again, and I withhold my vote for that reason.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. NIXON (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I presume I can be excused from voting on this question.

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I announce my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER].

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TAYLOR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). My pair is apparently absent from the Chamber. I therefore withhold my vote. I should like very much to excuse all Republicans from voting on all occasions.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Bacon	Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Root
Bankhead	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bourne	Foster	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Burnham	Gamble	Nelson	Swanson
Burton	Heyburn	Newlands	Thornton
Chilton	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Johnston, Ala.	Paynter	Warren
Culberson	Jones	Penrose	Wetmore
Cullom	Lippitt	Perkins	Williams

NAYS—15.

Borah	Clapp	Kern	Pomerene
Bristow	Crawford	La Follette	Reed
Brown	Cummins	Lea	Shively
Chamberlain	Dixon	Page	

NOT VOTING—38.

Bailey	Gallinger	Nixon	Smoot
Bradley	Gore	O'Gorman	Stephenson
Brandegee	Gronna	Oliver	Stone
Briggs	Guggenheim	Owen	Sutherland
Bryan	Hitchcock	Percy	Taylor
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Poindexter	Tillman
Crane	Lodge	Rayner	Watson
Curtis	Lorimer	Richardson	Works
Davis	McCumber	Smith, Md.	
du Pont	McLean	Smith, Mich.	

So Mr. OLIVER was excused from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the next name.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. PENROSE.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I withheld my vote because I have no interest in the pending legislation other than to hasten action upon it so that Congress may be enabled to adjourn at as early a date as possible and relieve the business interests of the country of the disturbance created by our continuance in session here.

I am opposed to all the tariff measures and amendments now pending or heretofore acted upon, and not belonging to the majority which in the last few weeks has had control of the tariff legislation in the Senate, I thought it logical and consistent to leave the perfection of the details of the measure to the majority of those Senators who have been in full control of tariff legislation.

Therefore, not being able to cast an intelligent vote at all, I withheld my vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the Senator from Pennsylvania for the reasons assigned by him be excused from voting?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks for the yeas and nays. Is there a second? [After counting.] Ten Senators have seconded the demand—not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some hands on this side were raised after the count had been made. I observed that myself, and I ask for a recount.

Mr. OLIVER. I submit a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin challenging the count of the Chair, the Chair will again put the question.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator from Wisconsin did not rise when he addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained. Is there a second to the demand for the yeas and nays. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is, Shall the Senator from Pennsylvania for the reasons assigned by him be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is excused from voting. The Secretary will call the next name.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. PERCY.

Mr. PERCY. I have a pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], as announced when my name was called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the Senator from Mississippi, for the reason assigned by him be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Mississippi is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. POINDEXTER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington seems not to be in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. RAYNER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. RICHARDSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is absent from the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. SMITH of Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland seems not to be in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is not in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. SMOOT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair fails to see the Senator from Utah in the Chamber.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. STEPHENSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from Wisconsin present.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. STONE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is sick at his residence.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah is out of the city.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I have announced, I am paired with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY], who is sick in his room in the city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Shall the Senator from Tennessee for the reasons assigned by him be excused from voting? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Tennessee is excused from voting.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. TILLMAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is out of the city.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. TOWNSEND, and he answered "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan votes "nay."

The Secretary called the name of Mr. WORKS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see the Senator from California in the Chamber.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, it should be stated, I think, in connection with this call——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us first dispose of the Senator from California.

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is not present, and there need be no motion. The Secretary will recapitulate the vote.

The Secretary having recapitulated the vote, the result was announced—yeas 29, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—29.

Bacon	Foster	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Bailey	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Swanson
Bankhead	Johnston, Ala.	Owen	Thornton
Chamberlain	Kern	Paynter	Watson
Chilton	Lea	Pomerene	Williams
Clarke, Ark.	Martin, Va.	Reed	
Culberson	Martine, N. J	Shively	
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	

NAYS—24.

Borah	Clapp	Gamble	Page
Bourne	Crawford	Heyburn	Perkins
Bristow	Cullom	Jones	Root
Brown	Cummins	La Follette	Townsend
Burnham	Dillingham	Lippitt	Warren
Burton	Dixon	Nelson	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—36.

Bradley	Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Gore	Nixon	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Gronna	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bryan	Guggenheim	Oliver	Stephenson
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Stone
Crane	Kenyon	Percy	Sutherland
Curtis	Lodge	Poindexter	Taylor
Davis	Lorimer	Rayner	Tillman
du Pont	McCumber	Richardson	Works

So the bill was passed.

Mr. BACON. I ask that the bill as amended and as it passed the Senate be printed in the RECORD. It is not in any one place in its entirety. I ask that it may be printed immediately following or preceding the vote—one or the other.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be entered.

The bill as it passed the Senate is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of January, 1912, the articles hereinafter enumerated, described, and provided for shall, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), be subject to the payment of duties at the rates hereinafter provided; that is to say:

1. On cotton thread and carded yarn, combed yarn, warps or warp yarn, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, except spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, hereinafter provided for, on all numbers up to and including No. 50, 10 per cent ad valorem; on all numbers above No. 50 and up to and including No. 100, 15 per cent ad valorem; on all numbers above No. 100, 20 per cent ad valorem. On cotton card laps, roping, sliver, or roving, 10 per cent ad valorem. On cotton waste and flocks, manufactured or otherwise advanced in value, 5 per cent ad valorem.

2. On spool thread of cotton, crochet, darning, and embroidery cottons, on spools, reels, or balls, or in skeins, cones, or tubes, or in any other form, 15 per cent ad valorem.

3. On cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which shall not exceed No. 50, 15 per cent ad valorem; containing yarn the highest number of which shall exceed No. 50 and shall not exceed No. 100, 20 per cent ad valorem; containing yarn the highest number of which shall exceed No. 100, 25 per cent ad valorem. On cotton cloth, when bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, printed, or mercerized, containing yarn the highest number of which shall not exceed No. 50, 20 per cent ad valorem; containing yarn the higest number of which shall exceed No. 50 and shall not exceed No. 100, 25 per cent ad valorem; containing yarn the highest number of which shall exceed No. 100, 30 per cent ad valorem.

4. The term cotton cloth, or cloth, wherever used in the paragraphs of this act, unless otherwise specially provided for, shall be held to include all woven fabrics of cotton, in the piece or cut in lengths, whether figured, fancy, or plain, and shall not include any article, finished or unfinished, made from cotton cloth. In the ascertainment of the value, upon which the duties imposed upon cotton cloth are made to depend, the entire fabric and all parts thereof shall be included.

5. On cloth composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber and silk, whether known as silk-striped sleeve linings, silk stripes, or otherwise, of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, and on tracing cloth, 30 per cent ad valorem; on cotton cloth filled or coated, all oilcloths (except silk oilcloths and oilcloths for floors), and cotton window hollands, 25 per cent ad valorem; on waterproof cloth composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, whether composed in part of india rubber or otherwise, 25 per cent ad valorem.

6. On all handkerchiefs or mufflers composed of cotton, whether in the piece or otherwise and whether finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem.

7. On clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, made up or manufactured, wholly or in part, by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, and not otherwise specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem; on shirt collars and cuffs, of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

8. On plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, and all pile fabrics, cut or uncut, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface; any of the foregoing composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, except flax, and on manufactures or articles in any form, including such as are commonly known as bias dress facings or skirt bindings, made or cut from plushes, velvets, velveteens, corduroys, or other pile fabrics composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

9. On curtains, table covers, and all articles manufactured of cotton chenille, or of which cotton chenille is the component material of chief value, tapestries, and other Jacquard figured upholstery goods, composed wholly or in chief value of cotton or other vegetable fiber; on any of the foregoing, in the piece or otherwise, 35 per cent ad valorem.

10. On stockings, hose and half-hose, made on knitting machines or frames, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and not otherwise specially provided for in this act, 20 per cent ad valorem.

11. On stockings, hose and half-hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half-hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half-hose, on all of the above composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, finished or unfinished, 40 per cent ad valorem. On men's and boys' cotton gloves, knitted or woven, 35 per cent ad valorem.

12. On shirts and drawers, pants, vests, union suits, combination suits, tights, sweaters, corset covers and all underwear of every description, made wholly or in part on knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, finished or unfinished, not including stockings, hose, and half-hose, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 30 per cent ad valorem.

13. On bandings, beltings, bindings, bone casings, cords, garters, ribbons, tire fabric or fabric suitable for use in pneumatic tires, suspenders and braces, tapes, tubing, and webs or webbing, any of the foregoing made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, whether composed in part of india rubber or otherwise, and not embroidered by hand or machinery, spindle banding, woven, braided, or twisted lamp, stove, or candle wicking made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, loom harness, healds, or collets made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, boot, shoe, and corset lacings made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and labels, for garments or other articles, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, 25 per cent ad valorem; on belting for machinery made of cotton or other vegetable fiber and india rubber, or of which cotton or other vegetable fiber is the component material of chief value, 15 per cent ad valorem.

14. On cotton table damask, and manufactures of cotton table damask, or of which cotton table damask is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 25 per cent ad valorem.

15. On towels, doilies, bath mats, quilts, blankets, polishing cloths, mop cloths, wash rags, sheets, and batting, any of the foregoing made of cotton, or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

16. On all articles made from cotton cloth, whether finished or unfinished, and all manufactures of cotton or of which cotton is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this act, 30 per cent ad valorem.

17. On all machines and parts of machines, used for carding, drawing, slubbing, roving, spinning, doubling, weaving, and knitting cotton, and all other machines and parts of machines used in the manufacture of cotton goods, 30 per cent ad valorem.

SEC. 2. The act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out all of Schedule A thereof, being paragraphs 1 to 83, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SCHEDULE A. CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS.

"1. Acids. Acetic or pyroligneous acid, not exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 10 per cent ad valorem; exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 15 per cent ad valorem; acetic anhydrid, 10 per cent ad va-

lorem; boracic acid, 60 per cent ad valorem; chromic acid, 10 per cent ad valorem; citric acid, 15 per cent ad valorem; lactic acid, containing not over 40 per cent by weight of actual lactic acid, 15 per cent ad valorem; containing over 40 per cent by weight of actual lactic acid, 25 per cent ad valorem; oxalic acid, 25 per cent ad valorem; salicylic acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; sulphuric acid, or oil of vitriol, not specially provided for in this section, 5 per cent ad valorem; tannic acid or tannin, 50 per cent ad valorem; ballic acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; tartaric acid, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other acids not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"2. Vegetable, animal, or mineral objects immersed or placed in, or saturated with, alcohol, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; all other alcoholic compounds not specially provided for in this section, 50 per cent ad valorem.

"3. Alkalies, alkaloids, distilled oils, essential oils, expressed oils, rendered oils, and all combinations of the foregoing, and all chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts, and all greases not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent; chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts containing alcohol or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, and not specially provided for in this section, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"4. Alumina, hydrate of, or refined bauxite, containing not more than 64 per cent of alumina, 15 per cent; containing more than 64 per cent of alumina, 5 per cent ad valorem. Alum, alum cake, patent alum, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, containing not more than 15 per cent of alumina and not more than three-tenths of 1 per cent of iron oxide, 20 per cent; alum, alum cake, patent alum, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, containing more than 15 per cent of alumina or not more than three-tenths of 1 per cent of iron oxide, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"5. Ammonia, carbonate of, 25 per cent; muriate of, or sal ammoniac, 10 per cent; liquid anhydrous, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"6. Argols or crude tartar or wine lees crude, 5 per cent; tartars and lees crystals, or partly refined argols, containing not more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash, and tartrate of soda or potassa, or Rochelle salts, 20 per cent; containing more than 90 per cent of bitartrate of potash, 20 per cent; cream of tartar and patent tartar, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"7. Blacking of all kinds, 20 per cent ad valorem; creams and preparations for cleaning or polishing boots and shoes, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"8. Bleaching powder or chloride of lime, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"9. Blue vitriol or sulphate of copper, 3 per cent ad valorem.

"10. Charcoal in any form, not specially provided for in this act; bone char, suitable for use in decolorizing sugars; and blood char, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"11. Borax, 10 per cent; borates of lime, soda, or other borate material not otherwise provided for in this section, 14 per cent ad valorem.

"12. Camphor, refined and synthetic camphor, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"13. Chalk, when ground, bolted, precipitated naturally or artificially, or otherwise prepared, whether in the form of cubes, blocks, sticks, or disks, or otherwise, including tailors', billiard, red, or French chalk, 25 per cent; manufactures of chalk, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"14. Chloroform, 5 per cent ad valorem.

"15. Coal-tar dyes or colors, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; all other products or preparations of coal tar, not colors or dyes and not medicinal, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"16. Cobalt, oxide of, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"17. Collodion and all compounds of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, whether known as celluloid or by any other name, 35 per cent; if in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, or other forms, not polished, wholly or partly, and not made up into finished or partly finished articles, 35 per cent; if polished, wholly or partly, or if finished or partly finished articles, except moving-picture films, of which collodion or any compound of pyroxylin or of other cellulose esters, by whatever name known, is the component material of chief value, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"18. Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors, 35 per cent ad valorem.

"19. Copperas, or sulphate of iron, 3 per cent ad valorem.

"20. Drugs, such as barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, excrescences, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, dried insects, grains, gums and gum resin, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, nutgalls, roots, stems, spices, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), seeds of morbid growth, weeds, and woods used expressly for dyeing or tanning; any of the foregoing which are natural and uncompounded drugs and not edible, and not specially provided for in this section, but which are advanced in value or condition by any process or treatment whatever beyond that essential to the proper packing of the drugs and the prevention of decay or deterioration pending manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That no article containing alcohol, or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, shall be classified for duty in this paragraph.

"21. Ethers: Sulphuric, 25 per cent; spirits of nitrous ether, 25 per cent; fruit ethers, oils, or essences, 100 per cent; ethers of all kinds not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent; ethyl chloride, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"22. Extracts and decoctions of logwood and other dyewoods, and extracts of bark, such as are commonly used for dyeing or tanning, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent; extract of nutgalls, aqueous, 10 per cent; extract of Persian berries, 15 per cent; chlorophyll, 15 per cent; extracts of quebracho, not exceeding in density 28° Baumé, 10 per cent; exceeding in density 28° Baumé, 15 per cent; extracts of hemlock, bark, 15 per cent; extracts of sumac, 10 per cent; and of woods other than dyewoods, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent; all extracts of vegetable origin suitable for dyeing, coloring, staining, or tanning, not containing alcohol and not medicinal, and not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"23. Gelatin, glue, isinglass, or fish glue, including agar-agar, or Japanese isinglass, and all fish bladders and fish sounds other than crude or dried or salted for preservation only, valued at not above 10 cents per pound, 25 per cent; valued at above 10 cents per pound and not above 35 cents per pound, 20 per cent; valued above 35 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem; gelatin in sheets, emulsions, and all manufactures of gelatin, or of which gelatin is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem; glue size, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"24. Glycerin, crude, not purified, 10 per cent ad valorem, refined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"25. Indigo extracts or pastes, 5 per cent ad valorem; indigo, carmined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"26. Ink and ink powders, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"27. Iodine, resublimed, 5 per cent ad valorem.

"28. Iodoform, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"29. Licorice, extracts of, in paste, rolls, or other forms, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"30. Chicle, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"31. Magnesia, and carbonate of, medicinal, 35 per cent ad valorem; calcined, medicinal, 35 per cent ad valorem; sulphate of, or Epsom salts, 35 per cent ad valorem.

"32. Alizarin assistant, sulpho-ricinoleic acid, and ricinoleic acid and soaps containing castor oil, or any of the foregoing in whatever form, in the manufacture of which 50 per cent or more of castor oil is used, 40 per cent ad valorem; in the manufacture of which less than 50 per cent of castor oil is used, 35 per cent ad valorem. All other alizarin assistants and all soluble greases used in processes of softening, dyeing, or finishing, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"33. Castor oil, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"34. Cod-liver oil, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"35. Flaxseed, linseed, and poppy-seed oil, raw, boiled, or oxydized, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"36. Fusel oil, or amylic alcohol, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"37. Hempseed oil, 25 per cent ad valorem; rapeseed oil, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"38. Olive oil, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem; in bottles, jars, kegs, tins, or other packages, containing less than 5 gallons each, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"39. Peppermint oil, 5 per cent.

"40. Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including sod oil, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent.

"41. Opium, crude or unmanufactured and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent and over of morphia, 30 per cent; opium of the same composition, dried, powdered, or otherwise advanced beyond the condition of crude or unmanufactured, 30 per cent; morphia or morphine, sulphate of, 25 per cent ad valorem; all alkaloids of opium and salts and esters thereof, 40 per cent ad valorem; cocaine, ecgonine, and all salts and derivatives of the same, 70 per cent; coca leaves, 30 per cent; aqueous extract of opium for medicinal uses, and tincture of, as laudanum and other liquid preparations of opium, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent; opium containing less than 9 per cent of morphia, 60 per cent; but preparations of opium deposited in bonded warehouses shall not be removed therefrom without payment of duties, and such duties shall not be refunded: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to repeal or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909.

"42. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, including barytes earth, unmanufactured, 45 per cent; manufactured, 40 per cent.

"43. Blues, such as Berlin, Prussian, Chinese, and all others, containing ferrocyanide of iron, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 30 per cent.

"44. Blanc fixe, or artificial sulphate of barytes, and satin white, or artificial sulphate of lime, 30 per cent.

"45. Black, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable substance, by whatever name known, including bone black and lampblack, dry or ground in oil or water, 20 per cent.

"46. Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in the manufacture of which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are used, in pulp, dry, or ground in or mixed with oil or water, 20 per cent.

"47. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, and umber and umber earths, not specially provided for in this section, when crude or not powdered, washed, or pulverized, 8 per cent; if powdered, washed, or pulverized, 35 per cent; if ground in oil or water, 15 per cent.

"48. Orange mineral, 45 per cent.

"49. Red lead, 50 per cent.

"50. Ultramarine blue, whether dry, in pulp, or mixed with water, and wash blue containing ultramarine, 25 per cent.

"51. Varnishes, including so-called gold size or japan, 20 per cent; enamel paints made with varnish, 25 per cent; spirit varnish containing 5 per cent or more of methyl alcohol, 50 per cent; spirit varnish containing more than 5 per cent of methyl alcohol, 100 per cent ad valorem.

"52. Vermilion reds, containing quicksilver, dry or ground in oil or water, 10 per cent ad valorem; when not containing quicksilver, but made of lead or containing lead, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"53. White lead and white pigment containing lead dry or in pulp or ground or mixed with oil, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"54. Whiting and Paris white, dry, 30 per cent ad valorem; ground in oil or putty, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"55. Zinc, oxide of, and white pigment containing zinc, but not containing lead, dry, 10 per cent ad valorem; ground in oil, 15 per cent ad valorem; sulfid of zinc, white, or white sulfid of zinc, 30 per cent ad valorem; chloride of zinc and sulphate of zinc, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"56. All paints, colors, pigments, stains, lakes, crayons, including charcoal crayons or fusains, smalts, and frosting, whether crude or dry or mixed or ground with water or oil, or with solutions other than oil, not otherwise specially provided for, 25 per cent ad valorem; all glazes, fluxes, enamels, and colors used only in the manufacture of ceramic, enameled, and glass articles, 25 per cent ad valorem; all paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists' paints or colors, whether in tubes, pans, cakes, or other forms, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"57. Paris green and London purple, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"58. Lead: Acetate of, white, 40 per cent ad valorem; brown, gray, or yellow, 30 per cent ad valorem; nitrate of, 30 per cent ad valorem; litharge, 40 per cent ad valorem.

"59. Phosphorus, 30 per cent ad valorem.

"60. Bichromate and chromate of potash, 35 per cent ad valorem.

"61. Caustic potash, or hydrate of, refined, in sticks or rolls, 10 per cent ad valorem; chlorate of potash, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"62. Hydriodate, iodide, and iodate of potash, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"63. Nitrate of potash, or saltpeter, refined, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"64. Prussiate of potash, red or yellow, 30 per cent ad valorem; cyanide of potassium, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"65. Medicinal preparations containing alcohol, or in the preparation of which alcohol is used, not specially provided for in this section, 45 per cent ad valorem; calomel, corrosive sublimate, and other mercurial medicinal preparations, 25 per cent ad valorem; all other

medicinal preparations not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That chemicals, drugs, medicinal, and similar substances, whether dutiable or free, imported in capsules, pills, tablets, lozenges, troches, or similar forms, and intended for medicinal purposes, shall be dutiable at not less than the rate imposed by this section on medicinal preparations.

"66. Plasters, healing or curative, of all kinds, and courtplaster, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"67. Perfumery, including cologne and other toilet waters, articles of perfumery, whether in sachets or otherwise, and all preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentifrices, including tooth soaps, pastes, including theatrical grease paints and pastes, pomades, powders, and other toilet articles, all the foregoing; if containing alcohol, or in the manufacture or preparation of which alcohol is used, 60 per cent ad valorem; if not containing alcohol, or in the manufacture or preparation of which alcohol is not used, 50 per cent ad valorem; floral or flower waters, containing no alcohol, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"68. Santonin, and all salts thereof, containing 80 per cent or over of santonin, 5 per cent ad valorem.

"69. Castile soap, 10 per cent ad valorem; medicinal or medicated soaps, 50 per cent ad valorem; fancy or perfumed toilet soaps, 35 per cent ad valorem; all other soaps not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"70. Bicarbonate of soda or supercarbonate of soda, or saleratus and other alkalies containing 50 per cent or more of bicarbonate of soda, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"71. Bichromate and chromate of soda, 35 per cent ad valorem.

"72. Crystal carbonate of soda, or concentrated soda crystals, or monohydrate or sesquicarbonate, 10 per cent ad valorem; chlorate of soda, 15 per cent ad valorem.

"73. Hydrate of or caustic soda, 12 per cent ad valorem; nitrite of soda, 30 per cent ad valorem; yellow prussiate of soda, 25 per cent ad valorem; sulphide of soda, containing not more than 35 per cent of soda, 10 per cent ad valorem; and hyposulphite of soda, 20 per cent ad valorem; sulphide of soda, concentrated or containing more than 35 per cent of soda, 45 per cent ad valorem.

"74. Salsoda or soda crystals, not concentrated, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"75. Soda ash, 20 per cent ad valorem; arseniate of soda, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"76. Silicate of soda or other alkaline silicate, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"77. Sulphate of soda, or salt cake, or niter cake, 8 per cent ad valorem.

"78. Moss and seagrass, eel grass, and seaweed, if manufactured or dyed, 8 per cent ad valorem.

"79. Sponges, 15 per cent ad valorem; manufactures of sponges, or of which sponge is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

"80. Strychnia or strychnine, and all salts thereof, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"81. Sulphur, refined, 12 per cent ad valorem; sublimed, or flowers of sulphur, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"82. Sumac, ground, 10 per cent ad valorem.

"83. Vanillin, 65 per cent ad valorem."

SEC. 3. That on and after the day when this act shall go into effect all goods, wares, and merchandise previously imported and hereinbefore enumerated, described, and provided for, for which no entry has been made, and all such goods, wares, and merchandise previously entered without payment of duty and under bond for warehousing, transportation, or any other purpose, for which no permit of delivery to the importer or his agent has been issued, shall be subjected to no other duty upon the entry or withdrawal thereof than the duty which would be imposed if such goods, wares, or merchandise were imported on or after that date: *Provided, however*, That if the duties above provided to be collected and paid shall, as to any article or articles, be greater than that provided to be paid by the present existing law less 30 per cent, then in every such case the duty or duties which are hereby levied and which shall be collected and paid on said article or articles shall be a sum equal to the duties provided to be levied, collected, and paid by the present existing law less 30 per cent and not greater.

SEC. 4. That the act approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out paragraph 121 of Schedule C thereof and inserting the following:

"121. Beams, girders, joists, angles, car-truck channels, T. T. columns and posts, or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, or whether assembled and manufactured, one-quarter of 1 cent per pound."

The said Schedule C in the act aforesaid, being paragraphs 117 to 199, both inclusive, is hereby further amended as follows, to wit:

"From and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles mentioned in paragraphs 117 to 151, inclusive, 159 to 163, inclusive, and 171 of said Schedule C, when imported from any foreign country into the United States, or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), 60 per cent only of the rates of duty which are in and by said paragraphs of said schedule prescribed; but the foregoing shall not apply to paragraph 121, which is hereinbefore repealed and a substitute reenacted therefor."

That from and after the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles mentioned in paragraphs 152 to 158, inclusive, 164 to 170, inclusive, 172 to 199, inclusive, of said Schedule C, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), 70 per cent only of the rates of duty which are in and by said paragraphs of said schedule prescribed: *Provided, however*, That if any article embraced in said schedule shall by an act of Congress passed by the Sixty-second Congress, second session, be placed on the free list, this act shall not apply thereto.

SEC. 5. That the articles mentioned in the following paragraph, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), shall be exempt from duty, namely:

Coal, bituminous, round, and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter inch screen: *Provided*, That the articles in the paragraph enumerated, the product, growth, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence, and shall make proclamation that the articles in this paragraph enumerated, the product, growth, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty.

SEC. 6. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are, in so far as they conflict with this act, hereby repealed. This act shall take effect and be in force on and after the first day of January, 1912.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. HEYBURN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 139), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and is hereby, authorized to have printed such hearings or other matter as may be deemed necessary in connection with subjects to be considered by said committee during the Sixty-second Congress.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEWARK, OHIO.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. PENROSE. I withhold the motion.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13276) to provide for the disposal of the present Federal building site at Newark, Ohio, and for the purchase of a new site for such building, to report it without amendment. I call the attention of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] to it.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LYNCHBURG, VA.

Mr. SWANSON. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13391) to increase the cost limit of the public building at Lynchburg, Va., to report it without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, August 18, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *August 17, 1911.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, strengthen, we beseech Thee, our faith in the eternal verities, that we may not become completely absorbed in the things which are temporal, that we may have great thoughts and do noble deeds, and thus build for ourselves a character which shall stand the test of time and leave behind us a record worthy of all emulation, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

THE RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to suggest a correction in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. On yesterday the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE] asked and obtained leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD. His remarks are extended in the RECORD and interlarded with the remarks 14 times occurs the word "applause," and once occurs the words "loud applause." The remarks were not delivered in the House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the gentleman, and I want to know to what page the gentleman refers?

Mr. MANN. To page 4031.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. To LITTLEPAGE. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman from Illinois anything more to say?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the RECORD be corrected by striking out from this speech the word "applause" where it occurs 14 times and the words "loud applause" where they occur once.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a question, as I am not informed. Was the gentleman from West Virginia given leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. He was given leave by unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, from the number of times that extensions of remarks have been made, interlarded with addresses from people all over the world, I think the gentleman has the right to extend his remarks as far as he wanted to do so.

Mr. MANN. I do not think he has the right in extending his remarks to insert actions of the House which did not take place.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman any motion to make touching the RECORD?

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that it be corrected.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I object.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the RECORD be corrected by striking out the words "applause" and "loud applause" where occurring in the speech of Mr. LITTLEPAGE on pages 4031, 4032, and 4033 of the RECORD.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to refer the matter to the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to refer the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the whole matter to the Committee on Printing. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 143, noes 71.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 122, answered "present" 13, not voting 79, as follows:

YEAS—171.

Adair	Edwards	Jones	Roddenbery
Adamson	Ellerbe	Kindred	Rothermel
Alexander	Evans	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rouse
Allen	Faison	Konop	Rubey
Ashbrook	Ferris	Korbly	Rucker, Colo.
Barnhart	Fields	Lamb	Rucker, Mo.
Bathrick	Finley	Lee, Ga.	Russell
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Lee, Pa.	Sabath
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Lewis	Saunders
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Linthicum	Scully
Booher	Foster, Ill.	Littleton	Shackleford
Borland	Fowler	Lloyd	Sharp
Brantley	Francis	Lobeck	Sheppard
Brown	Gallagher	McCoy	Sherwood
Buchanan	Garner	McDermott	Sims
Bulkley	Garrett	McGillicuddy	Sisson
Burke, Wis.	George	Macon	Small
Burnett	Glass	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Maher	Sparkman
Byrns, Tenn.	Goeke	Martin, Colo.	Stack
Callaway	Gould	Mays	Stedman
Carter	Graham	Moon, Tenn.	Stephens, Miss.
Clark, Fla.	Gray	Moore, Tex.	Stephens, Tex.
Clayton	Gregg, Pa.	Morrison	Stone
Cline	Gudger	Moss, Ind.	Sweet
Collier	Hamill	Murray	Talcott, N. Y.
Connell	Hamlin	Oldfield	Taylor, Ala.
Conry	Hammond	O'Shaunessy	Taylor, Colo.
Cox, Ind.	Hardwick	Padgett	Thayer
Cox, Ohio	Hardy	Page	Thomas
Cullop	Harrison, Miss.	Palmer	Townsend
Daugherty	Hay	Peters	Tribble
Davenport	Heflin	Porter	Turnbull
Dent	Helm	Post	Underhill
Dickinson	Henry, Tex.	Pou	Underwood
Dies	Holland	Pujo	Watkins
Difenderfer	Houston	Rainey	Webb
Dixon, Ind.	Howard	Raker	Whitacre
Donohoe	Hughes, Ga.	Randell, Tex.	White
Doremus	Hull	Ransdell, La.	Wickliffe
Doughton	Jacoway	Rauch	Wilson, Pa.
Driscoll, D. A.	Johnson, Ky.	Reilly	Witherspoon
Dupre	Johnson, S. C.	Richardson	

NAYS—122.

Akin, N. Y.	Bates	Burke, S. Dak.	Catlin
Ames	Bingham	Butler	Claypool
Anthony	Bowman	Campbell	Copley
Austin	Burke, Pa.	Cannon	Crago
Crumpacker	Hartman	McCreary	Roberts, Nev.
Currier	Haugen	McKenzie	Rodenberg
Dalzell	Hawley	McKinley	Sells
Danforth	Hayes	McKinney	Simmons
Davidson	Heald	McLaughlin	Sloan
Davis, Minn.	Helgesen	McMorran	Smith, J. M. C.
De Forrest	Henry, Conn.	Madden	Smith, Saml. W.
Dodds	Higgins	Madison	Speer
Draper	Hill	Mann	Steenerson
Driscoll, M. E.	Hinds	Martin, S. Dak.	Stephens, Cal.
Dwight	Howell	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Dyer	Howland	Miller	Switzer
Esch	Hubbard	Mondell	Taylor, Ohio
Farr	Humphrey, Wash.	Morgan	Thistlewood
Foss	Jackson	Morse, Wis.	Towner
Foster, Vt.	Kahn	Nelson	Utter
French	Kendall	Norris	Volstead
Fuller	Kennedy	Nye	Vreeland
Gillett	Kent	Olmsted	Warburton
Good	Knowland	Parran	Weeks
Green, Iowa	Kopp	Payne	Willis
Greene, Mass.	Lafean	Pickett	Wilson, Ill.
Griest	La Follette	Plumley	Woods, Iowa
Guernsey	Langham	Pray	Young, Kans.
Hamilton, Mich.	Lawrence	Prince	Young, Mich.
Hanna	Loud	Rees	
Harris	McCall	Reyburn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Bartlett	Humphreys, Miss.	Malby	Wilder
Burleson	Lever	Needham	
Fornes	Lindbergh	Patton, Pa.	
Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Wedemeyer	

NOT VOTING—79.

Aiken, S. C.	Cravens	Kinkead, N. J.	Prouty
Anderson, Minn.	Curley	Kitchin	Redfield
Anderson, Ohio	Davis, W. Va.	Konig	Riordan
Andrus	Denver	Lafferty	Roberts, Mass.
Ansberry	Dickson, Miss.	Langley	Robinson
Ayres	Estopinal	Latta	Sherley
Barchfeld	Fairchild	Legare	Slayden
Bartholdt	Focht	Lenroot	Slemp
Berger	Fordney	Levy	Smith, Tex.
Boehne	Gardner, N. J.	Lindsay	Stanley
Bradley	Goldfogle	Littlepage	Sterling
Broussard	Goodwin, Ark.	McGuire, Okla.	Sulloway
Burgess	Gregg, Tex.	McHenry	Sulzer
Calder	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moon, Pa.	Talbott, Md.
Candler	Harrison, N. Y.	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Cantrill	Hensley	Mott	Tuttle
Carlin	Hobson	Murdock	Wilson, N. Y.
Cary	Hughes, N. J.	Patten, N. Y.	Wood, N. J.
Cooper	Hughes, W. Va.	Pepper	Young, Tex.
Covington	James	Powers	

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLARK of Florida). The Clerk will announce the pairs:

The Clerk read as follows:

For the session:

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. SULLOWAY.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. SULZER with Mr. MALBY (and on all questions affecting a veto of the President).

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Until further notice:

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts (not to apply on vetoes).

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.

Mr. CURLEY with Mr. WILDER.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. CARY.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. PARRAN.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD (transferable).

Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. STERLING.

Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CRAVENS with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. DENVER with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GREGG of Texas with Mr. LAFFERTY.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BURLESON with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

From August 5 to August 19, inclusive:

Mr. REDFIELD with Mr. NEEDHAM (reserving the right to make a quorum and all votes affecting vetoes of the President).

Until August 19:

Mr. KONIG with Mr. POWERS.

Until Friday morning:

Mr. CANDLER with Mr. SLEMP.

Until Thursday noon:

Mr. JAMES with Mr. LONGWORTH (on all votes except vetoes of the President).

For the balance of the day:
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota.
On this vote:
Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. TILSON.
From to-day to the balance of the week:
Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. PROUTY.
The result was then announced, as above recorded.
The SPEAKER. The motion to refer is carried, and it goes to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution and bill of the following titles:
H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution for appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; and
H. R. 13277. An act to increase the limit of cost of the public building authorized to be constructed at Gettysburg, Pa.
The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:
S. 2904. An act to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to regulate the operation and equipment of the vehicles of the Metropolitan Coach Co.
The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) relative to the celebration in January, 1912, of the completion of the railroad to the island city of Key West, Fla.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:
S. 2904. An act to confer upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to regulate the operation and equipment of the vehicles of the Metropolitan Coach Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:
H. R. 8146. An act to construct a bridge across Rock River, at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois;
H. R. 4682. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River, at or near Glenhayes Station, in Wayne County, W. Va.; and
H. R. 11723. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between Burnett County, Wis., and Pine County, Minn.
The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:
S. 2055. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Bangor, Me., also for the sale of the site and ruins of the former post-office building.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:
H. R. 11019. An act to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool;
H. R. 4682. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Glenhayes Station, in Wayne County, W. Va.;
H. R. 11723. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the St. Croix River between Burnett County, Wis., and Pine County, Minn.; and
H. R. 8146. An act to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Curtiss, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:
S. 3253. An act to authorize the counties of Yell and Conway to construct a bridge across the Petit Jean River.

FREE-LIST BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Speaker to lay before the House House bill 4413, an act to place agricultural implements and other articles on the free list.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls up the conference report on the free-list bill.

The conference report and statement are as follows (No. 146):

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6, and agree to the same.
On the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7 and the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

O. W. UNDERWOOD,
C. B. RANDELL,
FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
J. W. BAILEY,
F. M. SIMMONS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, etc., submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:
On amendment No. 1: Places binders on the free list, as proposed by the Senate.
On amendment No. 2: Strikes out of the bill the provision, proposed by the House, limiting the application of the bill to boots and shoes of certain constituent parts only.
On amendments Nos. 3, 4, and 6: Makes verbal corrections in the text of the bill.
On the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5 and 7 and the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 the committee of conference have been unable to agree.

O. W. UNDERWOOD,
C. B. RANDELL,
FRANCIS BURTON HARRISON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House conferees agreed to the conference report. It leaves in disagreement three amendments of the Senate and one amendment of the House. I would like to arrange a division of time with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from New York that we confine debate on this proposition to an hour, and that he control half of it and that I control the other half.
Mr. PAYNE. I am agreeable to that.
Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are four motions I desire to make, but I desire to ask unanimous consent to make them all now, so that they will be pending before the House.
The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama what is the agreement with the gentleman from New York?
Mr. UNDERWOOD. That there shall be one hour's debate on the free-list bill, the gentleman from New York to control half the time and myself half the time.
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the debate on the conference report on this bill be limited to one hour, and that he control the first half of it and that the gentleman from New York control the other half. Is there objection?
There was no objection.
The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Alabama what is his other motion?
Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent to make at once the four motions that I desire to make in connection with this bill, in order to have them all pending at once.
Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman desire a separate vote on lemons?
Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; on each proposition.
Mr. MANN. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman that it does not need unanimous consent to give notice of the amend-

ments he will offer. They will be in order regardless of unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No doubt that is true, but I prefer to have the House determine.

Mr. MANN. What are they?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman what I propose to move. I propose to move to concur in Senate amendment No. 5, with an amendment striking out the word "corn," as it appears in line 11 of page 3 of the printed copy of the bill—I have not the original—and to concur in Senate amendment No. 7.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, does the gentleman propose to move to strike out "corn" and to insert "for purposes of distillation" after "corn"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will move to strike it out. The result is the same whichever method is followed. It is easier and less complicated to strike it out. I propose then to move to concur in Senate amendment No. 7, with an amendment striking out the word "corn" where it appears in line 19 of page 3 of the printed bill—wherever it appears correctly in the regular bill.

Mr. MANN. That is, the word "corn," with an amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. Then I propose to recede from the House amendment No. 1, inserting "lemons"; and then I propose to move to concur in Senate amendment No. 8, in reference to Roman and Portland cement.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not need unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. Certain motions are in order, and the notice covers them.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from Alabama withdraws his request for unanimous consent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I prefer to ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege, because when the hour is up there may be some question about my rights——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that, in addition to this amendment that he is offering now, when this hour of debate expires he shall have the right to offer three other amendments.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to make this suggestion and to obtain this parliamentary information if I can. The time for debate has been limited to one hour, and the previous question has not been ordered at the end of the hour. It will still be permissible to offer motions at the end of the hour. The gentleman from Alabama can offer his motions. On the other hand, if anyone on this side or that side desires to offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendments, it will be in order. I do not think the gentleman ought to take away any rights that any other gentleman may have. I ask for parliamentary information whether the agreement to close debate at the end of the hour in itself operates to prevent motions being made at the end of the hour?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think that it does not.

Mr. MANN. There is not any question about it.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Illinois objecting to this unanimous consent or not?

Mr. MANN. I will object, if the gentleman makes the request. I do not wish to cut the gentleman off from the opportunity to make his motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that unless the gentleman from Alabama moves the previous question at the end of this hour anybody who can get the floor can move——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to move the previous question, and I intended to allow the gentlemen on that side to offer——

Mr. MANN. I would suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that a motion for the previous question would not prevent a motion of priority, which is the motion to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And I have no desire to do so.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. It is not necessary to move the previous question. The debate is limited, and closes at the end of the hour.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Illinois objecting?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to put the bill through, notwithstanding the objections of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 5, with an amendment striking out the word "corn," where it appears in line 11, page 3, of the printed bill, and the corresponding place in the enrolled bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the House concur in Senate amendment No. 5, with an amendment striking out the word "corn," in line 11, page 3, of the printed bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this statement to the House. We passed a free-list bill, putting on the free list—

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

We also placed on the free list—

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

The House was in favor of that proposition. I believe to-day that the House—I know that the Democratic side of the House—is in favor of free meats and free bread for the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the bill went to the Senate the Senate added the following provision, both to the provision in the House bill relating to free meats and the provision relating to free bread. Their amendment was:

Insert after all words about these articles on the free list the following: "Coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this bill went to conference the conferees on the part of the House refused to agree to that Senate amendment, and stated that they insisted that the Senate should have another vote on the question of giving the American people free bread and free meat. We came to a partial agreement about minor amendments, but on these two important amendments we refused to agree and insisted that the bill should go back to the Senate for another vote. It went back to the Senate, and the Senate still insisted on its amendments and sent the bill back to the House with these amendments that prohibit meat and bread coming from any country in the world.

I understand, though, that the Senate is willing to pass the bill prohibiting meat and bread coming free from any country in the world except Canada; they are willing to pass the bill giving free bread and free meat from the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman say that it is his understanding that the so-called Kern amendment was for the purpose of preventing the introduction of meat and bread from any country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not say that that was the purpose. My friend misunderstood me.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman think that that was the intention, or was it a mistake?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was undoubtedly a mistake. The Kern amendment, by inserting the word "corn" in this amendment, prohibited bread and meat coming from Canada or any other country, because, under the reciprocal trade agreement, there is a tax on corn for distilling purposes going from this country into Canada. Therefore, if you pass the bill as it now reads without striking out the word "corn," you would not admit bread and meat free from any country. But if you strike out the word "corn," as I propose to do in my amendment, then you will prohibit free bread and meat coming from all other countries, but you will admit free bread and free meat from Canada. I understand that the Senate is willing to agree to that amendment and admit free bread and free meat from Canada.

But if we insist on free bread and free meat from the balance of the world it means that the bill will be defeated.

Now, there is no man in this House that is more anxious to have free bread and free meat from all the world than I am, because I believe that if there is anything that ought to go on the free list it is bread and meat for the people of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is no clause in this bill that is of more interest to my own constituency than this question of free bread and free meat. But I recognize the fact that we have got to surrender free bread and free meat or defeat this bill, and the propriety of surrendering rather than to deprive the people of the United States of the other great benefits they will receive under the enactment of this bill into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We will give to the country free agricultural

implements, we will give them free shoes, we will give them many other desirable things; and although I know that the Members on this side of the House desire to give the country free bread and free meat, I say the time has come when we are compelled to surrender as to these amendments in order that we may send to the President a meritorious bill.

Now, in reference to the Senate amendment putting Portland cement on the free list, so far as I know there has been no opposition from this side of the House and but very little from the other side.

As to lemons, put on by the House amendment, we refused to come to an agreement on free lemons. The Senate disagreed to our amendment. We insisted that they should take it back to the Senate for another vote. They did take it back, and the Senate defeated the amendment. Now, I say there is no more outrageous provision in the Payne tariff bill than the increased tax that they put on lemons.

They had a prohibitive duty on oranges, and have driven every foreign orange out of this country. The increased tax there was a fair tax, a high tax, at least a tax that was too high for the consumer, but gave all the protection to the lemon grower of California that he had a right to ask for in the Dingley bill, and the Payne bill increased it one-half. The result is going to be that if this tax on lemons stays on the statute books for a year or two longer, exactly the same thing is going to happen in reference to lemons that happened in reference to oranges. It is going to drive the Sicilian and the Italian lemon out of the American market, and the people of this country, and the hospitals, and the eleemosynary institutions that require lemons at the sick bed are going to be placed in the hands of one of the most drastic trusts that exists in the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So far as I am concerned, I would like to keep free lemons in this bill. I hope the day is not far distant when we can again legislate in reference to the tax on lemons and do justice to the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I realize that if the House stands out now for its amendment for free lemons on this bill the bill is defeated, and I think it is wise for us to surrender and take what we can get and remedy these other evils when we can get to them in a no distant day, as I am sure we will have the opportunity to do.

Mr. Speaker, after the debate on this proposition is over, I will make my motion in reference to the other amendment. I now reserve the balance of my time and ask the Chair to tell me how much time I have consumed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAGE). The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state what, in my judgment, will be the effect of this amendment. Two years ago the Payne tariff bill reduced the tariff on meats about 25 per cent. That was a Republican reduction, made by a Republican Congress—Republican in both branches—and by a Republican Ways and Means Committee; substantially an average reduction of 25 per cent on meats straight through. I wanted meats free then, and I am for free meat now. Shortly after that the Canadian reciprocity negotiations were begun by the President, and a Republican administration endeavored by its negotiations to have free meat between the United States and Canada. They did not succeed in it because Canada objected, but the Republican administration did succeed in reducing under the reciprocity treaty the duty on meats between these two countries by 16⅔ per cent. That makes a reduction of 41 per cent on meats during this Republican administration, and nothing by the Democratic Members of this Congress, now in practical control of both branches of it. Now, then, what came next? The reciprocity agreement was concluded, and there were those who honestly believed that they could not eat cattle, but must eat meat; that they could not eat wheat, but must eat flour; and so the Democratic Party brought in this free-list bill providing for free meat and free flour from all the world. Then the Republicans tried to secure a market for our farmers by insisting on reciprocal treatment of this product with other countries, and the Democrats refused even that. The bill passed this House and went to the Senate, and an amendment was put on there by a Democrat and voted for by every Democrat in the Senate, making meat dutiable at the Payne rate from all the world. That is the situation. Not a dollar of reduction on meats has been made by anybody except the Republican Party. An indorsement and approval of the Payne rates has been given by every Democrat in the Senate, and now every Democrat on the floor of this House proposes to supplement that indorsement. That is the situation exactly as it is. I propose to ask permission to insert as a part of my remarks an extract from the New York World of August 18, 1911, giving the prices of meats this year and last year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to insert an extract in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. HILL. Oh, it is Democratic authority, and you surely will not object to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I did not rise to object, but I would like to ask the question, If my friend disputes for a moment that every Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee during the consideration of the Payne bill was in favor of free meat?

Mr. HILL. Oh, the people of the United States look at the results and not at individual explanations. I am giving a statement of conditions exactly as they are, and when the gentleman from Colorado——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman put it on, and he voted for a rule to prevent us from amending it and cutting it off.

Mr. HILL. Very well. When the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER], a Democrat, the other day took the floor on this conference report, I said to him, "Does not this amendment put the Democratic Party squarely in the position of being in favor of the Payne rate of duty on meats as it is now contained in the Payne bill?" and he replied that it did. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], said last night, and he repeats it now, that he is compelled to recede and concur with the Senate on this question, in order to save the rest of the bill. So that the Democratic Party not only deliberately continues in effect a duty on meat by its vote in both Houses, but it gives us the terms and conditions under which they do it. Now, what are they?

What is the rest of this bill? First, free agricultural implements. We have them now free from every export country in the world except Germany, and we can have them from Germany if they will admit ours. What is the next item—this is no gift, it is a trade—what is the next item? We swap free bread for free barbed wire. The men in the Scriptures who asked for bread and were given a stone had a royal feast compared to the American people who, under Democratic legislation, are offered taxed food in exchange for free barbed wire. [Applause on the Republican side.] We swap free meat, for what? Free cotton ties. An industry of $700,000,000, averaging 20 per cent duty now, and you absolutely and deliberately say you are willing to sacrifice cheaper food for the wage earners and consumers of this country in exchange for free cotton ties for the southern cotton grower.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Connecticut knows that is not true——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will give me more time, I will yield to him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman makes a statement that is not true.

Mr. HILL. Then the gentleman can correct it in his own time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We have not made any swaps.

Mr. HILL. Fresh meats, ham, bacon, flour, the food of the people—$1,500,000,000 of it—and a month ago these men came in their holy purity and said they were going to give to the wage earners of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, New Orleans—the men who work in the factories and shops—that they were going to give them free food, and you swap it off now for bagging for cotton and save $600,000 to the million growers of cotton, and, as you have admitted in your free-list report would be the effect, you lose more than $100,000,000 to 90,000,000 consumers in this country. That is your swap. That is the trade you are making now with your Democratic brethren in the Senate.

Why do you not stand up to your claim of a month ago and have free meat and free flour? If you can not get it in any other way than by losing this bill, sacrifice your cotton growers, sacrifice your cotton ties, sacrifice your cotton bagging, sacrifice your barbed wire. They are insignificant compared with the needs the poor people——

Mr. FITZGERALD rose.

Mr. HILL. I will yield to the gentleman because I know he is in favor of free meat for his own people.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman was in favor of free meats when the Payne bill was under consideration, was he not?

Mr. HILL. I said I did try to get free meats; we did get a reduction of 25 per cent.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why did not the gentleman make a sacrifice of the New England manufacturers when he could not get free meats? [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I hope that will not be taken out of my time; it is so very seldom I am applauded by my enemies I want them to have full scope. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me a question. I did not stand on this floor preaching one doctrine to the House of Representatives and another to my constituents at home in a campaign. [Applause on the Republican side.] I stand for a moderate tariff that will absolutely recognize the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. [Cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side.] Absolutely.

Mr. GARNER. Does that apply to meat?

Mr. HILL. It applies to everything.

Mr. GARNER. Then, why did you want to put meats on the free list?

Mr. HILL. Because we can produce and do, and export from one hundred and seventy-five to two hundred million dollars' worth every year, raised cheaper here than in any other country on earth.

Mr. GARNER. Then, the tariff does not make any difference——

Mr. HILL. It is immaterial whether it makes any difference or not, I stand on the principle; you do not. You trade a principle for cotton ties, cotton bagging, and barbed wire and sacrifice the people of this country to your own interests to make a little larger profits in the cotton-growing industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The statement is as follows:

RETAILERS WILL BOOST ALL MEAT PRICES TO-MORROW—ADVANCE BY WHOLESALERS OF FROM 3 TO 5 CENTS A POUND FORCES THEM TO ASK MORE—PACKERS PLEAD THERE'S A SCARCITY OF CATTLE—CHICAGO REPORTS DON'T SHOW THIS TO BE TRUE—POTATOES GETTING DEARER.

New York housekeepers may look for higher prices for almost every kind of meat to-morrow. In the face of an advance in the wholesale prices for beef and pork of from 3 to 5 cents a pound, many of the retail dealers have been able to keep their prices down because they had laid in large stocks of meat at the lower figures.

Interviews with many large retail dealers by a reporter for the World yesterday showed, however, that the breaking point has come, and that retail dealers generally will be obliged to advance prices to-morrow. In pork of the first quality dealers who have been keeping the retail price at from 18½ cents to 20 will be forced to demand 25 cents, which is said to be a record price.

TWO CENTS MORE FOR PORTERHOUSE.

Porterhouse steaks that some dealers have been able to keep at 28 cents during the week will jump to 30 and 31 cents. Hams are already held at 24 cents retail, as against 20 cents two weeks ago, and must go higher in view of the advanced wholesale price.

Wholesale prices can be quoted with some accuracy, although there are many sides to the dealing in meats that make this almost impossible. To give retail prices in an understandable manner it is always necessary to obtain comparative figures of dealers in the same neighborhood at different times.

Dr. Ira S. Wile and Miss Winifred Gibbs, who made an exhaustive study of food conditions last year, found that four classes furnished the smallest number into which they could divide retail prices of meats that are called by the same name. At the present time a comparison of prices between some west side stores one year ago and between some east side stores to-day might seemingly show a falling off in price.

On the other hand, a comparison between prices of some east side dealers one year ago and the present prices of some west side dealers might show such an increase in price as to frighten the public. By taking the reports of the books of the same dealers in different localities it was shown yesterday that prices for meats are generally 1 or 2 cents above the average high level last year when the entire country was stirred by the high prices.

PREDICTS VERY HIGHEST PRICES.

In view of the fact that many retail butchers have been holding back on raising prices, one Fourth Avenue butcher stated yesterday he believed the coming week would see the highest prices ever recorded for meats.

An official of Swift & Co. reiterated yesterday the statement of the packers that there is a scarcity of cattle. Reports from Chicago do not show such a scarcity. Receipts of cattle for last week were 59,081, and for the week before 60,351, as against receipts of 50,184 for the first week in August, 1910, and 59,110 for the second week.

In connection with the increased prices of meats, the jump in the price of potatoes is said by many dealers to be likely to be most seriously felt here. Again prices vary according to locality, but Arthur Liess, of No. 3407 Broadway, gives the following comparison in the retail prices:

7 CENTS MORE THAN LAST YEAR.

"Last year at this time potatoes were selling at 18 cents for a basket of 2½ pounds. The price dropped to 17 cents, but is now 25 cents a basket, with every prospect of going higher."

Several of the butchers interviewed said new high prices would be forced by the fact that for the last 18 months or more they have been receiving 4 cents a pound for fat. This enabled the butchers to trim their meats carefully and sell at a low price. Now the packers have dropped their price for fat to 2 cents, with the result that on a trimmed steak or roast the butcher must charge 2 cents a pound more or be less careful in the trimming.

COMPARATIVE RETAIL PRICES IN ONE BUTCHER SHOP IN THE LAST YEAR.

To give retail prices that will show any comparison of figures with accuracy, the same dealers in the same localities must be quoted. To compare prices in some east-side shops one year ago with prices in some west-side shops to-day would give no idea of conditions. In the following table the World uses the retail figures of M. Utter, a meat dealer in upper Broadway. He has neither multimillionaires nor very poor for his customers. All figures are for first-class meats:

	1910		1911	
	Aug. 12.	Nov. 1.	Feb. 1.	Aug. 11.
Poterhouse steak	$0.26	$0.27	$0.23	$0.23
Sirloin	.22	.23	.20	.24
Prime beef, including bone	.21	.22	.20	.22
Round	.21	.22	.20	.22
Lamb chops	.27	.28	.25	.28
Pork chops	.20	.22	.18	.25
Hams	.20	.23	.19	.24

Market conditions to-morrow are expected to result in increased prices at retail. The profit on several lines is at present 2 cents a pound less than formerly.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Speaker, the attempt of the leader of the Democratic majority [Mr. UNDERWOOD], backed up by the solid vote of the other side of the House, to place lemons upon the free list, without any hearing or warning whatever, is, in my opinion, one of the most remarkable and unjustifiable movements in the history of tariff legislation.

What is the history of this attempt to subject the lemon industry of this country to the penalty of absolute free trade?

The bill now under consideration, and which is a measure to place certain articles upon the free list, was christened by its authors for political purposes "The farmers' free-list bill," and was declared by its sponsors to be a bill primarily for the purpose of reducing the prices of certain articles which the farmers of the country are supposed to buy. Lemons being an agricultural product, of course, that product could not logically be included in such a bill. However, when the bill was on its passage through this House two amendments were offered to the bill designed to place lemons on the free list. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], leader of the majority, recognizing that such an amendment was illogical, himself interposed points of order against each amendment to the effect that such an amendment was not germane to the bill, and the Chair promptly ruled that the point of order was well taken, and that such amendments could not be offered to the bill.

When this bill went to the Senate and was under consideration in that body, an amendment putting lemons upon the free list, and incorporating it in the bill, upon an actual vote was rejected by that body, not upon the merits, I regret to say, but because at that point in the consideration of the bill nearly all Democratic Senators desired to pass the bill without amendment, and a large majority of Republican Senators were against the bill in any form.

The two attempts in the House and the one attempt in the Senate upon this bill to subject the lemon industry to the penalty of free trade having failed and the Democratic majority having announced to the country that no attempt would be made to consider the agricultural schedule of the tariff until next session of Congress, the action of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in endeavoring to remove all duties from imported lemons is remarkable indeed. What next followed, Mr. Speaker? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] a few days ago, when he made the formal motion to send the free-list bill to conference, included in that motion a motion to concur in the Senate amendment putting cement and lime upon the free list by adding the words "and lemons." This was a remarkable action on the part of the chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means of this House, and, in my opinion, considering all the circumstances, his action is unprecedented. After both Houses had refused to include lemons in the bill in question the action of the gentleman from Alabama, in making the mere formal motion to send the bill to conference, to include in such motion a motion to concur in a Senate amendment by adding the words "and lemons," when the gentleman himself in the prior consideration of the bill had taken the position that such a motion was out of order, is truly remarkable. And this motion was made at a time when I was ill and sick in bed and had been excused on that account from attendance upon the House. It would seem that fair treatment would require that the Representative upon the Ways and Means Committee from the State most interested should at least have had some intimation or notice that such an important motion would be included in the mere formal procedure of putting the bill in conference. But I must assume that the gentlemen upon the other side in their efforts at tariff smashing do not consider it of any importance that an industry which is about to be subjected to the penalty of absolute free trade should have any notice whatever that such action is con-

templated. This attempted action of the Democratic majority in this House furnishes a good example of the consideration given tariff legislation during this session by the Democratic side.

The motion now pending, submitted by the gentleman from Alabama to recede from the House amendment to the Senate amendment, placing lemons on the free list and to concur in the Senate amendment, I thoroughly appreciate will relieve the lemon industry so far as this bill is concerned from the attempt to subject it to free trade. I am therefore in sympathy with the motion made by the gentleman from Alabama and shall support it. I appreciate, however, that this is a mere temporary respite from the agitation which our friends on the other side of the aisle have started in favor of reckless tariff revision. I thoroughly understand that this effort inaugurated by the Democratic Party will be renewed, and I thank the gentleman from Alabama for the timely notice which he has given us of his intention in this regard.

I desire to incorporate in my remarks at this point the language of the gentleman from Alabama in this respect. The reporter's notes show that the gentleman said:

As to lemons, put on by the House amendment, we refused to come to an agreement on free lemons. The Senate disagreed to our amendment. We insisted that they should take it back to the Senate for another vote. They did take it back, and the Senate defeated the amendment. Now, I say there is no more outrageous provision in the Payne tariff bill than the increased tax that they put on lemons.

They had a prohibitive duty on oranges, and have driven every foreign orange out of this country. The increased tax there was a fair tax, a high tax, at least a tax that was too high for the consumer, but gave all the protection to the lemon grower of California that he had a right to ask for in the Dingley bill, and the Payne bill increased it one-half. The result is going to be that if this tax on lemons stays on the statute books for a year or two longer exactly the same thing is going to happen in reference to lemons that happened in reference to oranges. It is going to drive the Sicilian and the Italian lemon out of the American market, and the people of this country and the hospitals and the eleemosynary institutions that require lemons at the sick bed are going to be placed in the hands of one of the most drastic trusts that exist in the United States. So far as I am concerned, I would like to keep free lemons in this bill. I hope the day is not far distant when we can again legislate in reference to the tax on lemons and do justice to the American people. But I realize that if the House stands out now for its amendment for free lemons on this bill the bill will be defeated, and I think it is wise for us to surrender and take what we can get and remedy these other evils when we can get to them in a not distant day, as I am sure we will have the opportunity to do.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the frank statement of the leader of the Democratic majority just made to this House. I am glad he has stated in effect what is his purpose, as it will put the growers of citrus fruits in California upon notice. I take it that his statement means that he proposes, if possible, not only to place lemons upon the free list but also to materially reduce the duty on oranges, and then I suppose it is his purpose and desire to reduce the rates on other products of California. For many campaigns I have been telling the people of California that if the Democratic Party had complete control of the two Houses of Congress and of the Presidency not a single industry of that State would escape the destructive tariff legislation of the Democratic Party. I have repeated this warning so often that many protectionists in our State began to believe that it was not made in good faith and that it was an exaggeration upon my part designed to advance my reelection to this body. Democratic candidates for Congress in California have for years denied that any industry of California need be afraid of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President. Every Democratic candidate for Congress in California since I have been in politics has declared again and again that, in the event of the election of a Democratic administration in the executive and legislative branches of the Government the growers in California of citrus fruits, raisins, grapes, olives, nuts, wine, figs, prunes, and other products of the soil need have no fear. If the action of the Democratic majority in its attempt to subject the lemon industry to the penalty of absolute free trade without notice or hearing and the announced determination of the leader upon that side to continue this effort shall serve to awaken the people of California to the true situation, his action in this regard will not have been without benefit.

I appreciate that the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, now pending, will carry, and that the lemon growers of California will continue to receive, at least until the next session of Congress, the same protection which they now have in the Payne bill. I thoroughly appreciate, however, that if the proposition to place lemons upon the free list was submitted to either body of Congress at this session as a separate proposition, freed from political combinations and promises, that it would undoubtedly carry in both Houses of Congress, and that only the presidential veto at this time could save the industry from being utterly destroyed. The combination now in control in the Senate, made for ulterior purposes only, may for the time being, in order to carry out certain promises, be unwilling to subject the lemon industry to the extreme penalty of free trade. Still, however, that combination, in my opinion, is merely temporary, is a mere rope of sand, liable to separate at any moment. I fear that when that temporary understanding shall be at an end in the Senate and the obligations and promises now existing discharged, if the membership of that body were permitted to vote their true sentiments, freed from all obligations and promises, that the lemon industry would be subjected to free trade by practically a solid Democratic vote, augmented by enough Republican Senators to bring about that result. I say this because I do not wish the industry to rest in any fancied security that the present Senate situation promises any permanent protection. I am grateful and I feel that the industry should be thankful even for the temporary cause which postpones, even if it does not prevent, destruction and gives an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I confidently believe that if the lemon growers of California were given an opportunity to be heard, or if that industry were investigated by the Tariff Board, the following results would be shown:

First. That since the present duty of 1½ cents a pound upon lemons was imposed by the Payne law the importations of lemons into this country have actually increased. The records show that there were imported for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, which was the last fiscal year under the Dingley law, 135,183,550 pounds of lemons. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, when the duty was 1½ cents, as provided in the Payne law, there were imported 160,214,785 pounds, or an increase of approximately 25,000,000 pounds. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, there were imported 134,968,924 pounds. This was an apparent decrease in importations of 214,626 pounds, or 2,940 boxes, as compared with the last fiscal year of the Dingley bill. But actual importations have not decreased. The weekly publication of the New York Fruit Exchange, under date of August 4, 1911, shows importations of foreign lemons as follows:

	Boxes.
Month of July 1910	265,000
Month of July, 1911	387,525

This is an increase in July, 1911, over July, 1910, of 122,525 boxes, or approximately 9,000,000 pounds, for the month of July only. Do not these figures show that the importers of foreign lemons deliberately, with a view of causing the receipts for the year ending June 30, 1911, to show a decrease, held back importations until the first few days of July, 1911? The abnormal increase of approximately 9,000,000 pounds in the importation of foreign lemons during the month of July, 1911, as compared with the same month in 1910, can lead to no other conclusion than that importations were deliberately held back and that cargoes were not permitted to be landed until after July 1, so that this decrease could be shown for the fiscal year just mentioned.

The statement, therefore, of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, when the original motion was submitted by the gentleman from Alabama to place lemons upon the free list, that the importation of lemons had decreased is found by actual figures and statistics to be absolutely without foundation.

Second. It can be shown that there has been a large increase in the revenue which the Government has collected from imported lemons under the Payne law as compared with that collected under the Dingley law. It is hardly necessary to more than state this proposition, because the mere statement of it carries its own proof. The amount of revenue collected upon imported lemons for the year ending June 30, 1911, was $2,024,533.86, while the amount of revenue collected for the last fiscal year of the Dingley law was $1,351,835.50, an increase in one year in favor of the Treasury of the United States of the sum of $672,698.36. The amount collected the first year under the Payne law was much larger. From the standpoint of revenue, therefore, the present rate is entirely justified, and the attempt to put this article upon the free list when it has proven such an excellent producer of revenue is inexplicable to me.

Third. An impartial investigation will show, and the lemon growers of California, if given an opportunity, can show, in my judgment, that the prices of lemons to the consumers since the Payne law has been in effect have actually decreased, all statements to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. W. L. Moulton, representative of the Citrus Fruit Growers of California in New York City, furnishes me with the following table, which can easily be confirmed upon investigation, giving the prices of Sicilian lemons in New York City during the week ending

August 5, 1911, and corresponding weeks in 1908 and 1907. Please remember that all sales of lemons in New York City are made at public auction:

	Week ending Aug. 5, 1911.	Week ending Aug. 5, 1908.	Week ending Aug. 5, 1907.
First choice, 300	$2.50 to $4.63	$3.85 to $4.50	$3.38 to $4.75
Second choice, 300	2.00 to 3.50	3.15 to 3.95	2.63 to 4.25
First choice, 360	2.50 to 4.00	3.10 to 3.65	3.63 to 4.75
Second choice, 360	2.00 to 3.00	2.70 to 3.25	2.72 to 4.25
Small sizes	1.75 to 3.25	2.52 to 2.75	2.25 to 3.50

These figures show that prices of lemons have been lower than they were before the passage of the Payne Act.

In addition to the foregoing, I have priced lemons in the markets and upon the streets in Washington very frequently, both before and after the passage of the Payne law, and I assert without fear of successful contradiction that they have been cheaper since that law went into effect than they were before. This very morning, on my way to the Capitol, I priced lemons and found them selling on the streets for 8, 10, and 12 cents a dozen, and in the markets the best lemons were to be obtained for 15, and none above 20 cents per dozen.

Fourth. It can be shown that large investments have been made upon the strength of the increased duty, there having been an additional acreage of lemons planted of approximately 30 per cent since the passage of the Payne law. These investments have been made upon the strength of the increased duty, and would be entirely sacrificed or destroyed if the duty were removed. In this connection I assert that there is ample territory in the State of California suitable for the growing of lemons that will make it possible, with the protection given by the Payne law, to lead within a comparatively short time to the production of sufficient lemons to supply the American market, a result greatly to be desired for reasons which I hope to enlarge upon further on in my speech.

Fifth. It can be shown, in my opinion, if a hearing is granted, that the lemon importers have raised a fund estimated at from $40,000 to $75,000, to be used in their campaign to place lemons upon the free list. According to my information, this fund has been obtained in the following manner: An assessment was first made of 5 cents a box upon each box of imported lemons. When this action became public the importers of lemons induced the steamship companies to increase the freight rate on lemons twopence a box, which is a little over 4 cents, and then a rebate equal to the increase in freight per box was granted by the steamship companies, which went into the fund. This action of the importers and the steamship companies, if proven to be true, as I believe it can be, indicates that much of the publicity campaign which has been carried on in favor of putting lemons upon the free list is a purely artificial and manufactured public sentiment. The manner of raising the fund, if it came from domestic transportation companies instead of foreign companies operating upon the ocean, would subject those responsible for the same to the penalties of our laws; but as the fund is made up of rebates given by foreign transportation companies operating upon the high seas, there is no jurisdiction in our laws to deal with such reprehensible action. The knowledge that such a fund has been collected by importers of foreign products and by foreign corporations to be used in a campaign to advance the interests of the foreign producer by methods akin to corruption, and to destroy the domestic producer, ought to result in a demand that even the Democratic majority in this Chamber will not dare ignore; that the domestic grower of lemons be given fair treatment; that he at least receive treatment equal to the foreign producer and importer. Mr. Speaker, we ask fair treatment and demand a hearing.

Sixth. I assert, and I believe it can be shown, that the importation of lemons into the United States is controlled by a very few individuals, who are organized into a drastic combination which follows all the practices of a criminal trust. This small coterie of powerful importers control absolutely the whole business of importation of lemons into this country. I am informed, and I believe my information is correct, that on account of the low prices of lemons in this country at the present time the importers are now reshipping large quantities of lemons, which were destined for the port of New York, to London and other ports in order to systematically starve the market and thus cause high prices in this country, so that these prices may be made to run to the highest level possible between now and the next session of Congress. I think it may be reasonably predicted that owing to the direct manipulation of the importers of foreign lemons that the prices of the product will be artificially advanced because of the action just enumerated for the ulterior purpose of attempting to influence the action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the island of Sicily furnishes most of the lemons that go into the markets of the world. In Italy proper and in Spain and in a few other localities lemons are produced, but the great competitor and the most promising rival to the Sicilian grower of lemons is the grower in the State of California. The Sicilian importer now enjoys the larger portion of the market of the United States, and distributes his product to practically all the territory of the United States east of the Missouri River. The California grower of lemons realizes that he is engaged in a tremendous struggle even for a fair share of the market of his own country. He confidently believes that under the American policy of protection he is entitled to at least an equal chance in the markets of his own land. The Democratic Party and those who are against the protective policy may temporarily discourage and embarrass and cause financial loss to the growers of domestic lemons, but the time will come when the friends of the protective policy will demand that this industry, as well as every other industry worthy of protection, shall be accorded that protection, and that the same shall be maintained by the laws of the land.

Seventh. I deny absolutely the statement made by both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], and other Democratic Members, that there is a domestic Lemon Trust, or anything approximating a trust. Many years ago the citrus-fruit growers of California, after years of struggle with the foreign producers, realized that their industry could be strengthened and the legitimate profits of the industry obtained for the actual growers of the fruit if they could effect an organization and sell in cooperation their product. There followed the organization of various fruit exchanges or associations throughout the territory in California where citrus fruits are grown. These exchanges were represented by a central organization, which became in time to be known as the California Fruit Growers' Exchange. These various associations are made up of actual growers of citrus fruits, and the purpose of the organization is to sell their product in cooperation. This organization does not in any sense fix prices, but simply acts as an agent for the producer so that the actual profits may be retained by the grower. Only about 60 per cent of the area devoted to citrus fruits belongs to the California Fruit Growers' Exchange. A thorough examination of the methods of marketing by this association will show that it is in no sense a trust. In fact, the central agency in selling the product of the grower, other than at auction, first notifies him of the price that can be obtained before the sale is made. About 25 per cent of the product is sold at auction in the open market. Furthermore, except to a very limited extent, it is impossible to artificially raise prices in the sale of perishable articles. The product in question must be sold within a short time after it is ready for market, and for prices regulated by demand and supply. The California Fruit Growers' Exchange endeavors, as the representative of the growers, to place the product of its members in the markets and consuming centers of the country in such quantities and at such times as will supply the demand. It is the purpose of this organization to distribute the product of its members, always with their consent, at those points where the demand is such that the product will be disposed of at fair and reasonable prices. This cooperative organization of the growers is organized for the very purpose of meeting the demands of the market in a fair and reasonable way, and thus obtaining for the farmer or grower the legitimate profit upon his product at prices which the demand and the supply fairly justify. If it were not for this cooperative selling organization carried on by the citrus-fruit growers, the whole industry of marketing these products would be controlled by nongrowers to the profit of the nongrower, and frequently to the loss of the actual grower or farmer. I sincerely trust that the Tariff Board will make a thorough and impartial study of the methods employed by the California Fruit Growers' Exchange in marketing these products, because I have every confidence that if this be done it can result only in a finding that will be favorable and creditable to this organization, and that it will disprove the assertion so flippantly made that there is a Lemon Trust or a Citrus-fruit Trust in this country.

Eighth. The growers of domestic lemons desire a hearing and an investigation in order that they may refute the libel which has been industriously and widely circulated to the effect that the increase in the duty upon lemons was granted in the Payne law in order that the transportation companies might get the benefit. Mr. Speaker, I desire to put before the House the true facts in regard to this matter. For many years the freight rate upon both oranges and lemons from California to

all eastern terminals east of Denver was a flat rate, or what is known as a postage-stamp rate, of $1.25 per hundred pounds, which was reduced subsequently to $1.15 per hundred pounds.

Some years ago the growers of lemons in California, on account of the tremendous competition of the Sicilian grower and the low rate of duty upon imported lemons, realized that they were selling their lemons at a loss, and threatened to cease picking the lemon crop, and many of the owners of lemon orchards converted their lemon trees into orange trees by the process of budding and grafting. The transcontinental railroad companies, appreciating that under the circumstances the lemon grower could not continue in business and ship his product to the eastern markets, and not desiring to lose the tonnage which the failure to ship lemons would bring about, voluntarily reduced the rate upon lemons from $1.15 per hundred to $1 per hundred pounds, with the avowed purpose of inducing the lemon grower to continue to ship his lemons. Shortly after the tariff duty on lemons was increased from 1 cent a pound to 1½ cents a pound the freight traffic association of the transcontinental railroads met and raised the freight rate upon lemons to equal the rate charged on oranges—that is, $1.15 a hundred. The citrus-fruit growers of California immediately took the necessary steps in the courts and before the Interstate Commerce Commission to test the reasonableness of the increase made in the lemon rate. At the same time the citrus-fruit growers inaugurated a proceeding before the Interstate Commerce Commission to reduce the freight rate on oranges from $1.15 a hundred to $1 a hundred. The two propositions were tried before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that tribunal decided that a rate of $1 per hundred on lemons was a reasonable rate, and the increased rate attempted to be made by the transcontinental railroad companies has not been collected. I understand an appeal has been taken to the Court of Commerce, where the matter is now pending. The Interstate Commerce Commission decided in the orange rate case that $1.15 a hundred pounds was a reasonable rate, the commission basing its finding for a different rate upon oranges from that of lemons upon the ground that the average haul of oranges (oranges going into all the consuming centers of the East and the bulk of the lemons produced in California being marketed in the consuming centers west of the Missouri River), being greater than the average haul of lemons, justified a greater freight rate. Mr. Speaker, it thus appears that the citrus-fruit growers of California did not acquiesce in the action of the transcontinental railroad companies in their effort to obtain a part of the increase granted by Congress in the lemon duty. On the contrary they promptly and vigorously put forth every effort to retain for the growers of lemons whatever benefit was granted to them by Congress in the increased rate of duty, and unless the Court of Commerce shall reverse the finding of the Interstate Commerce Commission the benefit of the increased duty will remain with the grower. This disposes of another baseless charge which has been widely circulated with the purpose of injuring the lemon grower of California. Of course the action of the railroad companies was unjustifiable and foolish and approved by no one.

Ninth. I am confident that an impartial investigation into the lemon industry in this country and abroad will show that the present duty of 1½ cents per pound on imported lemons should be maintained; that such a rate is no more than sufficient to meet the difference in the cost in the production of this article at home and abroad, and it is especially necessary to maintain the duty at this rate to give that encouragement to the domestic industry which is necessary to attract capital to invest in the industry of planting lemons and the production of that article for the supply of the domestic market.

The lemon growers of this country, instead of raising a vast sum for the purpose of carrying on a campaign to influence public opinion in their behalf, have gone to work in a systematic and honorable way by making a thorough study of the cost of producing lemons in this country and the cost of producing lemons in foreign countries, with a view of ascertaining as far as it is possible the difference in the domestic and foreign cost of production. The citrus-fruit growers of California, in order to make this investigation after long consideration, obtained the services of Mr. G. Harold Powell, who had been for many years the assistant chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, and who is recognized and conceded to be the leading expert upon the lemon industry in the United States, for the purpose of making this investigation. Mr. Powell has recently returned from a trip to Europe, and is now at work upon a detailed report making a comparison of the domestic with the foreign lemon industry. This report is not yet ready. However, I have a letter from Mr. Powell which bears upon this subject, written to me under date of July 5 last, which I shall print with these remarks as an appendix.

I maintain that in levying tariff duties it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to fix a rate that is adequate, not solely to measure the bare difference in the cost of production of the article at home and abroad, but that it must be sufficient to encourage the domestic production of the article. This is especially true and preeminently the case where the article to be produced is of a perishable nature, and where the returns from the investment made in the enterprise can not be expected until five or six years subsequent to the original investment. An enterprise which has for its object the production of a staple article promises an immediate return upon the capital invested. In addition, a staple article such as iron or steel suffers no particular deterioration if it is not marketed immediately when it is ready to be sold. It can be carried from year to year without much loss. Therefore, in fixing a duty upon such an article, if the duty covers the difference in the cost of producing the article at home and abroad, it meets the requirements of a protective policy.

On the other hand, if capital is invested in an enterprise such as the production of lemons for the market, no returns can be expected from the investment short of five or six years. The land must be purchased and prepared for the planting of the orchard and time must elapse for the first crop to be ready for the market, and after the crop is ready for the market it is of a perishable nature and must be disposed of when placed upon the market within a comparatively short time or there is a loss. Those who enter upon such an enterprise are entitled, under our protective policy, to adequate and ample protection. There is a million acres in the State of California suitable for the growing of lemons. A wise policy demands that we should encourage the planting and cultivation of these acres, and I thoroughly believe that if the present duty on lemons can be maintained for the next 10 or 12 years the production of lemons in this country would be expanded to the point where it will supply the domestic demand. Such a result would be of incalculable benefit to the consumers of the United States. It would result in the expansion of the lemon industry to the point now occupied by the orange industry. The orange industry of the United States is now able to meet the demand, and oranges are cheaper in the United States than ever before and are sold in the markets of this country cheaper than apples.

If the Democratic Party and those in sympathy with its efforts upon the tariff question shall succeed in subjecting the lemon industry to the penalty of absolute free trade, it will mean that the domestic production of lemons will be destroyed; that the capital invested will be sacrificed; that the lemon orchards of the country will be transformed into orange orchards or abandoned altogether. This will mean that the Sicilian monopoly will absolutely control the lemon market of the United States, with power to fix prices at whatever figures it desires and which prices the domestic consumer must pay. Under such conditions it is inevitable that prices will be inordinately advanced. Will the people of this country be so indifferent to their true interests as to permit such a consummation? I can not believe that any such result can be accomplished, even though the leader of the Democratic majority upon this floor warns us that such is the purpose of himself and his associates.

Mr. Speaker, I have voted against every tariff bill presented at this session except the measure providing for reciprocity between the United States and Canada, which is a measure standing alone as a distinct policy. Every other tariff measure presented by the Democratic majority has violated every principle of the policy of protection. The wool bill, the free-list bill, and the cotton bill are all measures illy considered, presented to the Congress of the United States without any hearing. Those interested in these industries and affected by these bills were insolently denied an opportunity to be heard. These bills are crowded with examples of Democratic incompetency in tariff making. None of these measures has been considered or reported upon by the Tariff Board. I do not believe that a Republican President will stultify himself by approving any one of these ill-prepared measures. He can perform no greater service to the country and its industries than by promptly vetoing these measures. [Applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
CITRUS PROTECTIVE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Cal., July 5, 1911.

Hon. J. C. NEEDHAM,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEEDHAM: I have recently returned from an extended investigation of the citrus-fruit industry of Italy and Spain. My attention has been called to the Daily Consular and Trade Reports of May

20, 1911, which contains an account of lemon growing in Sicily. The report was prepared by Mr. Nicolo Marasa, of Palermo. It was transmitted by Consul Hernando de Soto, of Palermo.

I wish to call your attention to the purpose of the Marasa report and the conditions under which it was prepared. The report was to be placed before committees in Congress to show the cost of producing lemons in Sicily and was to be used by the Italian importers in New York and the exporters in Italy in their combined campaign to place citrus fruits on the free list. I was informed by the Lega Agrumaria, an organization of Palermo exporters, which is handling the tariff campaign in Italy, that Mr. Marasa, who is a Palermo druggist or chemist, is the most competent person that could have been selected in Sicily to prepare the statement desired by the New York lemon importers. A copy of the report was transmitted to the State Department by the consul in Palermo, thereby making the document public at this time.

I do not care to criticize the Marasa report in detail, as the Italian lemon industry will be handled in a comprehensive report later in the season. I would like, however, to make two or three general criticisms. The report purports to show the average cost of producing lemons in Sicily. In order to determine the cost of production, Mr. Marasa has assumed a hypothetical 10-acre grove as representative of the groves in Sicily. He assumes what he thinks it costs to produce the fruit in the field, the proportion of the different grades of fruit, the price the different grades ought to bring, the taxes which should be paid by the owner, and other figures of a similar nature. He concludes from these figures that it costs on the average $1.76 to place a box of Sicilian lemons for export to the United States on board ship in Palermo. The f. o. b. cost is the foundation stone in the Marasa report. The value of the report may be measured by the correctness of this figure.

The Department of Commerce and Labor publishes annually a detailed statement giving the value of lemons imported into the United States. The value is based upon the sworn statement of the exporters of the f. o. b. cost of the fruit and packages. From these figures I find the approximate average f. o. b. cost during the fiscal year 1898 to the exporter was $1.39; in 1899, $1.68; in 1902, $1.46; in 1905, $1.53; in 1909, $1.39; during the fiscal year 1910, before the Payne-Aldrich Act became effective, $1.57; after the act became effective, $1.39. In two years only since 1898 has the average f. o. b. cost of the lemons exported to the United States from Italy, as sworn to by the exporters, equaled the assumed figures in the Marasa report. Either the sworn statements of the exporters are incorrect or the f. o. b. cost, as given by Marasa, is valueless.

In order to arrive at the profits in lemon growing in Sicily, Mr. Marasa divides the fruit produced by this grove into three grades—40 per cent, No. 1; 40 per cent, No. 2; and 20 per cent, No. 3. He assumes that the No. 1 fruit costs the exporter on the average $1.15 per box; the No. 2 fruit, 58 cents per box; and the No. 3 fruit, 29 cents per box. He states that the fruit of first quality is exclusively shipped to the United States, while the second-quality fruit is used largely for export to European countries. In an official report published in Rome in 1911, in which lemon growing in the Province of Messina is treated, the following occurs:

"The price of a choice and an inferior fruit varies enormously according to the year and the trade demand; the best lemons sell at 50 francs and up per 1,000 and they are all sent to London."

This equals $3.22 per box for the fruit alone. The entire crop of No. 1 fruit in Italy is not exported to the United States, as represented by Marasa, and has not been for many years. All of the northern countries of Europe, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Russia, Austria, and London in England, take a large proportion of the highest grade. The highest priced lemons of Italy are shipped to Russia.

In order to show a low net return on the investment and a high average f. o. b. cost to the United States, Marasa has assumed that the grower is paid a high price for the No. 1 fruit, all of which he consigns to the United States, and a low price for the fruit that is shipped to Europe. The weekly prices of the different sizes and grades of lemons at the packing house, exclusive of packing charges, are published by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Palermo. From these figures the average annual price for the sizes of No. 1 fruit which are exported to the United States was about $1 a box in 1910, instead of $1.15 as given by Marasa; in 1909, about 80 cents per box; 80 cents per box in 1908; $1.33 per box in 1907; and 75 cents per box in 1904. The average price of the sizes of No. 1 fruit, which are practically all shipped to European markets, brought the producer, instead of 58 cents per box as given by Mr. Marasa, an average of about $1.07 per box in 1910, 87 cents in 1909, 87 cents in 1908, and more than $1.33 in 1906 and 1907. The average price of No. 2 fruit, which Mr. Marasa assumes at 58 cents, is either incorrect or the detailed quotations of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Palermo have been misleading since the beginning of the publication of these figures by the organization.

I desire to call your attention also to the present status of the lemon industry of the United States. Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich Act, which increased the duty from 1 cent to 1½ cents per pound, the production of California lemons has increased 25 per cent and the acreage has increased nearly 30 per cent. The shipments of lemons from California in May, 1909, were 709 carloads; in 1911 they were 1,010 carloads; in June, 1909, they were 881 carloads; in 1911, 1,180 carloads. The average price f. o. b. California for all lemons sold during the week ending July 1, 1909, was approximately $4.63; the number of cars sold was 113. The average f. o. b. price of all cars of lemons sold during the corresponding period in 1911 was $3.16; the number of cars sold was 141. The average price received for lemons during the week preceding July 4 is generally one of the highest of the summer.

I desire to call your attention also to the present status of the lemon-importing business. During the fiscal year 1910, the year following the increase in the duty on lemons, the imports equaled 25,366,546 pounds more than the year preceding, when the duty was 1 cent per pound, and more than 7,000,000 pounds above the average imports for the preceding 10 years. The revenue collected on imported lemons by the Government during the fiscal year 1909 was $1,350,738.88. In 1910, which includes 11 months after the duty was raised, the Government collected $2,233,526.87, the largest revenue collected in the history of the importing-lemon business.

At the present time Italian lemons are coming to the United States in unprecedented quantities. The following statement from the records of the New York Fruit Exchange shows the approximate number of boxes of lemons reported afloat or in the port of New York unsold during the month of June, from 1909 to 1911, inclusive.

Foreign lemons reported afloat and in the port of New York unsold.

Week ending—	1911	1910	1909
	Boxes.	*Boxes.*	*Boxes.*
June 2	227,650	246,800	181,650
June 9	280,325	243,600	209,930
June 16	230,600	224,850	166,650
June 23	250,000	175,000	175,000
June 30	280,000	170,000	204,000

These records, with the official statistics, show the tremendous increase in imports of lemons, the increase in revenue collected by the Government since the Payne-Aldrich Act went into effect, and the decrease in the present prices of fruit.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Hon. JOHN D. WORKS, of the Senate.

Yours, very truly, G. HAROLD POWELL,
Secretary and Manager.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes allotted me I will not be able to present to you figures and statistics determining the exact amount of tariff that should properly be placed on lemons imported into the United States, nor could I give them to you at this time even if I had several hours in which to discuss this question. They are not yet ready. They are being gathered, assembled, tabulated, and verified in order to be ready for presentation to this House or to its Ways and Means Committee when considering the question of a just and correct tariff on lemons at the regular session of the Sixty-second Congress.

The lemon industry, realizing that it must take its turn with other industries in explaining its position to Congress, has been actively engaged in gathering information and statistics for the correct solving of the tariff problem so far as it relates to the lemon industry. Experts have been sent to foreign lemon-growing districts and have there obtained a vast quantity of information, which is being verified and compiled, with the particular view of enabling the Congress of the United States to determine what is a just and a fair rate to be placed upon lemons coming to the United States from foreign countries. The lemon industry does not desire further guessing. The facts only are desired, and so, at a cost to them of thousands of dollars, there is being collected at home and abroad exact and absolutely reliable information for the use of Congress.

Before Congress can intelligently determine what is a reasonable tariff rate for lemons we should know the cost of labor in foreign lemon districts, and how that labor lives, the relative costs of lands, of irrigating, of fumigating, of pruning, of cultivating, of soil covering, and all other items incident to the production of lemons. We should know the relative costs of storage, of sweating, wrapping, packing, orchard and country road transportation, also the general cost of transportation from shipping point to point of consumption. We should know the selling costs, the loss from rot, the retail selling prices here and elsewhere now and in years gone by. We should have the fullest and most accurate figures concerning the importations of lemons.

The gentleman from New York, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, stated to this House that—

> The immediate result of the Payne-Aldrich tariff raise in lemons was that the importation of lemons for the last fiscal year decreased over 10,000,000 pounds.

This was a very misleading statement, for the facts are that the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, the first year of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, shows the importations of lemons not to have decreased, but to have increased more than 25,000,000 pounds over the year ending June 30, 1909, the last year of the old tariff. And the year ending June 30, 1911, the second year of the new tariff, shows the total imports of lemons into the United States to have differed only fifteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent from the total imports of the year ending June 30, 1909, the last year of the old tariff. And, mark you, if you will total the imports of lemons for the two fiscal years of July 1, 1909, to June 30, 1911, under the new tariff act, and then compare the figures with those for 1909, the last year of the old tariff, you will find that for two years past, under the new tariff, the monthly importation of lemons has averaged approximately 12,300,000 pounds, while for the year 1909, the last year of the old tariff, the monthly average was only 11,200,000 pounds; and for the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, and 1909, the five years immediately preceding the Payne-Aldrich tariff, the monthly average was 12,250,000 pounds.

These figures show an increased importation for two years under the new tariff, as compared with the last year of the old tariff, of 1,100,000 pounds per month, and an increased monthly

importation for two years under the new tariff, as compared with the last five years of the old tariff, of 50,000 pounds per month.

Again, official figures will show importations of lemons approximately as follows:

	1909	1910	1911
	Boxes.	*Boxes.*	*Boxes.*
June	238,500	307,000	359,550
July	330,600	265,000	387,525
Total	569,100	572,000	747,075

An increase for June and July, 1911, over same months in 1910, of 175,075 boxes, approximately 12,780,475 pounds, and an increase over same months in 1909 of 177,975 boxes, approximately 13,992,175 pounds.

These figures are practically correct. Can any fair-minded man still maintain that an increased tariff has decreased the importation of lemons?

Now a word as to prices.

I believe it can be shown that the price of lemons under the new law is less than the price under the old law. I know that within the last two months I have repeatedly seen lemons for sale on the street corners of Washington at 1 cent each. I examined them and found them sound and good, and I have actually purchased lemons in Central Market, Washington, the principal public market of this city, for 15 cents per dozen, and they were very good lemons, too, not the finest, but as good as are generally used, and lemons can be bought to-day at from 10 to 15 cents per dozen in every market in this city.

Again, all sales of lemons in New York City are made at public auction, and the closing sale prices for the week of August 5, 1911, and same weeks in 1908 and 1907 are as follows:

	Week ending Aug. 5, 1911.	Week ending Aug. 5, 1908.	Week ending Aug. 5, 1907.
First choice, 300	$2.50 to $4.63	$3.85 to $4.50	$3.38 to $4.75
Second choice, 300	2.00 to 3.50	3.15 to 3.95	2.63 to 4.25
First choice, 360	2.50 to 4.00	3.10 to 3.65	3.63 to 4.75
Second choice, 360	2.00 to 3.00	2.70 to 3.25	2.75 to 4.25
Small sizes	1.75 to 3.25	2.52 to 2.75	2.25 to 3.50

In the Washington Times of August 8, 1911, placed in a prominent place, not as market items, but as interesting reading matter, was the following:

WAR-TIME PRICES LOWER THAN NOW—HOUSEWIFE THEN OBTAINED FLOUR, MEATS, LARD, BUTTER, AND CHEESE AT SMALLER COST—SUGAR ALONE SOLD AT HIGHER FIGURE.

Cost of food during war and at present.

Articles.	War time.	Present.
Flour	$4.10-$4.25	$7.75.
Pork	14 cents per pound	18-20 cents per pound.
Hams	6½ cents per pound	20-28 cents per pound.
Lard	8-12 cents per pound	12½ cents per pound.
Butter	15-20 cents per pound	30-35 cents per pound.
Cheese	14 cents per pound	25 cents per pound.
Sugar	10-18 cents per pound	6-7 cents per pound.
Molasses	30-35 cents per gallon	32-38 cents per gallon.
Beef	6½ cents per pound	15 cents per pound.
Shoulders	5 cents per pound	20 cents per pound.
Coffee	13-16 cents per pound	25-40 cents per pound.

If those figures are true, do you not think the growers of lemons in California have done a remarkable thing for the people of this country in keeping the price of lemons to 10, 12, 15, and 20 cents per dozen? Does not the price of lemons compare favorably with any other fruit sold in the market? I have priced lemons in the Washington market for many weeks, and found them at from 1 to 1½ cents each, while at the same time apples were selling at 5 to 10 cents each, and peaches at 3 to 7 cents each. Some have said, "Well, we have paid as high as 3 cents each for lemons." Perhaps so, for there are few, if any, farm products that are not abnormally high at times. I have paid 65 cents per dozen for eggs and 80 cents per pound for butter; yet no one maintains that such are the average prices of these commodities.

Potatoes—plain, old-fashioned Irish potatoes—are selling today in all our markets at very high prices. This very morning, in the market of Washington, I personally purchased potatoes in the usual household way, and counted them afterwards, and found that in one instance I had paid 1 cent each, or 12 cents per dozen, for potatoes a little smaller than medium size, and in the other instance 2 cents each, or 20 cents per dozen, for large, but not the largest, size potatoes.

If peaches and apples and even plain, everyday potatoes must at times sell at such prices, is it strange that lemons should occasionally take the same course? Especially when supply is never closely related to demand, and can not be wherever imported lemons control the market. Nor can prices of lemons be kept from becoming abnormally high where shipload after shipload of trust-controlled foreign lemons can be dumped on the market or into the ocean in order to control the market.

Again, as to the prices of lemons, I call your attention to the fact that in eastern Canada, which places no import duty on lemons, the prices to the consumer are approximately the same, though sometimes higher than in Eastern United States, where we do, and should continue to place an adequate duty on lemons, not alone for the grower, but also for the consumer of lemons.

Given a tariff fair and just to the American grower, the American laborer and the American consumer, California growers will, in a few short years, furnish lemons to the whole United States at prices reasonable to the user.

The enemies of American industry say that the California lemon industry is a trust. It will be proven to you, and to your satisfaction, too, that the lemon industry in California is not a trust, and can not be; that the members of the local associations and of the central associations are all lemon growers; that these local associations and central organizations work, not to artificially raise prices, but to gather and disseminate information that will cause their product to be distributed according to the laws of supply and demand, thus giving to the consumer, and obtaining for themselves, a fair price. These central organizations do not control the prices, nor even the destination of shipments, for each grower and shipper—and the shipper is the grower, and the grower is the shipper nearly always—can name his own price and determine the destination for his shipment and have returns made direct to him from the association agent selling his fruit. Again, the owner is notified if his orginal price can not be obtained, and the fruit is then disposed of according to the owner's new instruction.

As to the supply:

California now has between 25,000 and 30,000 acres of lemons and supplies almost half the lemons consumed in the United States. There are at least 60,000 acres additional in southern California suitable for the raising of lemons. Southern California alone can in a few years, if protected by a fair tariff, raise enough lemons to meet the total consumption of the United States. But as a further assurance that California can without question meet every possible demand, if given a sure and certain protection, there is a section of the great San Joaquin Valley of California that has begun to grow lemons and is able to put them into the market at a season when there are few imported lemons. In this valley there are more than 100,000 acres capable of producing lemons, and will be made to produce them at a moderate cost to the consumer and moderate profit to the grower if given a fair and equitable tariff rate. The production has grown and the acreage planted to lemons in California has increased more than 30 per cent since the present tariff act was passed.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the Democratic Party should not murder a great industry without giving it some reasonable opportunity for presenting its case, of defending its very life. Many millions of dollars and many thousands of homes and families are now dependent upon this industry. They should not have their means of livelihood strangled without any chance whatever to plead. Is the Democratic majority of this House satisfied to play the part of a commercial assassin and in five minutes strike down a great American industry without giving it any chance whatever to show its right to live?

I am in receipt of a message from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, which reads, in part, as follows:

One of California's most important industries is the growing of lemons. It is conspicuously free from trust influence, farmers and fruit raisers avoiding middlemen and speculators by marketing their products through their own organizations. At vast expense of patience and capital our citrus-fruit growers have built up a great industry, from which they pay large taxes to sustain Government schools and humane institutions, to which, if duty be removed, our competitors will contribute nothing, thus placing them at great advantage in our own markets, in addition to the difference in their favor on cheaper labor and lower freight rates between place of production and great centers of American population.

The following telegrams likewise show how our lemon growers feel upon this subject:

SAN DIMAS, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS, *Washington, D. C.:*

Urge that nothing be done reducing tariff on lemons at this time, or until after completion of report to Congress regarding conditions here and in Italy. This district starting many young lemon orchards under

present tariff. Change at this time would completely discourage any further planting, as it requires six years' time to get orchard in bearing from time of planting.

SAN DIMAS GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
By W. A. JOHNSTONE, *President.*

AZUSA, CAL., *August 10, 1911.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. STEPHENS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest against a change in the lemon tariff at present and urge that the matter be held in abeyance until the present investigation regarding comparative conditions at home and abroad is completed and reported to Congress.

AZUSA CITRUS ASSOCIATION.

COVINA, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Congressman WILLIAM D. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly protest against action on lemon tariff at present. Urge that matter be delayed until proper investigation of condition home and abroad presented Congress.

COVINA ORANGE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.
COVINA CITRUS ASSOCIATION.

FERNANDO, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.:

We, as citrus fruit growers of California, vigorously protest against the removal of the tariff on lemons until such time as we may be heard in the matter, having invested millions of dollars in promotion of the industry.

FERNANDO FRUIT GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *August 4, 1911.*

Hon. W. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Citrus Protective League, representing California citrus industry, in which nearly $175,000,000 are invested, enters a most vigorous protest against any change in the lemon tariff before all the facts are placed before Congress.

CITRUS PROTECTIVE LEAGUE.
G. HAROLD POWELL, *M'g'r.*

POMONA, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Congressman WM. D. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.:

Representing 800 growers, we most earnestly protest against any action being taken revising tariff on lemons until full opportunity is given us to present before Congress complete data on foreign and home conditions.

SAN ANTONIO FRUIT EXCHANGE.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Representative WM. D. STEPHENS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

In simple justice to thousands of lemon growers, many of whom have invested their all, we earnestly protest against any reduction in the lemon tariff until we have been allowed to present our case before the regular tariff committee and the case decided on its merits. We ask fair play.

LEFFINGWELL RANCHERS' ASSOCIATION.

PASADENA, CAL., *August 9, 1911.*

Representative WM. D. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

In simple justice to the lemon growers of California, who have millions of dollars invested in the business, please use your influence to delay any action on lemon tariff until such time as there can be a thorough and fair investigation of same.

PASADENA ORANGE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

WHITTIER, CAL., *August 10, 1911.*

Hon. WM. D. STEPHENS,
Care of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to put forth every effort to prevent any reduction in the lemon tariff at this time. Proposed change would be disastrous to California citrus interests and manifestly unfair without due hearing and consideration of comparative conditions here and in Sicily.

WHITTIER CITRUS ASSOCIATION.

Similar protests have been received by wire from the following:

Alhambra Orange Growers' Association, Alhambra, Cal.
Azusa Chamber of Commerce, Azusa, Cal.
Azusa Citrus Growers' Fruit Exchange, Azusa, Cal.
Azusa Foothills Citrus Association, Azusa, Cal.
Irwindale Citrus Association, Irwindale, Cal.
Bloomington Fruit Association, Bloomington, Cal.
Charter Oak Citrus Association, Charter Oak, Cal.
Claremont Citrus Association, Claremont, Cal.
College Heights Orange Association, Claremont, Cal.
Cucamonga Lemon Association, Cucamonga, Cal.
Cucamonga Citrus Fruit Growers' Association, Cucamonga, Cal.
Gold Buckle Association, East Highlands, Cal.
Etawanda Citrus Fruit Growers' Association, Etawanda, Cal.
Placentia Orange Growers' Association, Fullerton, Cal.
Glendora Heights Orange & Lemon Growers' Association, Glendora, Cal.
Glendora Citrus Association, Glendora, Cal.
Hemet Orange Growers' Association, Hemet, Cal.
Highlands Exchange Association, Highlands, Cal.
High Grove Fruit Exchange, High Grove, Cal.
Sierra Madre-La Manda Citrus Association, La Manda Park, Cal.
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Cal.
Sparr Fruit Co., Los Angeles, Cal.
Semi-Tropic Fruit Co., Los Angeles, Cal.
La Verne Growers' Association, Lordsburg, Cal.
Indian Hill Citrus Association, North Pomona, Cal.
West Ontario Citrus Association, Ontario, Cal.
Citrus Fruit Association, Ontario, Cal.
Pasadena Board of Trade, Pasadena, Cal.
Pomona Fruit Growers' Exchange, Pomona, Cal.
Riverside Chamber of Commerce, Riverside, Cal.
Riverside Business Men's Association, Riverside, Cal.
Redlands Cooperative Association, Redlands, Cal.
Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, Redlands, Cal.
Redlands Fruit Association, Redlands, Cal.
San Diego Chamber of Commerce, San Diego, Cal.
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal.
San Dimas Board of Trade, San Dimas, Cal.
San Dimas Lemon Association, San Dimas, Cal.
Uplands Citrus Association, Uplands, Cal.
Stewart Citrus Association, Uplands, Cal.
Uplands Heights Orange Association, Uplands, Cal.
Lemon Growers' Exchange Association, Uplands, Cal.
Ontario-Cucamonga Fruit Exchange, Uplands, Cal.
Mountain View Orange & Lemon Growers' Association, Uplands, Cal.
Walnut Fruit Growers' Association, Walnut, Cal.

I do not ask at your hands at this time any particular tariff rate, only that which after fair and full investigation is found to be fair and just and right for both grower and consumer. I was not sent to this Congress to advocate or stand for any tariff, even on lemons, that is unfair to the American people, and I am trying to do my duty as my conscience dictates. I hope never to vote for or against any bill through pique, but always to work and vote for the interests of the whole people. I shall not advocate a tariff on lemons of one rate or another until after the facts and figures have all been shown me. When a rate fair and just to consumer and grower has been clearly demonstrated, then I will advocate such a rate; no more, no less.

All the lemon grower asks is justice.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the motions offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I shall do it with some compassion for him. A few days ago there was none so great as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who held the House under his thumb awaiting his will and abiding his judgment. The gentleman from Alabama had only to crook his finger and the House did as he said. He had supplanted the Speaker of the House in influence; he had become himself, in effect, the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the House itself. But, lo and behold, he went into a conflict with another gentleman, another gentleman who bestrides this Capitol like a colossus, with one foot upon the House of Representatives and the other foot upon the Senate of the United States, with both branches beneath his feet and both doing as he commands. The gentleman from Alabama, with a solid majority behind him in the House, backed by a Democratic Congress, mighty here where they have a superior number, went into the conflict, yielded first on the wool bill, getting a little compromise with the Senator from Wisconsin, and yet completely, in effect, yielding. He takes his lesson good naturedly, but understandingly. Having effected some kind of a small compromise with the Senator from Wisconsin on the wool bill, he understands now what he is doing. He does not describe this as "a compromise." He describes it as "a surrender." [Applause on the Republican side.]

There seems some excuse for my genial friend from Alabama. He is new in charge of conferences. He has heard for the first time that old senatorial bluff about the Senate never yielding. On this side of the House there are many gentlemen who have heard that trite remark many times, knowing it was a very "cold bluff."

Why, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alabama had tried to escape an agreement on the wool bill, the Senate would have pursued him to the farthest corners of the earth to effect an agreement. Nothing could have prevented the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators from coming to an agreement upon the wool bill or from getting this bill presented to the President of the United States, and while the Senate conferees said they would not yield, yet if the gentleman from Alabama had had the nerve with which I had credited him and the experience which he ought to have had, he would have laid down the law on behalf of the House of Representatives to the Senate, and the Senate would have yielded at every place and on every line. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This bill was defeated by a narrow margin, a tie vote, in the Senate. Tell me that it would not carry if the gentleman from Alabama had declined to yield! A pro forma disagreement comes to us now from the Senate; a pro forma disagreement. But if a real disagreement had been enunciated on behalf of the House, the Senate would have yielded, and the gentleman from Alabama would have come back to the House with credit, instead of being a discredited tool of another man. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was considered in the House I addressed the House, having an hour's time, expressing my views touching it. I shall not now take any time at all except to say that, if I understand the Senate amendment, it limits the House bill as to certain items. The House bill gave free trade with all the world, which meant Australasia, practically, and Argentina, the two great meat-producing countries that have large exports.

Now the Senate amendment No. 5, on page 3, not only has the effect, if I understand it—and I want to be corrected if I do not—of not changing the reciprocal agreement in the event Canada consents to it, but it has the further effect that Argentina and Australasia—they being practically the two countries that have a surplus that compete with us—can not get free entry into our markets unless there is a reciprocal agreement of some kind made with Argentina and with Australasia—one or both. Any kind of an old reciprocal agreement, that might cover hairpins or anything else, would be sufficient to entitle, in the event the Senate amendment is agreed to, free entrance from Argentina and Australasia for their meats. I hope I will be corrected if I am wrong about that. But that takes future action; and unless there is to obtain some new-fangled proposition to originate revenue bills other than in the House and let the majority make a treaty, we are safe, at least so far as the meat producers and the farmers of this country are concerned. It takes future action. Therefore, if I understand it, I shall vote for amendment No. 5.

Ah, the gentleman from Alabama agonizes over the proposition that we can not have free meats with all the world. What does he mean by that? Argentina, a great producer of meat, a great producer of wheat, a great producer of corn, with cheap lands, has a freight rate—and so has Australasia—to the United States by the ocean less than we have in the Middle West from St. Louis or Chicago or Minneapolis to the seaboard.

I can not sympathize with my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] upon this side of the House. He, too, agonizes for legislation that would let Argentina and Australasia into our markets without duty. We part company there; but I am delighted—O heavenly Father, I am delighted—to see the burning brand of reform from California [Mr. STEPHENS], when one single article—lemons—is touched by the House amendment, that you now propose to back away from; I am delighted to see the gentleman from California rush to the defense of the duty on lemons. I am quite willing that the House should recede as to this California product, because I am a protectionist for California as well as every other part of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] I believe in the protective policy for all the people. Therefore I will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to recede from the House amendment placing lemons on the free list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I give the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. CANNON. I will vote for the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to recede, because I would go as far to protect Alabama and the whole South and California and the whole West as I would to protect Illinois in her industries, or any other State in her industries, and I decline to let the reformer from California [Mr. STEPHENS]—who falls over himself to vote with the Democratic side on everything except lemons—or the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], or the other side of the House, make for me my policy touching protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I have no patience with Representatives on either side of the House who vote to protect articles produced in their districts or States and against protection on articles produced in other States. I believe in the policy of protection from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot; and, thank God, there are a majority of those on this side of the House who believe in it and will keep the faith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he use some of his time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL].

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this House ought to draw clearly the lines of debate. For representatives of the people to speak in such phrase and in such guise that the effect is to deceive the people whom they represent is not becoming to the Members of this House.

The question before us is the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to recede from our disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5—and it will be followed by a similar motion in reference to No. 7—and to agree to the amendment with an amendment striking out the word "corn."

The House bill went to the Senate providing for free bread, free meats, and so forth:

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

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

The leader of the minority has seen proper to state that in the Senate the Democrats, recreant to their pledges and to their duty, and acting contrary to the will of the party in this House, defeated this provision in the House bill.

The gentleman ought to know that in the Senate every man bearing a Democratic commission, save one, voted for the House bill as it passed the House, but the Republican Senate voted it down with the help of this one Senator on the Democratic side. An amendment was then proposed, he says, by a Democrat, which is true; doing the best that he could after the House bill was voted down, proposing this amendment of the Senate, which would evidently, in his opinion, bring in free bread and free meat, at least from Canada, and from other nations as from time to time reciprocal agreements might be made. It at least gives some opportunity to the people of the United States to get their bread and meat untaxed. The amendment referred to, which was added to both the bread and meat sections of the House bill, is as follows: Coming from any foreign country with which the United States has a reciprocal trade agreement and which shall admit from the United States free of duty, cotton, corn, wheat, oats, horses, cattle, and hogs. Yet gentlemen on that side, those who vote every time for the protected manufacturer, those who boast that they stand for the principle of protection, endeavor to put the Democratic Party in the attitude of being opposed to free bread and free meat because the Republicans and one Democrat in the Senate did it. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] says that we have swapped free bread and free meat for cotton bagging and ties. We have swapped nothing.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. No; I can not allow an interruption. I only have five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If I misstate the gentleman, I will permit him to correct me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, of course, endeavors to be candid with the Members of this House and with his own constituents. He would not deceive anybody by the words he would use, nor the manner in which he would use them. Certainly not. As a matter of honor he would not do it, but it is a strange circumstance that he did not mention the other things of interest to the farmer and the consumer in this bill. He mentions cotton bagging and ties because of interest to the South. The gentleman from Illinois, the former Speaker of this House, also failed to mention the advantages afforded by this bill to the farmers of this country outside of the South.

We find that all agricultural implements, tools, machinery, wagons, harness, saddles, bags for grain, wire and iron for fencing, boots and shoes are relieved from taxation and are admitted into this country free from all the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. A moment ago the Chair informed the gentleman from New York that he had 10 minutes remaining. That was a mistake, there is only 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the Chair to say 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; the Chair said 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama has 13 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes more to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this motion, striking out the word "corn" from the Senate amendments, means that, adopting the Senate amendments—if the reciprocity bill should be adopted by Canada—we would have free breadstuffs and free meat from Canada. With the word "corn" remaining in the amendments, it would amount to nothing, because corn for distilling purposes is not admitted into Canada

free from this country. I favor, and I believe that this side of the House will favor, a motion to agree to the two amendments striking out the word "corn," in order that we may get the nearest relief we can and approach as near as possible to free bread and free meat, and insure that this bill, which is so beneficial to the farmers and consumers of the United States, shall be sent to the President, giving him an opportunity to furnish the country this long-promised relief. And I want to say to gentlemen on that side who opposed the Canadian reciprocity bill, if the President does not sign this bill, it will show that the criticism they made of him was correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which I shall not do in the case of the gentleman from Texas, I want to give this warning——

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend some remarks in the RECORD by inserting some letters from the consul general in Germany in regard to the construction of roads.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, for fear the gentleman will insert "applause" after every line, I shall object until that question is decided.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to pass on that proposition. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it was particularly appropriate that the discussion on that side of the House should be opened by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], because he is conspicuous from the fact that he is the one prominent Republican in the House that is in favor of putting meat on the free list, and that probably is the secret reason that he was not put on the conference committee on the Payne bill, where his position on the Ways and Means Committee entitled him to be.

It will not do to say that the Democrats are surrendering on free meat and free bread. The bill as it passed the Democratic House had these provisions, and it was defeated in a Republican Senate. The Republicans in the last Congress passed a bill revising the tariff, and refused to put meat on the free list. A bill was introduced subsequently suspending the duty on meat for one year, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] said that he would not call the Ways and Means Committee together to consider the bill because it was apparent that the Republicans would not report it favorably. So that no one could reasonably expect relief from the Republicans from the duty on meat.

It is somewhat amusing to hear gentlemen on that side complaining because the Democratic House is compelled to take the best bill it can get from a Republican Senate. Some gentlemen on that side made elaborate arguments when this bill was under consideration in the House to demonstrate that if meat were placed on the free list it would not be of any benefit to the consumer, but that it would be peculiarly beneficial to the American packers who have already absorbed all the packing establishments in the Argentine Republic. Everyone took that argument with a grain of salt, because the Republican Party's record has been such that we all know that if free meat would have been of benefit to American packers it would have long since been made free in a Republican Congress. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, Bradstreet's index shows that the price of foodstuffs has increased 7 per cent since the 1st of July. Within a few days we have passed a number of bills giving relief to homesteaders in the West because of the prevalent excessive drought and because it is notorious that they will not be able to comply with the law if they are compelled to remain on their homesteads during the period fixed by law. As a result of this excessive drought, extending through the entire West, no grass-fed cattle are now coming to the packing establishments—and it is well known that the price of meat as a result of that condition alone will be higher than it has ever been in the history of the country—and yet there is no hope for any relief for the people so long as the Senate and the Executive are controlled by Republicans. Gentlemen say, Why not insist upon free meat and free bread from the entire world? It is a well-known fact that the President is to veto this bill, and if it contained provisions for free meat and free bread it would merely accelerate his action in sending his veto message to the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Speaker, I consider it the greatest crime of civilization that a system of taxation should be continued in force in a country like ours, which places the greatest burdens upon the food and the clothing that the great masses of the people must have in order to exist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Republican Party, which had control of the entire Government, both Houses of Congress and the Executive, for a long period of time, steadfastly refused to give relief. Ignoring the lesson of the last election, by which the Democrats were placed in control of the House in a campaign in which the great issue was the high cost of living, the Republicans in both Houses of Congress refuse to aid the Democrats, coming fresh from the people with their mandate to reduce the burdens on the necessities of life. The Democratic Party finds itself in a position where it is held up and impeded when it attempts to give that full relief to the people to which they are entitled. I know that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is sincerely in favor of taking the burdens off the people by putting meat and bread on the free list—as much so as anyone in this House—and I know from an investigation and inquiries of my own that he has done everything in his power to bring about such a result.

The question now is whether we shall give the President an opportunity to afford some relief by taking the duties off of agricultural implements, by admitting free to this country boots and shoes of all kinds, by admitting free to this country sewing machines and barbed wire and cotton ties and bagging, so that at least some measure of relief will be afforded, or whether we shall sit here obstinate in our pride and decline to do anything at all because we can not have our own way? [Applause on the Democratic side.] While this bill would be far preferable to me if it had free meat and free bread from all the world, realizing that such provisions can not be had with a recalcitrant Republican Senate, and knowing that it will be vetoed in any event by a Republican President, I favor its passage in the hope that the people will realize that it is essential that a Democratic victory be had in 1912 in order to give the people the full measure of relief which they justly demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, you would think from hearing him talk that my colleague [Mr. FITZGERALD] who has just taken his seat was really and earnestly and insistently for free meat. How about his action? This free-list bill went to the Senate, and there was a tie vote on passing it, just as it came from the House, a tie vote on the proposition of free meat from all the world. Since then the Nation mourns the death of one Senator, which would change that tie vote into a majority for this bill as it came from the House. Is there anything clearer than that? I challenge one of you gentlemen there who is shouting and applauding for free meat to get up here and vote against this amendment which gives away the whole thing on meat. Do you dare to do it? Why not put it up to the Senate and let them vote again on this proposition for free meat and free flour? It was lost by a tie vote. The vote of one man who voted against it has been lost since that time by death. You hold the floor. Why do not you have the courage of your convictions and put it up to the Senate and demand that they take a vote on free meat and free flour, if you want it?

Oh, my friend says the bill is going to the President and the President is going to veto it. Very well, if the people of this country are with you in your demands, not in your actions, and want free meat and free flour, why do you not put that proposition up to the President and let him veto that and go to the country on that issue?

The Senate put a joker in the bill in this corn business. It would not even give us free meat from Canada or free flour from Canada. Our friends come pretty near accepting it. Finally they strike out corn, because there is a duty on corn going into Canada for distilling purposes, because the Canadians insist on protecting their rye used for distilling purposes, and so corn is to be stricken out, and we are to have free meat from Canada, and everybody knows that that will not make any difference to the price of meat in this country or the price of meat in Canada. With the little production of meat and flour there is in Canada that may come across the border in some localities, it will not at all affect the general result. And still you go shouting about free meat and free flour.

Why, Mr. Speaker, nearly every item here put on the free list in this bill is made from material that bears a duty all along the line. There is hardly a thing that you can mention, even the Senate amendment putting on cement, an article on which

there is a duty on what is called "raw material," and you propose to accept it. And so it goes through your whole bill, and with the exception of lumber and possibly with the exception of cotton used in cotton bagging, the material may be on the free list, but on everything else there is a duty on the material which you have not the industry to investigate or remove, or else you have not the courage to do it; I do not know which. You leave it there and bring in this incongruous bill on which no man in the United States can figure the amount of revenue that will be cut out under it because of the articles you put on the free list, and which can only be determined by the action of the court hereafter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] arise in his seat and advocate free meat and free bread, when that very same gentleman from New York voted against this free-list bill, spoke against it, and more than that, when he was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, refused to give relief to the American people when he had the opportunity to do so [applause on the Democratic side], makes me think that the speech he has just made does not come honestly from either his brain or his heart. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. And the gentleman says that after the recent change of the gentleman himself on the very bill and on this proposition in the last two months.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will state to the gentleman what I stated a minute ago, there is no change so far as I am concerned, there is no change so far as this side of the House is concerned, but we have to face an adverse majority at the other end of the Capitol. We have to face a President who is not of our political faith, and I will say to the gentleman from New York that I and my confrères on the conference committee insisted before anything should be done in reference to striking out the free meat and free bread from this bill that this question should go back to the United States Senate for a vote, and it did go back there. They had an opportunity to reverse their action. They refused to do it, and in less than 24 hours the leader of the Republicans in the Senate, who was disposed to play fair with the American people, the only man whom we can trust outside of the Democrats in the Senate to do justice to the American consumer, told me that if this bill was sent back to the Senate insisting on free bread and free meat that it meant the death of the bill. There are men on this side of the House here who heard that statement. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, under those conditions, the only question that confronted us was whether we would deadlock this proposition and give no relief to the American people or whether we would accept such relief as a Republican Senate was willing to concede.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I would ask the gentleman whether he is disposed to take the statement of a single Senator, one of the conferees, or to take an actual vote in the Senate when it stood a tie on a former vote, and there has been a change of one since that vote was taken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from New York, when this bill went back to the Senate, if there had been a majority for it, if the Democrats who were in favor of free meat and free bread could have summoned a majority they would have passed that; but some of the men who voted——

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield now, but some of the men who voted before for free bread and free meat are unwilling to do so now. Now, as to the statement of the gentleman from Connecticut about the adoption of free bread and free meat, my friend from Connecticut was not willing to join this side of the House to vote for this bill in order to give his people free bread and free meat. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the first motion that I made, to concur in the Senate amendment No. 5 with an amendment striking out the word "corn," on page 11.

Mr. MANN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment. I do not know as there is any difference in the parliamentary situation. The first motion is a motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and the gentleman would offer a motion to concur with an amendment. Of course, that is divisible. The first question is whether the House would recede from its disagreement, and then the gentleman's motion to amend at that stage would probably take precedence of the motion to concur.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my motion is a motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out the word "corn."

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not yet put the motion for the previous question.

Mr. MANN. The previous question would not cut out a prior motion, anyhow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware of that.

Mr. MANN. The motion must be to recede from the disagreement. That is divisible, if anybody wants it divided.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, my motion is that we recede from our disagreement to amendment No. 5 and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment striking out the word "corn" in line 11.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois offer a motion to concur?

Mr. MANN. I do not at this stage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests the gentleman from Alabama to state his motion again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My motion is to recede from our disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5 and to concur in the same with an amendment to strike out the word "corn" in line 11, page 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5 and concur in the same with an amendment striking out the word "corn." The Chair will ask the gentleman from Alabama if the Chair has stated his motion correctly?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make the same motion in reference to Senate amendment No. 7. I move to recede from our disagreement to Senate amendment No. 7 and concur in the amendment with an amendment striking out the word "corn" in line 19, page 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 7 and concur with an amendment striking out the word "corn" in line 19, page 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of the printed bill.

The SPEAKER. Of the printed bill. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to recede from the House amendment, adding the words "and lemons" to Senate amendment No. 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House recede from its amendment to Senate amendment No. 8, adding the words "and lemons." The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to recede from the House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 8 and to concur in the same.

Mr. MANN. We have not disagreed to Senate amendment No. 8.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is right. We have not disagreed. I move to concur in Senate amendment No. 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 8.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division. First, I would like to have the amendment reported, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement, and lime.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LENROOT. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to say that the House did not disagree to that amendment, and, therefore, we should not recede. That is not correct. Did not the House recede?

Mr. MANN. We concurred with an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Illinois is correct. I overlooked the fact that we concurred with an amendment and did not disagree.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a rising vote there were—ayes 160, noes 102.

So the Senate amendment No. 8 was concurred in.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the various amendments were disposed of was laid on the table.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] rises to a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to inquire particularly of the gentleman from Alabama if he does not want to make a motion now to agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing to agree to.

Mr. NORRIS. There is still a disagreement, as I understand. This amendment striking out "corn" leaves it still in disagreement.

Mr. MANN. The House has agreed to that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I have not asked to agree to a conference, because no conference is needed.

The SPEAKER. If the House has agreed to the entire matter there is nothing else left.

PUBLICITY OF CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to submit to the House a conference report on the bill H. R. 2958, requiring publicity of campaign contributions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] calls up the conference report on the publicity bill, and the Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title, as follows:

H. R. 2958, to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections in which Representatives in Congress are elected."

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I wish to inquire on what page of the RECORD this report is printed?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk simply read the title of the bill, so that Members can send out and get copies of it. Does the gentleman from Missouri know where this report is printed in the RECORD?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I understand the gentleman from Illinois has been informed by a Democrat—the true source of all his information. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I asked for information, but no Democrat was able to give it. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. A Democrat did give it, and the gentleman ought to correct that statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. It is on page 3920.

The SPEAKER. The report is printed on page 3920 of the RECORD of August 14.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry with reference to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, all the conferees being in favor of the conference report, will the time for the discussion of the conference report be permitted to be controlled by those who are opposed to it who are not among the conferees, under the practice of the House?

Mr. MANN. If the previous question were ordered, there would be no time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if there is any time for debate somebody who is opposed to the report should be recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. There are some. I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there will be no trouble about it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor and do not yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia rose to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly in order. The Chair submitted a question as to whether there was an objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order. There is no trouble about that. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Missouri, I desire to ask him if there is any purpose on his part to permit discussion on this conference report?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman, I suppose he simply desires me to say publicly what I have said to him privately—that I have no objection on earth to any discussion that the House wants to hear.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has it in his power to control it by moving the previous question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I may exercise that power, but if the gentleman will allow the matter to take the usual course, I will not abuse the privileges of a Member of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is not an abuse of the privilege of a Member of the House to move the previous question. That is simply the exercise of a right which the gentleman has.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I should like to ask some gentleman who is opposed to this bill—I prefer to ask my colleagues on the committee—if there is debate desired; and if so, about how much, to see if we can get consent to limit the debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois was just addressing the Chair.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman submitted a request to read the statement instead of the report.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course, that comes before the debate. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask which report is referred to. I hold in my hand what purports to be a document, and also what purports to be a report; one I see, however, is a Senate document and the other a House document.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If the gentleman will keep on studying, he will ultimately acquire some information about the procedure of the House.

Mr. MANN. Yes; I will by studying for myself, but not by information received from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have done my very best to enlighten him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri was proceeding to make some sort of a suggestion with reference to debate upon this question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. If it is in order now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask if some gentleman will indicate how much time is wanted in debate, to see if we can agree upon it.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote for the adoption of the conference report. I know of one or two gentlemen on this side who would like to be heard, one at least in opposition to the conference report, and I think if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] will state about how much time he desires, we can reach an agreement all around.

Mr. MANN. Let the Clerk read the statement, and in the meantime this can be arranged.

Mr. BARTLETT. When the statement is read, the gentleman can submit his request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. We might as well settle this question now.

Mr. BARTLETT. Very well. So far as I am personally concerned, I should like to have about 10 minutes. Can we settle the question as to who shall control the time against the conference report? I do not care particularly to do it. I should think that 30 minutes on a side would be ample.

Mr. MANN. We want a little more than that. Make it 40.

Mr. OLMSTED. I suggest that we have 2 hours' debate, 40 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], 40 minutes by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], and 40 minutes by myself.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are but two sides to this question, and it seems to me that there is but one side.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a biased view for anyone to take of it.

Mr. MANN. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] is a reasonable one.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will make that request, unless the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] will make it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be one hour of debate on this report [applause], one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by some gentleman on the other side, if there is one who is opposed to it; and if not, by some one on this side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, we can not agree to that; we are entitled to some time on this side of the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read instead of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

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

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2958) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same, amended to read as follows, viz:

SEC. 2. That section 8, as above amended, and sections 9 and 10 of said act be renumbered as sections 9, 10, and 11, and that a new section be inserted after section 7 of the said original act, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The word 'candidate' as used in this section shall include all persons whose names are presented for nomination for Representative or Senator in the Congress of the United States at any primary election or nominating convention, or for indorsement or election at any general or special election held in connection with the nomination or election of a person to fill such office, whether or not such persons are actually nominated, indorsed, or elected.

"Every person who shall be a candidate for nomination at any primary election or nominating convention, or for election at any general or special election, as Representative in the Congress of the United States, shall, not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day for holding such primary election or nominating convention, and not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day of the general or special election at which candidates for Representatives are to be elected, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part; and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made, for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election.

"Every person who shall be a candidate for nomination at any primary election or nominating convention, or for indorsement at any general or special election, or election by the legislature of any State, as Senator in the Congress of the United States, shall, not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day for holding such primary election or nominating convention, and not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day of the general or special election at which he is seeking indorsement, and not less than 5 nor more than 10 days before the day upon which the first vote is to be taken in the two houses of the legislature before which he is a candidate for election as Senator, file with the Secretary of the Senate at Washington, D. C., a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part; and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election.

"Every such candidate for nomination at any primary election or nominating convention, or for indorsement or election at any general or special election, or for election by the legislature of any State, shall, within 15 days after such primary election or nominating convention, and within 30 days after any such general or special election, and within 30 days after the day upon which the legislature shall have elected a Senator, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or with the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part; and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, up to, on, and after the day of such primary election, nominating convention, general or special election, or election by the legislature, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination, indorsement, or election.

"Every such candidate shall include therein a statement of every promise or pledge made by him, or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent or to whom he has given authority to make any such promise or pledge, before the completion of any such primary election or nominating convention or general or special election or election by the legislature, relative to the appointment or recommendation for appointment of any person to any position of trust, honor, or profit, either in the county, State, or Nation, or in any political subdivision thereof, or in any private or corporate employment, for the purpose of procuring the support of such person or of any person in his candidacy, and if any such promise or pledge shall have been made the name or names, the address or addresses, and the occupation or occupations, of the person or persons to whom such promise or pledge shall have been made, shall be stated, together with a description of the position relating to which such promise or pledge has been made. In the event that no such promise or pledge has been made by such candidate, that fact shall be distinctly stated.

"No candidate for Representative in Congress or for Senator of the United States shall promise any office or position to any person, or to use his influence or to give his support to any person for any office or position for the purpose of procuring the support of such person, or of any person, in his candidacy; nor shall any candidate for Senator of the United States give, contribute, expend, use, or promise any money or thing of value to assist in procuring the nomination or election of any particular candidate for the legislature of the State in which he resides, but such candidate may, within the limitations and restrictions and subject to the requirements of this act, contribute to political committees having charge of the disbursement of campaign funds.

"No candidate for Representative in Congress or for Senator of the United States shall give, contribute, expend, use, or promise, or cause to be given, contributed, expended, used, or promised, in procuring his nomination and election any sum, in the aggregate, in excess of the amount which he may lawfully give, contribute, expend, or promise under the laws of the State in which he resides: *Provided*, That no candidate for Representative in Congress shall give, contribute, expend, use, or promise any sum, in the aggregate, exceeding $5,000 in any campaign for his nomination and election; and no candidate for Senator of the United States shall give, contribute, expend, use, or promise any sum, in the aggregate, exceeding $10,000 in any campaign for his nomination and election: *Provided further*, That money expended by any such candidate to meet and discharge any assessment, fee, or charge made or levied upon candidates by the laws of the State in which he resides, or for his necessary personal expenses, incurred for himself alone, for travel and subsistence, stationery and postage, writing or printing (other than in newspapers) and distributing letters, circulars, and posters, and for telegraph and telephone service, shall not be regarded as an expenditure within the meaning of this section, and shall not be considered any part of the sum herein fixed as the limit of expense and need not be shown in the statements herein required to be filed.

"The statements herein required to be made and filed before the general election, or the election by the legislature at which such candidate seeks election, need not contain items of which publicity is given in a previous statement, but the statement required to be made and filed after said general election or election by the legislature shall, in addition to an itemized statement of all expenses not theretofore given publicity, contain a summary of all preceding statements.

"Any person, not then a candidate for Senator of the United States, who shall have given, contributed, expended, used, or promised any money or thing of value to aid or assist in the nomination or election of any particular member of the legislature of the State in which he resides shall, if he thereafter becomes a candidate for such office, or if he shall thereafter be elected to such office without becoming a candidate therefor, comply with all of the provisions of this section relating to candidates for such office, so far as the same may be applicable; and the statement herein required to be made, verified, and filed after such election shall contain a full, true, and itemized account of each and every gift, contribution, expenditure, and promise, whenever made, in anywise relating to the nomination or election of members of the legislature of said State, or in anywise connected with or pertaining to his nomination and election, of which publicity is not given in a previous statement.

"Every statement herein required shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the candidate, taken before an officer authorized to administer oaths under the laws of the State in which he is a candidate, and shall be sworn to or affirmed by the candidate in the district in which he is a candidate for Representative, or the State in which he is a candidate for Senator in the Congress of the United States: *Provided*, That if at the time of such primary election, nominating convention, general or special election, or election by the State legislature said candidate shall be in attendance upon either House of Congress as a Member thereof he may at his election verify such statements before any officer authorized to administer oaths in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the depositing of any such statement in a regular post office, directed to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or to the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, duly stamped and registered, within the time required herein shall be deemed a sufficient filing of any such statement under any of the provisions of this act.

"This act shall not be construed to annul or vitiate the laws of any State, not directly in conflict herewith, relating to the nomination or election of candidates for the offices herein named, or to exempt any such candidate from complying with such State laws."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate amending the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment so that the title as amended will read as follows, viz:

"An act to amend an act entitled 'An act providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected' and extending the same to candidates for nomination and election to the offices of Representative and Senator in the Congress of the United States and limiting the amount of campaign expenses."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. W. RUCKER,
M. F. CONRY,
M. E. OLMSTED,
Managers on the part of the House.

WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM,
ROBERT J. GAMBLE,
JOS. F. JOHNSTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew a request that I made a little while ago in a modified form. I ask unanimous consent that there may be 90 minutes debate, 30 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], 30 minutes by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], and 30 minutes by myself.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will not the gentleman make it 35 minutes?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did intend to make it 35 minutes, but we have already consumed 10 minutes in reading the report.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will make it 35 minutes, that will give us time enough.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will modify my request and make it 35 minutes apiece.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the debate extend for 1 hour and 45 minutes, 35 minutes to be controlled by himself, 35 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], and 35 minutes by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a very brief statement. During the last session of Congress this House passed a publicity bill applying solely to the great political committees which operate in more than one State in connection with elections at which Members of Congress are elected. That bill required publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures both before and after elections. It went to the Senate in that form, was amended, and came back to us with all the provisions relating to publicity before election stricken from it.

The House disagreed to the Senate amendments, and the bill went to conference. In conference the House conferees found gentlemen representing another body obdurate, firm, and unyielding, and finally by a majority vote the conferees on the part of the House yielded and recommended to the House that it recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments and accept the same. As one of the conferees I refused to join in the conference report or statement. When the conferees report was up for action by the House I made a brief statement, giving my reasons for refusing to agree to the action of my associates, but declaring my purpose to vote for the bill, crippled and disabled as it was, realizing that I would have opportunity in the near future in another Congress to introduce a bill to right the wrong which I thought was then being perpetrated and to further urge the enactment of a law which would respond to the just demand of millions of good people.

When this Congress convened I did introduce a bill providing for the amendment of existing law by restoring the section requiring publicity before election, which the Senate struck out in the last Congress. That bill passed the House unamended, some amendments proposed by gentlemen on the other side being voted down. In the Senate the House bill was amended by the addition of a new section requiring publicity of expenditures by candidates for Representative and Senator in Congress, and applying to nominations as well as to election. Mr. Speaker, this Senate amendment was a surprise to me, and I think a surprise to every Member of the House and to the country, but in my deliberate judgment was a greater surprise to the distinguished gentlemen who constitute another body than to any other persons on earth, and I feel warranted in expressing the opinion that it never would have been agreed to in the Senate if gentlemen there had not confidently relied upon the House to oppose and strike it out.

But, in writing this amendment into the House bill, the Senate responded to the well-considered and almost unanimous sentiment and judgment of the people of the United States. And having sent so good a measure here, a measure which so fully responds to a righteous public opinion, a Democratic House immediately determined to accept it.

As frankly stated by me at the time, the conference on the Senate amendments was requested for the sole purpose of revising and perfecting the Senate amendments. With the able assistance of my good friend, Mr. CONRY, of New York, who has been very loyal and efficient in helping to perfect this legislation and in securing this conference report, and the assistance of my genial, nonpartisan friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], we have brought the measure back to the House perfected and amended in conference, and I think very materially improved. The provisions of the Senate amendments have all been carefully preserved; no principle has been eliminated from the amendments; the bill has not been weakened in any respect, but has been broadened and strengthened in many respects.

The principle of publicity—full, complete publicity both before and after election—is secured and we have inspired and breathed into this legislation life, vigor, and efficiency. This law will reflect the will and win the approval of people throughout the United States, regardless of political affiliation, who desire to purify elections and to restore and preserve inviolate the sanctity of the ballot box. I exceedingly regret, Mr. Speaker, that there is not an entire unanimity of sentiment on this side of the House in favor of the adoption of the conference report. This measure, so righteous in itself, so just in its provisions, so universally demanded, ought, it seems to me, to command the cordial support of every Member. But there are gentlemen who can not give it support, and in this preliminary statement I desire to say that with those gentlemen I have no quarrel. I realize the conditions that surround them, and I shall not question the judgment or challenge the vote of any gentleman who differs from me or put in issue the merits of the apprehensions which impel him to oppose this legislation.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. A brief question.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I find in the original bill as amended by the Senate the words "and consent" connected with his knowledge regarding the receipt of money. The conference report would apparently insert the words "and con-

sent." Does the bill as it appears before us now include the words "and consent"?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It does. Mr. Speaker, I was saying, and I repeat, I have no quarrel with gentlemen on this side of the House who differ with me. I recognize their devotion to public will and their unwavering devotion to the great undying principles of democracy. I know they will discharge their duty on this and on all occasions as they see it. I must be permitted to say, however, that I do not believe the apprehension of the danger they fear from Federal interference in matters belonging solely to the States is a reasonable apprehension, or that it is justified by the history of the past or by conditions existing to-day.

Mr. Speaker, only a few words more. I trust I may be pardoned for calling attention to the fact that one of the most valuable features of this bill was written into it by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. Recently chosen by a direct vote of the people of his State to serve them in that high office, he had the courage to proclaim in the Senate of the United States that no candidate for Representative or for Senator of the United States should spend more than a reasonable sum, to be fixed by law.

By his matchless eloquence he convinced that great legislative body that we should not only require publicity of all campaign expenses, but that we should fix a definite and positive limit to expenditures, beyond which it would be unlawful to go. The amendment offered by Senator REED, and accepted by the Senate, prescribes a maximum limit of $5,000 which may lawfully be expended by candidates for Representative and $10,000 by candidates for the United States Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I say to you this is the best feature of this entire law; and while I concur in the judgment of some of my friends that the limit with reference to Members is too high—much too high—because I believe $5,000 is more than any candidate for membership in this House ought to be permitted to expend, yet I insist that even a high limit is preferable to no limit. If it should ever be charged and shown that I have spent in excess of $700 to secure my nomination and election, then I confess I would be unworthy to sit upon this floor [applause on the Democratic side], because the law of the sovereign State in which I reside requires me to subscribe to an oath that I have not spent a sum greater than that, and I will not violate the law of my State. I seek to win the votes of the people in my district, not by corrupting the masses but by doing the will of the splendid people whom I am proud to represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I heard the gentleman give the history of this bill. Did the gentleman forget to mention the fact that the gentleman brought this bill, particularly relative to the primary feature of it, before the Democratic caucus, and they did not vote on it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have not forgotten any fact connected with the history of this bill, but the statement just made by the gentleman is not accurate, as he must remember when I call attention to the fact.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I am not correct about it, I will be glad to be informed.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think I have informed you, but I will inform you again.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then kindly inform me.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. A gentleman who represents neither Missouri nor Alabama, but the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN], who is here to speak for himself, circulated the petition for a caucus. I said to every man to whom I spoke that I had no intention or desire to tie the hands of any free man by caucus action on this bill, and in the Democratic caucus neither the gentleman who called the caucus nor those who indorsed his action dared to present the matter because of the fact——

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman will remember there was considerable opposition to this bill——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman can make a speech in his own time; now, let me proceed to make mine. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must not put me in the attitude of having called a caucus on this bill, because he must know I did not. The fact is I never knew of it until I got official notice of the call. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] greatly magnifies the strength of the opposition to this legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was going to ask you if you did not make an explanation of that feature before the Democratic caucus, and the Democratic caucus manifested a great deal of opposition to it, and it was withdrawn?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. The gentleman from Alabama indulges too much in pure imagination. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I wish I could meet my responsibilities under my oath and at the same time could free the minds of some gentlemen of the horrible nightmare this bill has caused them, but I can not do it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You never encountered that "nightmare," and that is the reason you do not understand it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I wish to assure my friend of the devotion I have for the land from which he comes. My kindred all sprung from that region, as the gentleman knows, and every sentiment of my nature is entwined around the institutions of the South, but the South is only one part of this country. It is the South, thank God, a glorious South, but we are legislating to-day for a glorious country, composed of the North, the South, the East, and the West—a united country—and the people demand publicity in every State and in every district. [Applause.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I deny here that the South or any State in the South is undertaking to shelter itself or escape publicity under any circumstances or conditions.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have not so charged.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have heard you make that insinuation before.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I have made no such insinuation. The gentleman is too sensitive.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I am not sensitive—not in the least.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think you are too sensitive. I will not debate this question with him further, as I fear the gentleman is growing too sensitive.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is one way a man has of attacking another. I am not in the least sensitive. It is an acknowledgment of your inability to answer.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. What in the world troubles the gentleman from Alabama? I have answered him. The trouble is he proceeds on an erroneous assumption of fact and will not listen to reason. I have no objection to the conclusion he reaches. He is entitled to his opinion, however wrong it may be.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will say this to the gentleman from Missouri: That if there is any bill that ought to have been submitted to a Democratic caucus since this special session began, it is this bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I say this: That, in my humble judgment, and from my position here on the floor of this House, if there is any bill that has been before the extra session of Congress that ought to have gone to a Democratic caucus, it is this bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in answer to that I will say to the gentleman for the last time that this bill was discussed before the caucus, and I believe the caucus was called on his request, not mine, and in that caucus I told the gentlemen who called the caucus, "If you want caucus action, for the Lord's sake get it." I will not try to tie anybody.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did you ask for it when you made that long speech before the Democratic caucus?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I did not want any caucus action, and hence asked for none. I went there to see what you were going to do. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interruptions I am having, if the Chair will kindly tell me how much time I have used, I will yield the floor, as I see I can not proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOWARD rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri his opinion of one clause of the bill. I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri, in his opinion, what would be the effect of this saving clause that you have in this bill? For instance, in the State of Georgia suppose you could not spend under the law of Georgia over $500 in a campaign for Congress, while this bill says you can spend up to $5,000; would this law be paramount to the law of the State?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer the gentleman by saying that in the State of Missouri, where I live, the State law prohibits my spending over $700, and I will consider the State law as absolutely binding upon me, and not this law. I do not believe that this law will ever be construed to annul or vitiate any law of the States not directly in conflict with this.

Mr. HOWARD. Just a question further. In the gentleman's opinion, does the gentleman think that this $5,000 clause in this bill, as proposed by his committee, is not in direct conflict with the clauses of the laws in other States?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Certainly not, because the bill expressly provides that the law of the State shall prevail and govern, provided only that the total expenses shall not exceed the limit here fixed. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I represent a State which has, and has had for years, most wholesome, efficacious, and strict laws upon the subject of publicity of campaign expenses. These laws require every candidate, from constable to Congressman, to file in the office of the clerk of the court and to publish in every county where he is a candidate an itemized statement of the expenses that he has incurred in an election, and to swear from what sources the money comes—by whom paid; and they also require him to swear that he has not employed a hired worker at the polls or at any time during his candidacy; that he has not directly or indirectly conveyed or had conveyed to the polls any voter in a buggy or in a wagon or carriage or automobile; and these laws apply to primary and general elections alike. My State has, under the sovereign power that was reserved to it when this Government was formed, never yielded to the General Government the exercise of its police powers, but has always exercised that power. She has spread upon her statute books wholesome laws in regard to the election of every officer by the people, whether in the primary or the real election. We are not afraid in Georgia that we can not vote the Democratic ticket and keep that State steadfast, as it has been for 45 years, in the Democratic column unless we pass this bill and thus prevent the Republicans from buying the election; nor have we any fears that the Republicans will buy us. [Laughter on the Republican side.] That may be a fear peculiar to my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]. But we would not have any such fear, even if we did not have the protection to be afforded by this bill. It takes no law of Congress or the exercise of any drastic Federal power, the unlawful use of the State's police power, concentrated in the Federal Government, to keep corrupt people from buying an election in the State of Georgia. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri says this part of the bill which I particularly object to is his peculiar hobby; at least he said so the other day on the floor of this House; application of the provisions of this bill to primary elections was his peculiar hobby. The gentleman never mounted that hobby or rode upon it or even rocked it until he saw "this pillar of cloud by day and this column of fire by night" that has arisen over in the Senate in the person of the immaculate junior Senator from Missouri. [Laughter and applause.] "Paul may plant and Apollos may water," but not a vote can the junior Senator from Missouri get from this House or from the gentleman from Missouri from that district until a new light arose at night and the pillar of cloud by day spread itself over his entranced vision. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, why do I say so? Why, in this House, early in April, some vicious Republicans and the unthinking Democrats voted for and engrafted on his bill this identical proposition—that the Congress of the United States could go into Missouri and prevent the voters there from being bought in the primary elections. [Laughter.] What did the gentleman from Missouri do? In his wrath and indignation he moved that the bill be recommitted with instructions, and that the amendment placed in the bill by the vicious Republicans and the misguided Democrats should be stricken out; and all the power of the organization of the House, including the whip of the House and Democratic officials and the influences which he could set to work, were invoked by the gentleman, and at his instance the House voted promptly to strike the obnoxious amendment from the bill; and all the Democrats but two voted to strike it out, and the gentleman and the entire Democratic side applauded the result. The gentleman from Missouri, who, with his soul enthused with the idea of preventing the people of this country from being bought by Republican money, was so anxious to ride his hobby and to stride through the Halls of Congress on it, never mounted that hobby—on the contrary, he hamstrung it all he could—until he saw the junior Senator from Missouri, this new leader from the West [laughter]——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BARTLETT. I regret I have not time. I do not want to be discourteous at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Not until this new giant, this Missouri Lochinvar, came out of the West, with spear leveled and helmet down, bestriding the gentleman's hobby; and then the gentleman climbed on behind. [Laughter.] It occurs to me to suggest that Shakespeare, had he lived in this age and could he have seen the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] in this performance, might have said of him what he said of "Bottom." You remember in that play when Bottom dressed himself to perform before his associates, they looked at him and said, "Bottom, how thou hast been transformed." And now, when the gentleman from Missouri came back from the conference, arrayed in all this new-found paraphernalia, clothed almost with the mantle of the new Senator from Missouri, it occurs to me that his coconferees must have raised their hands in admiration and said, "O Bottom, Bottom RUCKER, how thou hast been transformed." [Laughter.] What change has come o'er the spirit of his dreams. Manfully and gallantly he led the hosts of Democracy against the solid phalanx of Republicans and a few straying, rebellious Democrats in this House, but could not stand even one punch of the wooden spear of this new champion, the junior Senator from Missouri. [Laughter.]

I do not ascribe improper motives to anyone, much less to my friend from Missouri. I take it for granted that not only has a great light shone upon him outwardly, but that like Saul of Tarsus it came down like the noonday splendor and pierced his very soul and blinded him. I take it for granted and I accept it. I question no man's motives. But I stand here today in defense of that splendid system of Government which our forefathers formed, cemented with their blood, wrested from England, and builded upon solid foundations, and whose spire that points up to heaven, around which I trust the lightnings of eternity shall play, whose sides no beating storm from without shall shake, and no inward dissension shall ever tear down. [Applause.] Regardless of the new dogma from Missouri, promulgated by the new knight from out the West; regardless of the changed views and vigorous assault made upon my position by my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], I shall still proclaim my devotion to that instrument, which does not give to Congress the power to exercise police authority in the States. [Applause.] Whence comes the power, even in a State, to regulate the primaries? Lest my views may be misconstrued, Mr. Speaker, I want to state right here and now that I am willing to have the fullest publicity of campaign expenses, in every election, including primaries. I am willing that the law shall prescribe the fullest publicity. I will even bow to the opinion of the majority of the court in the Siebold case and the other cases, which held that in regulating a congressional election the Congress had the power to do certain things; but I stop there, and I say no flood of power, however high its waves may dash against the adamantine foundations of this Constitution of ours, no fanaticism—I beg pardon for using the word, but that is the suitable word—no clamor from uplift magazines, or any other influence shall force me from the position that this Congress has no power to invade my State, usurp its police power, and destroy or regulate in the slightest degree its primary elections. [Applause.]

I say that as a lawyer; and as a lawyer I demand to know from any lawyer here whence comes the power from the State even to regulate primaries? From its police power. If I am not correct, I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], for whose legal learning and information I have great respect, to correct me. The police power of the State regulates its primaries. There is where you get the power. That is the law laid down in the decisions, and I have read many of them in the past few weeks. What police power vests in the Congress of the United States, outside of the right to exercise it in the District of Columbia, in the Territories, and in those other places where the Congress has exclusive jurisdiction? None whatever; and the Supreme Court of the United States has often and without dissent decided that Congress has no police power within the several States. Does any man who is familiar with the law, who has read the decisions of the highest court in the land, claim that the Congress of the United States has any police power in a State? I pause long enough for some one either to show his knowledge or his ignorance.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. While the gentleman is pausing, let me ask him a question.

Mr. BARTLETT. On that subject, yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. No; on another subject.

Mr. BARTLETT. On that subject. The gentleman can not answer the question.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think I can.

Mr. BARTLETT. Answer it.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I will answer it in my own time and to my entire satisfaction.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman from Missouri is easily satisfied. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Perhaps not to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. BARTLETT. Oh, the gentleman might. But I am sure that when the gentleman speaks to himself he will have a distinguished orator and an appreciative audience both at the same time and in the same person. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, that being true, what power has Congress to invade my State and throw any safeguards around the ballot box at the primary? We never had any charge that a primary or any election was bought in Georgia, and I think, as a general thing, that the States south of the Potomac River have escaped that charge, with rare exceptions. But in order to safeguard and to protect our elections from any possibility of wrong, we have surrounded them with all of these safeguards. The law of the State of Georgia is better than this law. If you pass this act with reference to the primary and concede the power of the General Government to enact a law, is it not exclusive? If Congress has the power to exercise the authority to enact this law, it has the authority to negative the law of the States and permit them to be ignored. The laws of Congress are the supreme law of the land. If it has the power at all to exercise authority so as to regulate the primary, it has the right to make those regulations the supreme law of the land. Thus by this act you destroy all the other safeguards provided by our State laws. My State does not prescribe the limit of expenditure, but it does say that you shall publish an itemized statement of all sums expended. This bill provides that the expenses for stamps, stationery, and clerk hire shall not be included in the $5,000, the limit placed by the bill on expenditures. In a recent primary canvass in my district the items for stationery, clerical hire, and personal expense, published as required by law in my State, were the chief expenses incurred. So if this law passes in Georgia I can spend $2,000 in traveling expenses, stationery, clerk hire, and stamps, and spend $5,000 additional in hauling men to the polls and in surrounding the ballot box with heelers, and have men riding over the district working for me. You strike down the wholesome law of Georgia and erect in its place a sham, a pretext, a law of whose unconstitutionality, as far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest doubt, in which opinion many able lawyers of this House concur.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri said they had now reported from the conference "a bill full of life, full of vigor, and full of efficiency." Does the gentleman from Missouri mean to say that he led the House into the passage and adoption of a bill which had no life in it, which was a mere "dry bones," a mere skeleton, and transmitted it to this other body—the Senate—where this new man in the Senate touched it with his finger and made it spring up into a living being? [Applause.]

My friend has been here for 12 or 14 years, and I hope he will stay here as long as he wants to, but I will not accept his own characterization of himself that he in this House sent to the Senate a bill without life, without vigor, and without efficiency; and when this new man in public life, this new Senatorial magician, just lately inducted into the Senate from Missouri, laid on his hand and breathed into its nostrils and made it stand up, a full-blown body, full of life and full of vigor.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I think, if the gentleman wants to be accurate, he would not quote me in that way.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wrote it down at the time the gentleman said it. The gentleman said "We have brought back a bill full of life, full of vigor, and full of efficiency."

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; that is so; but the gentleman said that I said it was no account when it went to the Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say it was of no account; I said that the gentleman transmitted a bill to the Senate which he now says is full of life and vigor and efficiency because it took the act of the new Senator from Missouri to make it full of life and vigor and efficiency. That is what I said. I know that the gentleman from Missouri is effective in dealing in metaphor, and he has some poetry to apply to every sentence in his speech. I just attribute that to a poetical license and the extent of his enthusiasm. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I could say a great deal about this bill. It is because I believe in local self-government, it is because I believe in the Constitution, it is because I believe in the right of the sovereign power of the States to exercise the police power of those States and not transferring it to the Federal Government, it is because I have lived in an age and an era where they had a Federal election law—and I know the horror and the misery and the infamy of that period, which will last long after the infamous authors are dead and justly forgotten, except for their infamy—that I will vote against this bill to give to the Federal authorities the power to control elections in my State. I am not afraid of this little bit of a pretext of invading the rights of the States or of requiring a Member of Congress in a primary election to give an account of his expenses. If it stopped there, there might not be any great harm, but it is the admission that Congress has that power to so invade the province of the State. When you admit the power and say it is necessary to regulate the primary, tell me, Representatives, where is the reason, if you are going to regulate the primary, in a simple way of requiring an account of expenses, why you should not regulate as to who should vote in the primary or in a general election? And if you can regulate the primary and regulate the election with reference to the expenditures of money in the primary, why can you not say who shall vote and who shall not, and every other incident connected with the election of Congressmen?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Did not the gentleman vote for the amendments to the Hepburn bill and the interstate-commerce law?

Mr. BARTLETT. In what way?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Did not the gentleman vote for its passage.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did for some of the amendments.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And did not that bill make it a crime for shippers to make contracts for rebate?

Mr. BARTLETT. Why, certainly.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. And did not that give Federal jurisdiction both in the State of Georgia and in the State of Missouri?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; and any man who has a license to practice law, unless he has forgotten how, who does not know the distinction shows his ignorance by asking the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has used 24 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there are many more reasons that I could give why this bill should not pass. The bill turns over the control of the primaries in the States to the Federal Government and the trial for violations of the law to a Federal court. Thank God, you gentlemen of the North have never been cursed with Federal judges like we have, and Federal courts that have been a simple horror to our people in the years past and gone. But, Mr. Speaker, I must give time to those who are more able to discuss this question than I. I am going to conclude by saying, so convinced am I of the correctness of my position on this proposition that Congress has no power to regulate the primary elections of my State, nor power to invade it and strike down those wholesome laws and enact new laws not half so efficient and wholesome—so convinced am I that no such idea ever entered the minds or the hearts of the men who builded the Constitution, but that it was left solely for our friend from Missouri and his new Senator to erect his new "pillar of cloud by day" and enlighten the world by his new "pillar of fire by night," and lead us poor benighted men who have been wandering in the wilderness to a new Canaan—that I will not and can not give my vote to this bill, even though all the press of the country in certain regions are clamoring for it, even though all the uplift magazines demand it, and even though my friend from Missouri has changed his position—I will not say his opinions—upon it and become the very transformed, translated "Bottom" of the Congress; even though all these things come all at once and all together to induce me not to preserve my devotion to the Constitution of the United States, the rights of my people, and the rights of my State, I shall stand here, though I stand alone, and resist the passage of this bill in my feeble way, and to them all I say, come one, come all, the very earth shall fall from its accustomed orbit sooner than I! [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to acknowledge the faithfulness and loyalty with which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] kept in conference the promise which he made to the House when he asked for a conference. [Applause.]

Now, just a few words with reference to this bill. In the last Republican Congress—in 1910—we passed a campaign-publicity bill. This Democratic Congress had barely assembled when there was brought in here with a great flourish of trumpets another bill, supplementary to the first, and which we were told was to carry out Democratic campaign promises and platform pledges. Upon investigation that bill appeared to accomplish very little. It applied only to committees conducting elections

in two or more States. It did not apply to individual candidates. It did not require returns by individual candidates of their expenses either at the primaries or at the general election. When the proposition was offered in this House to amend so as to make it apply to individual candidates and to extend its provisions to the primaries it was voted down by very nearly a party vote, our Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber voting against it and the Republicans solidly voting for it. The bill went over to the Senate, and there it was amended so as to become a real publicity bill; in fact, a publicity bill plus. As amended by the Senate the bill applied not only to campaign committees, but to individual candidates; and not only to candidates for the House, but also for candidates for the office of Senator of the United States. It applied not only to the general election, but as well to the primaries and to nominating conventions and to elections by the legislature. It goes further and fixes a limit to campaign expenses.

The last Democratic national platform called particularly for the fixing of a limit upon campaign expenses, but the bill as it originally passed this Democratic House omitted all reference to that subject. The Senate amendment put it in. The bill came back to this House and the Senate amendments were all disagreed to. A conference between the two Houses was asked for and agreed to. I had the honor to be one of the managers on the part of the House in that conference. The report of the conference retains substantially all the Senate amendments, with some modifications making them more effective and more certain of operation. The question now is, Will the House agree to the conference report? The bill as agreed to in conference fixes the limit of $5,000 upon the expenses which any candidate may incur in securing his nomination and election to the House of Representatives. In the case of candidates for the Senate of the United States the limit is $10,000. I was in favor of scaling the limit of expenses according to the number of votes cast at the last preceding election, so that in smaller States or smaller districts the expenses allowed would not be so great as in the larger ones, something like the corrupt-practices act in England; but I was not the sole conferee, and did not have my way entirely.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. OLMSTED. For just a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman, of course, recognizes that the exercise of this power is under the following provision of the Constitution:

The times, places——

Mr. OLMSTED. I do not care to have that read in my time. I am quite familiar with that provision of the Constitution.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I wanted to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the provision to which I have referred?

Mr. OLMSTED. I am familiar with it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think that word "elections" in that section of the Constitution refers to an election fixed by the Federal statute rather than by any party agreement——

Mr. OLMSTED. I will answer the gentleman in a moment. I well understand that there is considerable objection from certain States where by "grandfather clauses" and by other means the Republican vote has been so nearly eliminated that the whole contest comes at the primary. There is in those States great objection to the operation of this proposed law.

Now, I will answer right here the question that the gentleman from Georgia has asked. The Constitution, in section 4 of the first article, confers upon the legislatures of the States, in the first instance, the right to prescribe the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, but makes that power in the States subject to the authority of Congress to make or alter those regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators. The word "election," if my friend will run down the word to its final signification, he will find means "choice." Where the choice is really determined at the primaries it is in substance as much an election as if it occurred in November. The primary election in such a case decides the election. It fixes and determines the choice.

Mr. HARDWICK. Can the gentleman cite us to some of these decisions to which he has so glibly referred?

Mr. OLMSTED. I have not referred to decisions.

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman said that if we would run it down it would be found to be so held.

Mr. OLMSTED. I can not allow my limited time to be taken up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. OLMSTED. Upon that side of the House gentlemen from districts where there is no contest in November, where it all occurs at the primary, have been along with the rest clamoring for publicity. But they seem to want it only in spots—in Republican spots.

Now, if we are to have a publicity bill at all, we want a publicity bill that applies to the whole country—North, South, East, and West—wherever a Congressman or a Senator is to be elected. [Applause.]

Let me show you how it works. I have known a gentleman, an able, distinguished, genial, and worthy gentleman, to occupy the position of minority leader on this floor in three Congresses. His district had a population of more than 200,000. He received less than 1,500 votes at the general election, but there having been no votes against him, he was triumphantly elected. There was no contest at the general election, and, of course, no expenses to report. A publicity bill that did not apply to the primaries would not afford any publicity of the actual expenses in a district like that.

According to the Congressional Directory for the present session, in the eight districts in the State of Mississippi there was not a Republican vote recorded for Congress. In one district in Alabama—the eighth district—the present honorable Member reports that he received 8,785 votes. The Republican candidate received 6 votes. But even that is better than it was in Mississippi, where they say that a man having the temerity to run for Congress on the Republican ticket and receiving 2 votes was arrested as a repeater. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLMSTED. I will yield for one question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is the district I have the honor to represent on this floor.

Mr. OLMSTED. I am glad you have six good Republicans in it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not in the least ashamed of it, and I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania here, not putting myself forward too much, that since my election to Congress I never have been in either a convention or primary election in that district. The honor has always been given me by my people by giving notice for three months that if anybody wants to run against me to do so, and if there was no other candidate I was declared the nominee of the Democratic Party. If the gentleman only was acquainted with the circumstances he would fully understand why the Republican received only 6 votes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I am not finding any fault with the gentleman or his district. I am glad that it does itself the honor to send so good and able a gentleman to Congress. [Applause.]

Now, in the third district I find that in the Sixtieth Congress the Member was elected without opposition, receiving 2,306 votes. The population of his district was 186,346.

The Member from the sixth district, having a population of 211,000, received 3,030 votes.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is my district. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLMSTED. I can not yield my time. I am not finding any fault with the gentlemen nor their districts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do I understand the gentleman declines?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is out of order.

Mr. OLMSTED. I would be glad to yield if I had the time. In one district of that State the gentleman elected received the magnificent total of 1,743 votes, the district having a population of 181,395.

I will insert here, without reading, a statement showing the districts in Mississippi, Mr. Speaker, with the population and the votes cast for Members of Congress:

Districts.	Population.	Votes.
First	187,739	2,563
Second	183,795	2,567
Third	232,174	1,540
Fourth	199,650	2,536
Fifth	183,066	2,782
Sixth	162,440	4,077
Seventh	211,521	1,933
Eighth	190,885	(1)

[1] Not given.

In the sixth district there were 173 votes recorded for a Socialist candidate, but in the whole eight districts not a single Republican vote was recorded.

Mr. BARTLETT. What has that got to do with campaign contributions?

Mr. OLMSTED. I am going to show what it has to do with them. A very distinguished gentleman, then and now holding a place on this floor from the fourth district of Georgia, reported in the Sixtieth Congress—they do not report the votes now—the votes he received not at the general election but—

at the Democratic primary, in which the real contest occurs, and which is, therefore, the only election in which the people take much interest.

I am stating these facts not in a fault-finding way but merely to show what the gentleman from Alabama so frankly admitted, that in many districts the real contest takes place at the primaries and not at the general election. That is why we are in favor of having the publicity law apply to the primaries. Why should not the expenses of "the real contest" be given publicity in those States where it occurs at the primaries as well as in those States where it occurs at the general election?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. OLMSTED. For one question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Your purpose is to investigate why there are not more votes cast?

Mr. OLMSTED. Not at all. It is simply to require publicity of nomination and election expenses.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; to inquire into it.

Mr. OLMSTED. This bill makes no provision for any inquiry at all, except as to the amount of expenses of nomination and election in every State and in every district.

There is another matter which may well be considered here. We passed recently through this House joint resolution No. 39, providing for the election of Senators by the people. This pending bill provides that whether elected by the legislature or by the people, every candidate for the Senate must report his expenses. This bill, if passed, will be passed in pursuance of authority contained in the fourth section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, conferring upon Congress the power to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators as well as Representatives.

In the resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution so as to provide for the election of Senators by the people, you attempted to modify also the fourth clause, which gives to Congress the power of regulation. The Bristow amendment, agreed to by the Senate, retained the power of regulation in Congress. When that amendment came over here every Democrat voted to disagree, so that is now in conference. That Bristow amendment would restore the resolution, so as to leave in Congress, in case the Constitution should be amended, the power to regulate senatorial and representative elections.

I admit frankly that our Democratic friends, who voted to take away from Congress entirely the power to regulate these elections, are in an awkward position. They have been shouting for a publicity law; but if they vote for this bill they ought at once to move to recede from the disagreement of the House to the Bristow amendment, and let that resolution pass at once, so that the direct election of Senators by the people may be no longer delayed by the presence in it of that obnoxious provision which would prevent Congress from passing any publicity bill at all or in any other way regulating elections. You have been clamoring in campaigns and in campaign platforms for publicity. Now we offer you publicity—Republican publicity—an ocean of publicity. Do not stand shivering on the shore. In the language of the small boy at the happiest period of his life, we say to you, "Come on in; the water is fine." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this conference report regardless of the action of others. The Democrats have long endeavored to secure publicity of campaign expenses in order to prevent or minimize the corruption notorious in our national elections, perpetrated by the contributions of special interests to the campaign funds of the Republican Party. Heretofore Republican ascendancy has defeated our efforts. All we could secure was publication after the election instead of before—locking the stable door after the horse was stolen. Early in the present Congress we passed a bill in the House, wisely devised and drawn, to publish before election in time to checkmate corrupt efforts and defeat their purpose.

That bill fully met the emergency. It laid bare the contributions to national campaign committees for the purpose of corrupting congressional and presidential elections. From different motives, foolish ones on the part of the Democrats, carried away with wild fads, and sinister ones on the part of Republicans who wish by implication to legalize the expenditure of money by candidates, amendments were placed on the bill in the Senate, some of them exceedingly foolish, some of them exceedingly vicious, and all of them inimical to the purpose of the House bill. The 10-cent statesmanship feature, so utterly ridiculous and insulting to the intelligence of American voters, has wisely been abandoned.

The authorization by implication that candidates for Congress may spend $5,000 outside their personal expenses and candidates for the Senate may spend $10,000 outside their personal expenses is a crime against purity, honest politics, and civilization. The proviso that the candidate's personal expenses, traveling, hotel bills, postage, stationery, telegraph, and telephones should not be counted covered substantially the purposes for which a candidate ought to spend money. In honesty and in fact no candidate ought to be allowed to spend any money outside of his personal expenses as enumerated for the purpose of influencing his election. There is no honor in an election that is purchased in whole or in part. There is no profit in it if it takes all or a substantial part of the salary to pay for the election. A man who can afford to spend his salary, or a substantial portion thereof, and go to Congress anyhow, defraying his expenses from other sources, goes there for ulterior purposes, backed by interests which have ends to subserve, He is not there for the public good. He is there improperly, and legislation, if efficacious at all, should prohibit the expenditure of any money to purchase elections. Candidates for any office ought to be prohibited by law from spending a solitary cent to secure votes. When they pay their personal expenses and whatever they may be required to contribute to the expenses of holding the election in an open and legal manner they ought to be prohibited from spending anything else. But this is not the place for that legislation.

Every State ought to be decent enough to provide honest and efficient election laws. When the two Houses of Congress exercise their constitutional power to be the judges of the qualification and election of their own Members, they are armed with sufficient power to purify themselves and protect themselves against unworthy membership. They ought not to condescend to the usurpation and exercise of unnecessary powers to interefere with elections in the States. Federal interference with State elections has always been opposed by the Democratic Party. Aided by Federal courts, it is the one overshadowing menace to our liberties and to be fought at all points and resisted to the death.

The unconstitutional provision for the Federal Government to interfere with primary elections is not only obnoxious but monstrous. I will never vote for it. A State which is not competent to regulate that subject ought to ask the Federal Government to relieve it of further responsibility, and divide its territory among States that are able to do their duty. Right here I will anticipate any criticism that may be made on my position through repetition of the oft-repeated falsehood that this objection to interference in primary elections is peculiar to the South—an effort to protect and conceal the political misdeeds of the South.

There was never a more false and unjust aspersion concocted and published. The elections in the South are honest, free, and fair, under adequate State laws, providing publicity and all other requisites. Everybody votes who wants to, and his vote is counted. Representatives do not purchase their elections there, but enjoy their positions as Members here because they are elected by the free suffrage of the most enlightened, upright people in the world—the only true American and English constituency left solid in any State in this Union. With them remains the only true, reliable, and conservative guaranty for constitutional liberty; with them rests the hope of the defense of the principles of this Government and the perpetuity of our institutions. They pity the ills of the other States, and hope the other States may muster sufficient character and patriotism to deal with the questions. But they are not uneasy about this publicity law electing a single Republican Representative or Senator in any of the Southern districts or States now democratic.

These foolish provisions are put in for the purpose of carrying the large cities and the border States, where enough white people are wrong on politics to take the wrong side and support efforts to use the power of the Federal Government to interfere with elections in the States. The border States, where a great many of the white people are deluded into the support of the Republican Party, may be carried by the Republicans through the instrumentality of these provisions, and some of the larger cities, with their motley population unacquainted with the principles of a republican form of government and caring less for them, may be captured by the Republicans; but let no man hug to his bosom the vain delusion that anybody in the South is afraid of their gaining any Representative or Senator there.

Our doctrines are fundamental. Our principles are fixed and eternal. The citadel of our political virtue is impregnable. Faction and partisanship and Federal oppression have done their worst with us and have failed. We are now safe, but want to elect some Members and Senators in other States. We intend to remain pure and exercise a beneficent influence to help our sister States to purify themselves, and I decline to vote for any provision, either foolish or vicious, that would help subject them to further corruption instead of relieving and protecting them therefrom, as the original House bill provided. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, how does the distribution of time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has 12 minutes, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has 4 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has 20 minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in this report, and I shall vote against it, with the idea of having another conference. As the bill went from the House to the Senate it was a publicity bill. The character of the legislation has been transformed by amendments which were made, some of them improvised on the floor of the Senate, from that of a publicity bill to that of a corrupt-practices act. One of the great pieces of legislation in England is their corrupt-practices act. I believe we should have one in the United States, but I do not believe in passing an act of this important character that is ill-considered, that has never been before any standing committee of this House, and one in which the Representatives of the House upon the conference have not even had an opportunity to give us well-thought and well-considered provisions.

I have great confidence in the gentlemen who represent the House upon the conference committee. The gentleman from Missouri and his associate upon that side of the House [Mr. CONRY] are very able lawyers, and there has been no better lawyer in this House during my term of service than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]. I believe that the thing to do, for those of us who want a well-thought and well-considered corrupt-practices act, is to vote down this conference report, ask for a further conference, and let these gentlemen during the coming recess give it that care, thought, and labor which its importance demands, and bring in a report in December worthy of the country.

For that reason I propose to vote against this report, and not because I do not favor legislation of this character. When I was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives I introduced the first bill in the nature of a corrupt-practices act that ever passed any legislative body in this country. I introduced the publicity bill that became a law in the last Congress, and if we are to have further legislation along these lines I feel a deep interest in having it carefully drawn, and not to have the slipshod and the sloppy and incomplete provisions that are contained in this bill.

In the first place, this bill assumes to restrict the amount of money that a Member of Congress may use, and it fixes that amount at $5,000. In my whole 10 campaigns I have not spent $5,000. There is practically no restriction to that. Then they exempt traveling expenses, stationery, and postage, the circulars that a man may send out in his primary campaign, and the same items when he is up for final election. There may easily be spent under those items three or four or even five thousand dollars more. That leaves so large a sum as to amount to no practical limitation upon the amount that may be spent.

But I am more opposed to this bill because it makes it necessary for every candidate for Congress, whether he is elected or defeated, and for every candidate for the Senate to make an affidavit upon subjects that are not clearly defined, so that he may know what is required of him. If one is called upon to make oath to certain things in a highly penal statute, he should be told just the points that he is to cover. If you will carefully read the provision here with regard to the oath of a candidate, it is indefinite. It may be construed by one man one way, so as to include certain expenses, and by another man so as to exclude those expenses, and no candidate can be sure just what he is to cover in his return.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MCCALL. I should like a couple of minutes more.

Mr. OLMSTED. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MCCALL. Mr. Speaker, I will not have opportunity, in the limited time left me, to call attention minutely to parts of this law, but you will find that the provision with regard to the filing of returns by the candidates does not state where those returns are to be filed. It leaves it merely a matter of inference. As to the return itself, there is the following provision:

> Such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election.

Now, it is very easy for a candidate to make an affidavit as to contributions or promises of money or things of value made by him or by his authorized agent, but how can he tell what is done by any other person? But, you say, it must be with his knowledge and consent. Now, what does that mean? A candidate goes to a place in his district where a meeting is called by the city or town committee. He has nothing to do with it except that he is asked to speak there, but the meeting is in the interest of his candidacy and perhaps in the interests of the State ticket. He consents to that meeting. He has knowledge of it. It is not clear that it would not be incumbent on him to go to the authors of that meeting to find out what they pay for the band, what they pay for the hall, and include that in his account. I do not believe that was intended, but it should be definite. You have altogether too many loosely defined penal statutes. You can find other matters in this bill that are not clear, and your conscientious candidate may feel compelled to make an extreme return in order to include everything that is doubtful, and the candidate who wishes to avoid the law will take to himself the benefit of the doubt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has 13 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] 4 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] 12 minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. BARTLETT. And I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time allowed me I can not more than skim the surface or touch in high places this great question. I can only outline. I wish to say when this conference report was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] I reserved all points of order, expecting that I would have an opportunity to fully and freely discuss thet question now before the House. My object in doing so was to put myself on record in a proper light with reference to two leading propositions contained in this measure. One was the contribution of campaign expenses in general elections. The other was as to the contribution of campaign expenses in primary elections. There is a vast difference in the issues involved in these two propositions. When this bill was before the House, I voted against the amendment which purposed having the law apply to primary elections, but voted for the bill, which provided that the law should apply alone to general elections. My opinion has not been changed by the fact that an amendment has been incorporated in the bill by the Senate by which the law is made to apply to primaries.

For six years the gentleman from Missouri, who has charge of this measure, has been an ardent advocate of the proposition to require the publicity of campaign expenses in general elections, but in no instance during that time has he ever advocated the publication of campaign expenses in primary elections until this bill came back from the Senate with the amendment tacked upon it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], who has just preceded me, who has been looked upon as the father of the proposition to require the publication of campaign expenses, has never advocated or proposed anything of this kind and does not favor the bill in its present form at this time.

The Democratic Members of the House of Representatives are put in this attitude: We have staring us in the face a Democratic platform, a plank of which demands the publication of campaign expenses, but which does not require or contemplate the publication in primary elections. Hon. William J. Bryan addressed a message to the President of the United States, then Secretary of War, demanding the publication of campaign expenses and requesting him to join with him in procuring the passage of a bill by Congress for that purpose, but gave no intimation that it should apply to primary elections. Why, in all the agitation in and out of Congress, in the maga-

zines, and elsewhere, has it not been urged that Congress should make the law apply to primary elections? It is because of the embargo placed upon legislation of this kind by the Constitution of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with this contingency: Here is a demand made by the Democratic convention for the publicity of campaign expenses. Here is a provision of the Constitution of the United States which prevents the Federal authorities from infringing upon the rights reserved to the States. When the Constitution of the United States was framed the States then in existence were already fully organized. They had their own laws, which were interpreted by their own judicial tribunals, and they surrendered only certain rights and prerogatives to the Federal Government through the Constitution. All rights not especially surrendered were reserved to and remain inherent in the States. Amendment IX reads:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Amendment 10 reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

The courts of the States have the sole province and exclusive jurisdiction of interpreting the laws of the States. This broad proposition is submitted: There is a national law providing for the election of Members of Congress. The Constitution and acts of Congress provide for that; providing the number, age, residence, when they shall be elected, and even that the Members of the House of Representatives shall be voted for on written or printed ballots or by voting machines. There is no Federal primary election law. The States of the Union alone have primary election laws, which laws have been enacted by the legislatures of the various States having these laws. If the amendment tacked onto this bill by the Senate is incorporated into this law, the Federal judges will have jurisdiction of the cases arising under the law and will have the right to interpret the primary election laws of the various States, which will be a clear infringement upon the rights of the States and will be in violation of the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Believing that this measure will pass the House, and being paired and prevented from voting upon the question as now presented, I avail myself of the opportunity of expressing my views, trusting to the future for vindication of what I believe to be a usurpation of the rights reserved to the people of the States by the express terms of the Constitution.

For years I have worked and voted for a law providing for the publicity of campaign expenses in general elections, as demanded by the national Democratic platform, which was intended to correct the evil of vast sums of money being used by the national campaign committees in corrupting the electorate and controlling national elections, and I would hail with delight an opportunity at this time to vote for such a law. When the bill was returned to this House in its present form I requested that we be allowed to vote separately on the two propositions, but this could not be permitted under the rules of the House, and we are forced to accept or reject the report as it comes from conference as a whole. For the purpose of showing the Democratic view, that the evil practices sought to be stopped related to national elections and not to local elections or primaries, I herewith incorporate as a part of my remarks the demands of the Democratic Party, culled from the Democratic Campaign Book, page 221:

We demand Federal legislation, forever terminating the partnership which has existed between corporations of the country and the Republican Party under the expressed or implied agreement that in return for the contributions of great sums of money wherewith to purchase elections they should be allowed to continue substantially unmolested in their efforts to encroach upon the rights of the people.

Any reasonable doubt as to the existence of this relation has been dispelled by the sworn testimony of witnesses examined in the insurance investigation in New York and the open admission of a single individual—unchallenged by the Republican national committee—that he himself, at the personal request of the then Republican candidate for the Presidency, raised a quarter of a million dollars to be used in a single State during the closing hours of the campaign.

In order that this practice shall be stopped for all time, we demand the passing of a statute punishing by imprisonment any officer of a corporation who shall either contribute on behalf of or consent to the contribution by a corporation of any money or thing of value to be used in furthering the election of a President or Vice President of the United States or any Member of the Congress thereof. We denounce the Republican Party, having control of the Federal Government, for its failure to pass the bill introduced in the last Congress to compel the publication of the names of contributors and the amounts contributed toward campaign funds, and point to the evidence of the insincerity of Republican leaders when they sought, by an *absolutely irrelevant and impossible amendment*, to defeat the passage of the bill as a further evidence of their intention to conduct their campaign in the coming contest with vast sums of money wrested from favor-seeking corporations. We call attention to the fact that the recent Republican national convention at Chicago refused when the issue was presented to it to declare against such practices.

We pledge the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law prohibiting any corporation from contributing to a campaign fund and any individual from contributing an amount above a reasonable maximum, and providing for the publication before election of all such contributions above a reasonable minimum. (Democratic platform.)

Also from the Democratic campaign book, page 145, the following telegraphic correspondence explains itself:

LINCOLN, NEBR., *May 25, 1908.*

Secretary WM. H. TAFT,
Washington, D. C.:

I beg to suggest that as leading candidates in our respective parties we join in asking Congress to pass a bill requiring publication of campaign contributions prior to election; if you think best, we can ask other candidates to unite with us in the request.

W. J. BRYAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 26, 1908.*

Hon. WM. J. BRYAN,
Lincoln, Nebr.:

Your telegram received. On April 30 last I sent the following letter to Senator Burrows, the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate:

"My Dear Mr. Burrows: I sincerely believe that it would greatly tend to the absence of corruption in politics if the expenditures for nominations and elections of all candidates and all contributions received and expenditures made by political committees could be made public, both in respect to State and national politics. For that reason I am strongly in favor of the passage of the bill which is now pending in the Senate and House, bringing about this result so far as national politics are concerned. I marked this letter "personal" because I am anxious to avoid assuming an attitude in the campaign which it is quite possible I shall never have the right to assume, but so far as my personal influence is concerned, I am anxious to give it for the passage of the bill.

"Very sincerely, yours, WM. H. TAFT."

Since writing the above, in answer to inquiry, I have said publicly that I hope such a bill would pass.

WM. H. TAFT.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *May 26, 1908.*

Hon. WM. H. TAFT, *Secretary of War,*
Washington, D. C.:

Am very much gratified to receive your telegram, and trust that the publication of your letter will add the weight necessary to turn the scales in favor of the measure. Elections are public affairs, and publicity will help purify politics.

W. J. BRYAN.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *May 26, 1908.*

Senator CHARLES A. CULBERSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please secure copies of my telegrams to Secretary Taft and his reply concerning campaign contributions. His letter to Senator Burrows may enable you to secure action on the bill.

W. J. BRYAN.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *May 26, 1908.*

Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Please secure copies of my telegram to Secretary Taft and his reply concerning campaign contributions. His letter to Senator Burrows may enable you to secure action on the bill.

W. J. BRYAN.

But the Republican Congress failed to enact a publicity law.

Mr. Burrows did not press it upon Congress, nor did he, as temporary chairman, call it to the attention of the Republican national convention. The convention by a vote of 94 yeas to 880 nays voted down the publicity plank.

The following is an extract from the Senate Documents, volume 4, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session:

The abuses arising from the secret political contributions has brought about a demand that the sources and objects of campaign contributions and expenditures should at least be revealed to public scrutiny, in order that their regulation and correction, if deemed necessary, should be made with the fullest knowledge of the actual conditions and evils involved.

Following the lead taken by New York in 1890, 17 States have passed measures securing in some degree the publicity of campaign funds. In the closing days of the presidential campaign of 1904 the question of campaign contributions had been made an issue of almost paramount interest. The governors of many States had urged that legislation should be adopted upon this subject. Public opinion demanded that campaign money should be regarded as public money.

On the subject of campaign contributions Senator Gray wrote:

Corrupt-practices acts have been largely unavailing and seemingly incapable of being enforced. Compelled publicity as to contributions and campaign expenses will be more efficient than all of them put together toward suppressing the evil of electoral corruption. It will work automatically and require no legal machinery of pains and penalties to enforce it. I mean that when publicity is once enforced the beneficial results flow automatically, without the intervention of penal legislation.

STATE RIGHTS.

On the question of State rights I will incorporate in my remarks the presentation of this question by Dr. J. L. M. Curry, minister to Spain under President Cleveland, president of Howard College, and at the time of his death custodian of the Peabody fund:

The Union is not the primary social or political relation of those who formed it. The State governments were already organized and were adequate to all the purposes of their municipal concerns. The Federal Government was established only for such purposes as the

State governments and the confederation could not sufficiently answer, namely, the common purpose of all the States. The people of the States not as a unit, not in the aggregation, but separately, hold in themselves all governmental power. One portion they granted to the State governments, another to the Government of the Union, and the residue they retained undelegated to themselves.

Mr. Jefferson deprecated "usurpation of the powers retained by the States, interpolations into the compact, and direct infractions of it," and as late as 1825 solemnly asserted that though a dissolution of the Union would be a great calamity, submission to a government of unlimited power would be a greater.

The powers reserved in the tenth amendment are not only reserved against the Federal Government in whole, but against each department, the judicial as well as the legislative and executive. Otherwise the Federal sphere is supreme and the spheres of the States subordinate. It can not be tolerated for a moment that the Supreme Court has the right to modify every power inhering in the State governments or undelegated to the people, so as to exempt its own action from their influence. The authors of the Federalist insisted that the apprehended inequality did not exist, and that should it be developed the States would be able to control. Hamilton wrote: "The General Government can have no temptation to absorb the local authorities left with the States. * * * It is, therefore, improbable that there could exist a disposition in the Federal councils to usurp the powers with which commerce, finance, negotiation, and war are connected. Should wantonness, lust of domination, beget such a disposition, the sense of the people of the several States would control the indulgence of so extravagant an appetite."

Those who contend most strenuously for the rights of the States and for a strict construction of the Constitution are the genuine lovers and friends of the Union. Their principles conserve law, good order, justice, established authority; and their unselfish purpose has been to preserve and transmit our free institutions as they came from the fathers, sincerely believing that their course and doctrines were necessary to preserve for them and posterity the blessings of good government. The States have no motive to encroach on the Federal Government and no power to do so, if so inclined, while the Federal Government has always the inclination and always the means to go beyond what has been granted to it.

Also Loring's commentary on the argument of Daniel Webster:

As the United States Government's sovereignty is undoubtedly limited to the express grants of the Constitution, the powers not granted are in the States or people. There was no need of any reservation, except to allay the fears of those who erroneously believed that the Constitution gave unlimited power to the Union.

Again, Dr. Curry, in discussing the ninth and tenth amendments, says:

The ninth amendment prohibits a construction by which the rights retained by the people shall be denied or disparaged by the enumeration; but the tenth, in language that tyranny can not pervert or dispute, "reserves to the States, respectively, or to the people the powers not delegated to the United States or prohibited to the States." Could any language more conclusively show the ultimate authority of the States or that the General Government has no more right to enforce its decisions against those of the several States where they disagree as to the extent of their respective powers than the latter have of enforcing their decisions in like cases? This reservation was incorporated from a caution deemed unnecessary and excessive by some, because such a reservation is of the very essence and structure of the Constitution, but it has been vindicated as a marked demonstration of the wisdom and sagacity of the fathers. Instead of receiving powers the States had bestowed them, and in confirmation of their original authority most carefully reserved every right they had not relinquished. The powers reserved by those who possessed them, the distinct people of each State, are those not delegated or prohibited, and were intended to remove suspicion of a tendency in the Constitution toward consolidation which had been vigorously charged by some of those who had opposed the ratification. It can not be reiterated too often that the people do not derive their rights from the Government. In England, Magna Charta and other franchises were granted by Kings and residuary rights remain in and with the Government, the ungranted rights remain with the Government; here, ungranted rights remain with the grantors and these are the people of the States.

TUCKER ON THE CONSTITUTION.

I also quote from John Randolph Tucker:

The Federal Government has no powers but those delegated by the Constitution. It has no inherent powers, but only those derived from the Constitution as expressly delegated or granted by necessary implication. Those not so delegated, unless prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people. Reservation of powers is the basis of the title of the States or of the people of the States to political powers under the Constitution. They are not secured to the States or to the people of the States by virtue of the Constitution. They are inherent in the people of the States, and unless delegated to the United States, or by their constitutional act prohibited to themselves, they remain with the States respectively and the people.

In the case of the United States against Cruikshank, Chief Justice Waite uses this emphatic language:

The Government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is defined and limited by the Constitution. All powers not granted to it by that instrument are reserved to the States or to the people.

In Martin against Hunter, Judge Story, delivering the opinion of the court, said:

It is perfectly clear that the sovereign powers vested in the State governments by their respective constitutions remain unaltered and unimpaired, except so far as they were granted to the Government of the United States. * * * The Government, then, of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

Hamilton, in the Federalist, says:

The rule that all authorities, of which the States are not explicitly divested in favor of the Union, remain with them in full vigor * * * is clearly admitted by the whole tenor of the instrument.

Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1908, the House of Representatives had under consideration the McCall publicity bill, providing for the publicity of campaign expenses, to which there had been attached an amendment providing for the publicity applying to primary elections.

Mr. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, who has almost invariably advocated those measures inimical to the interests of the South, stated:

The amendments go beyond the old election's law sections to which I have referred by including primary elections, and I have no kind of doubt that Congress has authority to regulate and control primary elections held under State and Territorial laws where they are called for the purpose of nominating candidates for Congress and Delegates thereto.

To this speech the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], who now has charge of the measure before the House, replied. He said:

We on this side—

Meaning the Democratic side—

will not dodge the issue. We earnestly favor publicity of campaign contributions, but we are unalterably opposed to force bills and Federal supervision of elections.

Hon. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, the minority leader, in his speech in that debate upon the question, said:

You know that nobody who believes in American institutions would vote for section 11 of the Crumpacker bill. It puts the execution of State laws in the hands of the Congress and the courts of the United States.

You know that nobody would vote for section 12 of that bill, which does the same thing and which prescribes a Federal punishment for a violation of State laws.

The vote was taken on the bill as amended. One hundred and sixty-one Republicans voted in the affirmative, including the Speaker [Mr. CANNON]; 126 Democrats voted against it.

It was this measure to which reference is had in the Democratic national platform in which the statement is made—

The insincerity of the Republican leaders when they sought by an absolutely *irrelevant and impossible amendment* to defeat the passage of the bill.

Thus, by the Democratic Party, in the national convention assembled, is this very effort to infringe upon the sacred rights reserved to the States and to the people thereof repudiated and denounced.

When the bill which is now under consideration was up for passage in the House only a few days ago, the Democrats of the House indignantly refused to accept an amendment allowing the provisions of this act to apply to primary elections. It was finally passed by the House of Representatives after the amendment relating to primaries had been eliminated. No one more vigorously opposed the amendment than the gentleman from Missouri who has charge of the bill. The bill went to the Senate by the votes and with the approval of the Democratic Members of this House, and after they had most emphatically refused to enact the measure into law with the provision incorporating the primary feature. But, lo, the Senate reinstated the provision requiring that the law apply to the primary-election laws of the various States. Now, we behold the anomaly of those who had worked and voted against the measure, and had declaimed against it, advocating it.

When the Republicans were in the majority, we denounced their efforts to force this measure upon us. But now, when the Democrats are in the majority, it seems inconceivable that a fundamental Democratic principle should be trampled underfoot. When this bill which we now have under consideration was before this House on April 14, 1911, in charge of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], who is now presenting it to this House, an amendment was offered to make primary elections in which Members of Congress should be elected amenable to its features.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. His motion was carried upon his statement that he opposed the measure in its present form—meaning with the amendment thereto applying to primaries. He stated that he was not only opposed to it in that form, but added, "So is every other man who wants publicity." The question was put by the Speaker—

Shall the bill be recommitted with instructions to have section 2 stricken out?

This was the section applying to primary elections. The question, being put, was carried by 157 yeas to 149 nays—the Democrats in the affirmative and the Republicans in the negative. On the same day the chairman of the committee reported the bill back to the House with section 2, relating to primaries, ordered to be stricken out. The amendment was again voted on, and section 2, referring to primary elections, was stricken out by a vote of 165 yeas to 139 nays, the Democrats again voting against the provision in favor of having publicity ap-

ply to primary elections, even the Democratic Speaker asking that his name should be called, so that he could be placed on record as opposed to the publicity law applying to primary elections. After the primary-election feature had been eliminated the bill was passed by a vote of 307 yeas and not a single vote against it, even the Republicans putting themselves on record with the Democrats in favor of carrying out the demands of the Democratic Party for the publicity of campaign expenses in *general elections*. The Democrats had thus time and again put themselves on record at this session of Congress—as they had done heretofore—as opposed to the violation of the rights of the States by allowing the Federal authorities to invade the sacred precincts of the States and take from the State courts the right to interpret the laws of the States.

RECONSTRUCTION.

Not many years ago the people of the Southern States had an experience with Federal interference with the local affairs, and the horrors of reconstruction still strike consternation in the hearts of those who experienced that fearful ordeal. There is no disposition on the part of any loyal citizen of this great Union to again fight over the battles which divided the two sections of this Union; but the fearful experiences of those troublesome times which tried men's souls will serve as an illustration of the danger of again allowing any infringement upon the rights reserved to the States. Only a few illustrations culled from the official records will suffice.

LOUISIANA.

Henry Clay Warmoth was the first Republican governor of Louisiana during the reconstruction times, when the laws of the States were either suspended or made subservient to the Federal authorities. He was an adventurer, having no interest in the welfare of the State. He had been a Democrat in Illinois; had gone from there to Missouri, where he enlisted in the Federal Army. He escaped charges preferred against him in the Army, also, after the war, in Texas, from which State he went to Louisiana. He there entered politics as a Republican. He first ran for Delegate to Congress from Louisiana, the negro voters being required to deposit 50 cents each with their ballots to defray his expenses. He was subsequently declared elected governor of Louisiana. His salary was $8,000 per annum. The first year he was governor he made over $100,000, and when his term expired and he retired to private life his wealth was estimated at $1,000,000. The tax collector in New Orleans, appointed by him, received $60,000 per annum. The above facts are taken from House Report No. 92, Forty-second Congress, second session, page 24 (investigating committee).

Illiterate negroes filled the various offices in the State, sat on juries, made laws to plunder the people, taxation being synonymous with confiscation.

CARPETBAG RULE IN LOUISIANA.

William Pitt Kellogg was the second Republican governor of Louisiana.

The conviction has been general among the whites since 1872 that the Kellogg government was a usurpation. This conviction among them has been strengthened by the acts of the Kellogg legislation, abolishing existing courts and judges and substituting others, presided over by judges appointed by Kellogg, having extraordinary and exclusive jurisdiction over political questions by changes in the law centralizing in the governor every form of political control, including the suspension of elections by continuing the returning board with absolute power over the returns of elections; by the extraordinary provisions enacted for the trial of titles and claims to office; by the conversion of the police force, maintained at the expense of the city of New Orleans, into an armed brigade of the State Militia, subject to the command of the governor. * * *

With this conviction is a general want of confidence in the integrity of the existing State and local officials * * * which is accompanied by the paralization of business and destruction of values. The securities of the State have fallen in two years from 70 or 80 to 25; of the city of New Orleans from 80 or 90 to 30 or 40; while the fall in bank shares, railroad shares, city and other corporate companies have in a degree corresponded. Throughout the rural districts of the State the negroes reared in habits of reliance upon their masters for support, and in a community in which the members are always ready to divide the necessaries of life with each other, not regarding such action as very evil, and having immunity from punishment from the nature of the local officials, have come to filching and stealing fruit, vegetables, and poultry so generally * * * that the raising of these articles had to be entirely abandoned, to the great distress of the white people.

The taxation has been carried almost to the point of confiscation. In New Orleans the assessors are paid a commission on the amount appraised, and the houses and stores can be had there for the taxes. In Natchitoches Parish the taxation reached about 8 per cent of the assessed value of the property. In many parishes all the white Republicans and all the officeholders belong to the same family.

The Kellogg government claims to have reduced taxation. This has been effected in part by establishing a board to fund the debt of the State at 60 per cent of its face value. This measure aroused great hostility, not so much on account of the reduction of its acknowledged debt as because it gave the funding board * * * discretionary authority to admit to be funded some $6,000,000 of debt alleged to be fraudulent. So that under the guise of reducing the acknowledged debt it gave opportunity to swell the fraudulent debt against the State. (H. Rept. No. 101, 43d Cong., 2d sess., p. 6.)

SOUTH CAROLINA—HIGH PRICE FOR A GOVERNOR.

COLUMBIA, S. C., *October 16, 1877.*

Personally appeared F. J. Moses, who, on oath, deposes and says: When, as governor, I approved the large printing bill for the Republican Printing Co., during the session of 1872–73, I received from Mr. Woodruff the sum of $15,000, I think. The money was paid in a check drawn by Le Grand Benedict in favor of Hardy Solomon, and the sum of money was turned over to Messrs. Seibels & Ezell as the first payment on the purchase of the Preston mansion.

Report on Public Frauds in South Carolina, page 317:

Moses was speaker of the house from 1868 to 1872 and governor from 1872 to 1874. Besides this bribe, he testified that he received, when speaker, $25,000 at one time and $15,000 at another, besides smaller sums and "divisions." He was a scalawag. (1873.)

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT,
Thursday, July 2, 1874.

Saw Wright. He wanted me to raise him $2,500, and said he would give me the decision by 6 o'clock, if I would get that amount for him. He suggested that I try ex-Gov. Scott, but he was no go. Scott said he did not want the mandamus unless it could be used for legislative expenses, as well as for Frazee, Rose, and the printing company, and went back and told Judge Wright so. Wright asked me to telegraph for Jones, and I did so; but failed to bring him. Very much troubled about mandamus. (Report on Public Frauds in South Carolina, p. 296.)

Extracts from diary of Woodruff, clerk of the State senate:

Judge Wright was a Massachusetts negro. Except in Arkansas, Louisiana, and South Carolina, the supreme courts were fairly decent bodies. (1874.)

A NEGRO LEGISLATURE.

In place of the old aristocratic society stands the rude form of the most ignorant democracy that mankind ever saw invested with the functions of government. It is the dregs of the population, habilitated in the robes of their intelligent predecessors, and asserting over them the rule of ignorance and corruption. * * * It is barbarism overwhelming civilization by physical force. * * * We will enter the house of representatives. Here sit 124 members. Of these 23 are white men, representing the remains of the old civilization. These are good substantial citizens. * * * There they sit, grim and silent. They feel themselves to be but loose stones thrown in to partially obstruct the current they are powerless to resist. This dense negro crowd * * * do the debating, the squabbling, the lawmaking, and create all the clamor and disorder of the body. These 23 white men are but observers, the enforced auditors of the dull and clumsy imitation of a deliberative body, whose appearance in their present capacity is at once a wonder and a shame to modern civilization.

The speaker is black, the clerk is black, the doorkeepers are black, the little pages are black, the chairman of the ways and means is black, and the chaplain coal black. At some of the desks sit colored men whose types would be hard to find outside of Congo, whose costumes, visages, attitudes, and expressions only befit the forecastle of a buccaneer. (A "liberal" Republican's description of the South Carolina Legislature of 1871. From Pike, Prostrate State, p. 12 et seq.)

KEEPING MONEY IN THE STATE.

Afterwards I saw (Senator) Leslie in one of these rooms and he handed me a smaller package, about the shape of a brick, which I took and carried home, and on examination found that it contained about $5,000 in money. I will not be positive, but I think the sum of $30,000 was to be distributed among members of the senate committee on finance, and there was some feeling afterwards about some rumors that Owens and Whittemore had got more than other senators * * *. I have one of the Blue Ridge scrip now for $5,000 which was given me in connection with these matters, in addition to the $5,000 testified above. I was supporting these bills because I thought, after hearing arguments of these men, that it was right, and merely took the money because I thought I might as well have it and invest it here as for them to carry it off out of the State. (Report of public frauds in South Carolina, p. 640. Statement of W. Beverly Nash, a negro leader. 1872.)

WHAT ARE YOU WILLING TO PAY?

I went to Tim Hurley, negro, and told him the circumstance; that this man wanted to get a charter for his mine; that it would bring into the State $160,000 or $170,000 of cash immediately, and would help our people a great deal. He looked at me and said, "What is it worth?" I said, "It has not been tried yet, but we hope to make it profitable." He burst into a laugh, and said, "You are green; I mean what are you willing to pay to get the thing through?" I said, "I am not willing to pay anything. You are legislating for our people; this is for the benefit of the people, and we demand our rights at your hands." The bill was not passed that week, and I returned to Columbia on some business afterwards and met this man, who said, "There is no other way than to pay this thing through, and I have made arrangements to do it; if you will go to the legislature to-morrow you will see the difference between your arrangements and what I have made." (Ku Klux report, South Carolina testimony, p. 178. Statement of counsel for manufacturers.)

THE REPUBLICAN RULE IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

That certificates for legislative expenses have been made to cover vast frauds no man will dispute. They are universally regarded as the last culminating evidence of a prevailing system of corruption which has disgraced our State and offended the nation. (Veto of bonanza bill, Mar. 17, 1875.)

A very large number of the members of the South Carolina Legislature come to the capital for the purpose of selling their votes and making all they can out of the office. (Interview, May 24, 1875.)

The last six sessions up to the time I was inaugurated cost the State, under the head of legislative expenses, the enormous sum of $2,147,430.97. These figures, I may say, are unparalleled in the history of American legislation. It is stealing, pure and simple. (Interview, May 24, 1875.)

The duties of a trial justice here are precisely the same as the duties of justice of peace in other States, yet previous governors had appointed and commissioned over 200 men to the important duties of this office who could not write nor read a word of the English language. It was a farce and a fraud; for how can men thus ignorant

intelligently try cases, civil or criminal, brought before them? (Interview, May 24, 1875.)

What a travesty it is to see men filling the office of school commissioner, to pass on the qualifications of school teachers, when they can barely write their names. (Speech, Feb. 2, 1876.)

Extracts from Gov. Chamberlain's statements published in the Charleston News and Courier, September 20, 1876. He was then candidate on the Republican ticket for relection.

House Miscellaneous Document No. 31, part 1, Forty-fourth Congress, second session.

SOME LEGISLATIVE EXPENSES.

Copies of receipted bills in the South Carolina treasury show that $200,000 was spent for furniture, only $17,000 of which went to furnish the statehouse. The investigating committee in 1877 printed about 1,200 pages of similar bills, and this was only a fraction of the material there. No attempt was made in South Carolina to disguise the frauds. (Report of public frauds in South Carolina.)

Public printing in South Carolina.

Session of:	
1868–69	$21,124
1869–70	45,000
1870–71	152,465
1871–72	173,000
1872–73	450,000
1873–74	385,000
1874–75	50,000
1875–76	50,000
Total cost from 1868 to 1876	1,326,589
Total cost from 1790 to 1868	609,000
Showing an excess of cost for printing during the 8 years of Republican administration over the previous 78 years	717,589
Average cost of printing under the Republican administration per year	165,823
Average cost under old régime per year	7,807
Cost of printing under Hampton administration, 1 year	6,178
Amounts appropriated, session 1872–73, Republican administration	450,000
Total for 25 years, old régime, from 1840–1866	278,251
Excess of cost of printing for 1 year of Republican administration over that of old régime for 25 years	171,749
Total cost for 15 months under Republican administration	850,000
Cost of printing for 78 years, old régime	609,000
Cost per month under Republicans	55,666
Cost per month under Hampton administration	514

COUNTY OFFICERS IN MISSISSIPPI.

The Ames Republicans (in Mississippi) have unscrupulously used the ignorance and greed of the negroes to help them in their political schemes. Controlling the negro vote and using it as a solid mass, they have put into such offices as the county supervisors and treasurers, as well as into the legislature, negroes who were often not only unable to read and write, but who were notoriously corrupt and corrupting demagogues. For instance, the late treasurer of Hinds County, in which the State capital lies, was a negro who could neither read or write, and who was killed a few weeks ago by another negro for a disgraceful intrigue. In the last legislature were several negroes who could neither read or write. It happened that the members of a grand jury were totally illiterate. A city government was to be elected last August in Vicksburg, and the Republicans nominated for mayor a white man at the time under indictment for 23 offenses, and for aldermen seven colored men, most of them of low character, and one white man, who could neither read nor write, the keeper of a low groggery. * * * Of the present supervisors of Warren County (Vicksburg) the president and two others can not read. It is a notorious fact that Gov. Ames has appointed to judicial places men ignorant of the law, and that he has used his appointing power to shield criminals who were his adherents and to corrupt the judiciary of the State. (Nordhoff, Cotton States, p. 75, 1875.)

TAXATION IN MISSISSIPPI.

In 1869 the State levy was 10 cents on the $100 on assessed value of lands. For the year 1871 it was four times as great; for the year 1872 it was eight and one-half times as great; for the year 1873 it was twelve and one-half times as great; for the year 1874 it was fourteen times as great as it was in 1869. The tax levy of 1874 was the largest State tax ever levied in Mississippi, and to-day the people are poorer than ever before. * * * A careful estimate shows that during those years of increasing and most extravagant tax levies the public debt was increased on an average annually over $664,000, a sum itself sufficient to defray the entire expenses of the government economically administered. (A protest from the Mississippi taxpayers' convention to the legislature, Dec. 2, 1874. Mississippi Elections, 1875, p. 457.)

Statement of Reuben Davis, formerly a Member of the United States Congress:

"You took $16,000 of my cotton and left me a beggar; I call that an act of oppression. You denied me the right to vote; I call that an act of oppression. You denied me right to hold office; I call that an act of oppression. You refused to permit our State to be represented in Congress; I call that an act of oppression. You sent men here to organize these colored people for political purposes and for your political good, and the men who came were the men your people in the North would scarcely recognize as gentlemen at home, and they robbed us; I call that oppression. I call it oppression not to throw a little flower upon the grave of a southern soldier, which we have never failed to do upon the graves of northern soldiers in the South since the war ended.

I call it a manifestation of bitterness toward us in the general legislation which has been imposed upon the South, and which was intended for the South alone, although * * * it was general on its face. But I have seen as many as four or five hundred men of my country taken before your Federal court, and when they got there the district attorney says: "Pay me the cost and I will dismiss the suit." We have been robbed of our substance that way; I call that oppression. (Mississippi Elections, 1875, p. 1077.)

ARKANSAS.

Arkansas has less than 650,000 people. It has about 120,000 voters. These owed in 1868, when reconstruction began in this State, about $3,500,000, and had $319,000 in cash in their treasury. The debt was State debt. The counties owed little or nothing. To-day, after seven years, the State owes at least $15,700,000, and most of the counties have debts of their own sufficient to make them bankrupt. And for this huge indebtedness, which amounts for State, counties, towns, and school districts, to probably $20,000,000, the people have nothing to show, except some miles of railroad. * * * The State debt alone amounts to more than $115 for every voter. State, county, township, and school debts, including scrip of all kinds, would probably bring the voters in debt $175 per head. * * *

In Little Rock the collector of taxes openly engaged in brokerage, took out a Federal license as a broker, and then drove a thriving trade with the citizens when they came to pay their taxes. You must understand that all State and county scrip was receivable at par for taxes. If a citizen had to pay $50 taxes, he might buy scrip at 30 cents and pay it in at par.

But the collector bought scrip beforehand, when the market was low, and made his own bargain with the citizens. It is said that he made his office worth $100,000 a year. His way was to demand a moiety of the tax, but in greenbacks. For this he gave a receipt in full. Then he kept the greenbacks and turned into the treasury the scrip he had bought up so cheaply. This atrocious form of swindling became so universal that I have been told that only one tax collector in the whole State has uniformly turned into the treasury the same money which he received, and this when the allowances of the assessors and collectors were so great that in some years it cost 20 per cent to collect the State revenue. (Nordhoff, The Cotton States, 1875, pp. 29–31, 1868–1875.)

NORTH CAROLINA.

The taxation for State purposes has increased fivefold under the new constitution. Our taxation for State purposes before the war used to be 10 cents on each $100 valuation of property (one-tenth of 1 per cent). We pay this year for State purposes 52 cents on each $100 of value—that is, the present levy for regular State purposes, in addition to the public debt, county expenses, etc. (Ku Klux Rept., North Carolina testimony, p. 313, 1871.)

ALABAMA.

In 1858 the total State tax of Madison County, Ala., from all sources was $23,417.63. In 1870 the total State tax of Madison County was not less than $65,000, made up as follows:

Tax on real estate	$51,445.30
Tax on personal property	8,471.75
Tax on licenses, polls, insurance, etc., estimated at	5,082.95

The estimate of taxes for polls, insurance, etc., is a low one, and the probability is that the aggregate will, in fact, fall but little below $70,000. The total State tax on land in Madison County in 1858 was $7,213.10; in 1870 it was $51,445.30, a difference of $44,232.20. In other words, the total tax paid on land in our county in 1870 was more than seven times what it was in 1858. And before the war we had over 13,000 slaves in the county, worth not less than $8,000,000—a sum fully equal to the value of all the taxable property in the county. My taxes last year, 1870, were three times as great as the year previous. (Ku Klux Rept., Alabama testimony, p. 461. Statement of P. M. Dox, northern man, Independent, 1871.)

BACON AND HAMS IN POLITICS IN ALABAMA, 1874.

These reports are by no means as complete as they should be, but by reference to them it will be seen that in the first congressional district M. G. Candee issued in Wilcox and Monroe Counties 24,902 pounds; G. V. Boynton, in Dallas County, 19,021 pounds; total, 43,923 pounds. In the second congressional district were distributed 41,949 pounds in the various counties; however, 7,239 pounds of this was reclaimed by the Government. In the third congressional district 20,000 pounds were distributed, but the Government afterwards recovered 12,182 pounds of this. Fifty-two thousand one hundred and thirty-five pounds were distributed in the fourth congressional district and 31,278 in the fifth district. (H. Rept. 262, 43d Cong., 2d sess., p. 1299. Report of Capt. W. T. Gentury, Nineteenth Infantry, United States Army.)

As to the use made of the Government bacon, Perrin (deputy United States marshal) testified:

I issued the bacon for Monroe County. Previous to doing so a report was circulated among the negroes that in order for them to obtain bacon they would have to vote the straight Republican ticket; and if they received bacon, and afterwards refused or neglected to vote the said Republican ticket, they would forfeit their rights in law. As I was a candidate for the legislature upon the said ticket, I did not consider it necessary to correct this report. * * * It was extensively stated that a barbecue would be held at Monroeville on election day, and that all negroes who would attend and vote the Republican ticket would receive bacon enough to last them a year. This induced many of them to come from adjoining counties and vote on said day. * * * At least 500 illegal votes were cast there for the Republican ticket.

Under pretense of relieving destitution caused by floods in Alabama, the radical Members of Congress from that State secured an appropriation from Congress. The appropriation was made in the spring; but the bacon was held until the fall election, and distributed in districts never flooded. (1874, Nordhoff, Cotton States, p. 88.)

FLORIDA—END OF CARPETBAG RULE IN FLORIDA.

The visiting statesmen returned to the North and the Florida lawyers began to set up for themselves. They filed in the Supreme Court a petition for a writ of mandamus, * * * asking that a board of State canvassers be compelled to reassemble and canvass the returns as sent up by the county boards of canvassers. The board, in their first answer, raised the question of the jurisdiction of the court. * * * A peremptory writ was issued, commanding the board to count the votes from the face of the returns. Of course, there was no answer to any such writ, but the conspirators undertook to trifle with the court, and filed the protest instead of executing its mandate.

The court then intimated clearly to the conspirators what they might expect if its mandate was not immediately obeyed. The conspirators, viewing the iron bars of the prison house in fear and trembling, with weeping eyes, returned and made the canvass. The second canvass gave Drew 195 majority over Stearns, and the Hayes electors 214 over Tilden. The board in this canvass threw out the returns from Clay County so as to save the Hays electors. * * * Gov. Stearns, looking back over the hard labor of his plundering career, and seeing that

the packing of juries, the prostitution of public schools, the disfranchising of whole counties, mob conventions, planned irregularities in elections, the public money to get possesion of railroads, the wholesale stuffing of ballot boxes had availed nothing, still was loath to give up the government when he was actually in sight of the promised land. He called a consultation of the ring chiefs at the City Hotel and required to know of them whether they would support him should he maintain that he was governor, the decision of the Supreme Court to the contrary notwithstanding. With one voice, they all answered "Yea." Some of the carpetbaggers doubted the propriety of defying a Republican Supreme Court, but the "Little Giant" (L. G. Dennis) declared that if Stearns did not hold onto the government he would kill him. The day before Drew was to be inaugurated Stearns saw many strange faces in Tallahassee among the whites, and he began to grow pale and talk weak. The "Little Giant," now seeing that Stearns was about to yield up the ghost, went out and filled himself with the red beverage of hell and came to the hotel to murder him, and would have attempted to do so if he had not been locked in a room and detained until he fell asleep.

In the meantime the whites had made great preparation for the inauguration of Drew. Early next morning Drew and Stearns were seen coming out of a house together, as though they had been holding a long consultation. The whites were on hand from Georgia and from all parts of the State in large numbers, and the confiding freedmen came also to see the inauguration of Stearns. Drew seems to have made it all right with Stearns, or Stearns with Drew, and Stearns procured a team and drove into the country, while Drew was inaugurated. The whites had stationed in an old cotton storehouse close by the capitol between 300 and 500 men armed with repeating rifles, with the intention of slaughtering the men who might attempt to inaugurate the defeated candidate. Everything, however, passed off quietly, and the new governor was inaugurated amidst the shouts of thousands of glad-hearted people, both black and white, who boasted that their votes had done the work. Thus ended the eight years of carpetbag famine and pestilence. (Wallace, Carpetbag Rule in Florida, p. 342.)

Wallace supported Stearns and Hayes. Drew was Democratic candidate for governor, 1876. * * *

THE SOUTH WITH HER CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORED.

Mr. Speaker, if the time were propitious, I would like to turn from this horrible nightmare of only a few years ago, when our fields of the South were a barren waste, our homes made desolate, our manhood trampled under foot, and all save the sacred honor of our womanhood destroyed, to our present achievements; to detail at length the wonderful development in mining, manufacturing, and agricultural pursuits; but I will only take time to state in a general way that no land under the sun has made such rapid strides in material development as has the South within the last generation. Natural gas, oil, iron ore, coal, sulphur, salt, timber, and other natural resources abound in almost limitless quantities.

But the South is naturally an agricultural country, and, freed from oppressive taxation and tyrannical oppression, we are working out our own destiny, and are to-day a happy and contented people. Why molest us? Why throw in the "apple of discord" as we dance with glee to the harp of joy? I herewith submit for the earnest consideration of every lover of this great country of ours the statement of the Manufacturers' Record of the 17th instant, entitled "Developing the Nation's Greatest Asset":

What a marvelous story of vast expansion in manufactures and in agriculture, of transformation, of increasing wealth, is being unfolded as from day to day the census tells in cold statistics of the capital and products of the individual States of this country! The 16 Southern States covered by the work of the Manufacturers' Record now have more capital invested in manufacturing than the whole country had in 1880.

In 1880 the total capital invested in manufacturing in the United States was $2,790,000,000. These 16 States had $2,885,000,000 in manufacturing capital when the present census figures were compiled in 1909, and to this several hundred millions have since been added. This is a marvelous change. It should arrest every man's attention. In 1880 the United States was justly boasting of its vast industrial interests, of its development in manufacturing and agriculture, and yet these Southern States now have several hundred million more capital engaged in manufacturing operations than the entire country then had. With such an achievement despite hard conditions prevailing until recent years in the development of the industrial activities of the South, how limitless are the possibilities of this section as indicated by what has already been accomplished! In 1900 the value of the mineral products of the South was $131,700,000; in 1909 it was $327,421,000; and we have as yet scarcely begun to scratch the surface or even to discover the extent of the mineral wealth of the South. Southern prosperity, however, is not found in manufacturing and mining alone. The same great expansion is seen on every hand and in every line of activity. The addition of over $4,000,000,000 to the value of the farm properties of these States attests the progress of agriculture.

In 1900 the total value of the farms of the 16 Southern States included in this comparison was $3,233,000,000. In 1909 it was $7,298,000,000. During the same period the value of farm buildings, more strongly indicative of increasing prosperity than even the value of farm lands, rose from $855,000,000 to $1,672,000,000, strikingly illustrating the vast activities in the construction of dwellings and farm buildings generally during that 10-year period. What a wonderful change must have marked the life of the farmers of these 16 States as indicated by this increase of over $800,000,000 in the value of their farmhouses, what an advance in their financial strength, in their power to consume, their power to improve and produce, was made by the gain of $4,000,000,000 in the value of their farm property. This advance in farm lands and buildings finds its explanation in the increase in the value of the 12 leading crops of these States, which advanced from $916,000,000 in 1900 to $1,977,000,000 in 1909, a difference in the value of one year's output of over $1,000,000,000 as compared with the output of 10 years before.

Year after year from 1900 there was an ever-increasing value of southern farm products, the momentum continuing until, as stated, the value in 1909 of these 12 leading crops, which, of course, does not by any means express the full value of the output of all southern farm products, was $1,000,000,000 greater than in 1900. This difference of $1,000,000,000 in the value of these 12 crops in 1909 and 1900 was greater than the aggregate national banking capital of the United States at present, and it is going on from year to year.

Increasing productivity in agriculture and in manufactures has naturally led to an increase in foreign commerce through the southern ports. Ten years ago the combined value of the foreign exports and imports of the South figured up $536,000,000. For the last fiscal year the figures show a total of $896,000,000, a gain of $360,000,000 compared with 1900. The importance of the South as an asset in the Nation's commerce is indicated in the following facts:

1. During the last fiscal year 47 per cent of the total exports of the United States originated in the South.

2. During the same year 36.4 per cent passed through southern ports.

3. In that year the value of the exports from one southern port was twice as great as the total value of the combined exports from all the entire Pacific coast of the United States, and was $23,541,732 more than the combined values of exports and imports of the Pacific coast.

4. The value of the foreign exports from that one southern port exceeded by $38,389,552 the combined export trade of San Francisco, Boston, and Philadelphia.

In banking and in railroad operations the same wonderful increase is seen. These figures illuminate the whole story of the South's upbuilding. Intelligently studied, they give some conception of how great must have been the activity in the establishment of new factories, the purchase of equipment for mine and mill, for the construction of dwellings, the building of wharves and warehouses, and for all the other activities which go with such a vast expansion of business. They emphasize as nothing else can do what this period of expanding activity has meant in city building operations and the limitless work connected with the engineering problems of city life, the building of streets and roads and water works, the establishment of sewerage systems, electric light plants, and kindred enterprises.

Interesting, however, as these facts are as throwing light upon what has been accomplished, they are of infinitely more interest as illuminating the future. They show that the South, standing erect and triumphant, is ready to go forward with a momentum it has never known before, with its material upbuilding, backed with the vast force of accumulated money and, even more important, accumulated experience in manufacturing enterprises, in mining operations, and in agricultural pursuits.

Starting to-day with a manufacturing capital exceeding by $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 the total manufacturing capital of the United States in 1880, and with its agricultural output exceeding by over a half billion dollars the total value of the farm crops of the United States even as late as 1890, when the value of the latter was $2,460,000,000, against $2,975,000,000, as the present value of the farm products of these 16 Southern States, surely here is a condition which should create abounding optimism throughout the whole country about the South. It should stimulate the energies and activities of every man interested in the continued progress of this section. It indicates what will be achieved with this magnificent foundation on which to build. From these facts may be gained some idea of the wide ramifications of southern upbuilding in the future, how towns and cities will grow, how greater buildings for factories, for offices, for warehouses, for hotels, for schools, churches, and homes will be erected in ever-increasing numbers, how railroads must expand, terminal facilities be increased, agriculture be advanced, how good-roads work and street making will be pressed, and how everything that makes for the broadest activity of a richly endowed and rapidly growing country will move forward with redoubled energy by reason of achievements already made.

As "the development of the South means the enrichment of the Nation," facts such as these should be received with as much enthusiasm by every business man in the North and West and East as by the people of the South. This land of opportunity, this land of limitless possibilities, has achieved much. In the next 10 years it will achieve infinitely more. Every manufacturer, every banker, every investor, every business man of whatever kind in the whole country, is necessarily interested in such a story of the South's progress, for the South is the greatest asset of America, and its development will add enormously to the wealth and progress and power of the United States. In this re-creation of a country will be found limitless opportunities for the people of the South, as well as for the business people of other sections who want to share in the South's prosperity.

On August 4 there was released to the daily press the following statement by the Southern Commercial Congress, showing the increase of farming lands and buildings in the South within the last decade:

In 10 years, 1900 to 1910, the 16 States of the South have more than doubled in the value of farm lands and buildings. This valuation has increased from $4,077,291,000 to $8,964,782,000, a gain of $4,887,491,000. The average increase for the entire section is 125 per cent.

The table given below has been prepared by Clarence J. Owens, commissioner of agriculture of the Southern Commercial Congress, and is based on the reports of the Bureau of the Census.

The summary follows:

Total value of farm lands and buildings.

States.	1900	1910	Increase.	Per cent.
Alabama	$134,619,000	$287,673,000	$153,054,000	114
Arkansas	135,182,000	308,129,000	172,947,000	128
Florida	40,800,000	117,623,000	76,823,000	188
Georgia	183,370,000	477,603,000	294,233,000	160
Kentucky	382,004,000	633,782,000	251,778,000	66
Louisiana	141,130,000	238,682,000	97,552,000	69
Maryland	175,178,000	240,774,000	65,596,000	37
Mississippi	152,007,000	330,295,000	178,288,000	117
Missouri	843,979,000	1,710,505,000	866,526,000	103
North Carolina	194,656,000	455,715,000	261,059,000	134
Oklahoma	170,805,000	736,473,000	565,668,000	331
South Carolina	126,762,000	331,833,000	205,071,000	162
Tennessee	265,151,000	479,606,000	214,455,000	81
Texas	691,774,000	1,822,713,000	1,130,939,000	163
Virginia	271,578,000	530,918,000	259,340,000	96
West Virginia	168,296,000	262,458,000	94,162,000	56

With the application of the principles of scientific agriculture, the marvelous increase in wealth indicated above, is but the beginning of a period of development that will make the South preeminent as an agricultural section. The South holds undisputed leadership in the greatest average annual rainfall and in the number of growing hours.

On August 7 the congress published the following statement, showing the increase in the value per acre of the farm lands in the South during the same period:

Farm land in the 16 States comprised in the territory of the Southern Commercial Congress has doubled in the average value per acre the past 10 years. The increase is from $9.60 in 1900 to $19.71 in 1910.

The average value per acre of farm land.

States.	1900	1910	Increase.	Per cent.
Alabama	$4.84	$10.45	$5.61	116
Arkansas	6.32	14.11	7.79	123
Florida	7.06	17.83	10.77	153
Georgia	5.25	13.74	8.49	162
Kentucky	13.25	21.80	8.55	65
Louisiana	9.74	17.97	8.23	84
Maryland	23.28	32.28	9.00	39
Mississippi	6.30	13.61	7.31	116
Missouri	20.45	41.76	21.30	104
North Carolina	6.24	15.29	9.05	145
Oklahoma	6.50	22.54	16.04	247
South Carolina	7.14	19.89	12.75	179
Tennessee	9.93	18.53	8.60	87
Texas	4.70	14.77	10.07	214
Virginia	10.08	20.22	10.14	101
West Virginia	12.60	20.64	8.04	64

The bureau of agriculture of the Southern Commercial Congress has received authentic information that a financier from a distant State recently purchased 22,000 acres in North Carolina, at $3.40 an acre, and in a few weeks sold about 2,000 acres at an average of $40, leaving 20,000 acres profit.

The average value per acre in North Carolina is $15.29. The illustration gives conclusive evidence that there are some landholders in the South who know not the value of their property.

However, the people of the South are beginning to ascertain these values, and those living outside of the South are coming to a fuller understanding of the wealth, held by the section, in the variety and character of soils.

Since the reconstruction period, from 1880 to 1910, the population of the Southern States has increased from 18,260,716 to 32,415,297. During the same period the enrollment of the children in the schools has trebled. The expenditures for schools has increased from $7,133,000 in 1880 to $62,945,359 in 1908. The increase in bank deposits bear the same ratio; the same is true of her mining and manufacturing industries; her churches and everything else which tends to show the peace, prosperity, and happiness of a contented people. In the name of all that is sacred and holy to the lovers of freedom I most solemnly and vigorously protest against the enactment of any legislation which will tend to break down the bulwark of liberty guaranteed to the people of the States by the founders of this great and glorious Union of ours.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken or who may speak may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, why not permit any gentleman who desires to express his views upon this bill to extend his remarks in the RECORD for five legislative days?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Louisiana will be granted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak have the right to extend their remarks, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] amends that by asking that all gentlemen have five days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD upon this bill.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection if the remarks are confined to the bill.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. On this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Under the circumstances, the question still being unsettled as to whether a man can write applause into a cold-storage speech, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Missouri 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to conceive of any reason why any Member of this House of either party should hesitate to give unqualified support to this measure.

It is asserted here in sort of ghostly aspirated tones, until my friends from Georgia were heard this afternoon, that the measure means the entrance of the country upon a new and untried policy of Federal supervision of elections. Be it so, Mr. Speaker. The people of the country, from all sections and from all parties, will welcome the innovation with open minds and hearts. For if there is within the reach of the Congress of the United States an Augean stable whose stench and putrefactions rend the high air of the heavens, it is what is known as the "money power" in national elections.

If this Congress—Democratic in one branch and Republican in the other—shall be the Hercules to let in the river of light and reason and cleanse the Nation from this mighty "pest," its services to the country can never be overestimated.

This bill comes to us simple in form and direct. It says to us, "Take this step forward, or remain where we are and suffer these wrongs to continue."

I have watched this bill somewhat closely from the beginning of the session, when it came here from the committee, with the sole intention of changing the time of filing publicity reports. I learned from current rumors that there was an understanding that it was best for the present Congress not to attempt going beyond the control of contributions and expenditures of election committees involving two or more States. This, in effect, meant its application to national committees only. I offered an amendment covering practically the same grounds as the Senate amendments now under consideration, mainly for the purpose of stating my views upon the publicity of campaign contributions. From my general reading I have come to hold the view that the expression of views in legislative bodies is not of much consequence unless an opportunity of voting upon them is afforded to the assembly.

I sought to gain no partisan or factional advantage. I heard Member after Member state that he favored the publicity which reached into the heart of all primary and general elections. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that it were useless to provide for the publicity of campaign funds by committees and leave the individual candidate free to solicit and accept contributions from any source and use them to secure his election over his more honest opponent. If it were necessary to prohibit the purchase of the memberships by wholesale, it should be necessary to prohibit the purchase at retail.

The only effect of a law which permits the purchase of Members by retail and permits the purchase at wholesale would be to raise the price and not to prevent the traffic.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that this law is an approach to a force bill, and that it is aimed at the primaries of the South. I deny this, Mr. Speaker, and in defense of the South I deny that the Southern States are more in need of campaign publicity acts than we of the North and West.

In my brief service in Congress I have had occasion several times to address this House in favor of Federal election laws; but I am not an extreme federalist; and I also deny that I am a vicious Republican, as voiced by those gentlemen from the South. The only trouble with my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is that the first Republicans he ever saw were vicious Republicans, and the youthful vision still lingers in his heart. I will go as far as any Member of this House in protecting our dual form of constitutional Government, and, therefore, the rights of the States in their appropriate and constitutional spheres.

As I grow older—I hope riper in judgment—I see more clearly the beauty and strength of that system of government, a system of which Webster said—

> constituted a secret wholly unknown to the nations of the past, and the only known solution of the problem of maintaining order and at the same time preserving liberty.

But, Mr. Speaker, the integrity of elections to the National Congress is of nation-wide interest. It is the corner stone upon which our dual system rests. Upon these matters the will of the whole people must ever be wiser and freer from prejudice than that of any one community.

There is room enough in which to be jealous in the protection of the rights of the States in matters of purely local concern.

It has been my fortune as a State officer, in a humble way, to be thrown into the midst of somewhat notable battles over the preservation of these rights.

I have always believed that when the Federal courts of the land, for the purpose of extending their own jurisdiction, construed the words "persons within the jurisdiction of a State," in the fourteenth amendment, to include corporations domiciled in the State, and thereby going so far even as to sustain suits brought by a foreign stockholder against his own corporation, and permitting such stockholder resident in a distant State to join as codefendant with his own corporation in the Federal courts, the executive officers state that these courts laid violent hands on the Constitution and smothered the spirit of the

eleventh amendment, which solemnly enacted and guaranteed to the people of the States that a sovereign State should not be held to answer in a court of law, except at the suit of another sovereign State or the Government itself.

As an humble member of an humble organization—the associated attorneys general of the States of the Union—we went to the last ditch with former Attorney General Young, of Minnesota, in support of this position.

I believe that the public sentiment created by this suit and by this and similar organizations resulted in action by the last Congress, which curtailed to some extent the power of the courts over State officers in suits involving railroad rates.

We tried out in our own State the right of the State to enforce its own local liquor statutes free from interference by the Federal courts in a pretended protection of interstate commerce. We had the same contest as to our health and stock-food laws.

We went through the entire series of Federal courts to the Supreme Court of the United States to establish the proposition that the State had a right to regulate the banks which were the creations of its own laws.

And since this session of Congress began the Circuit Court of the United States has vindicated the right of the State to regulate fire insurance, even to the extent of fixing rates of insurance.

Upon all of these matters the rights of the States are superior to those of the Federal Government. They should be protected of their exercise of these rights and their general police power free from Federal influence.

And in view of the fact that it is now asserted that a Territory is to be denied admission to the Union because of the manner it has provided for choosing judges, I deem it a proper time to say that before the expiration of the present Congress I shall see that the Members of this House are given an opportunity to vote upon an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will change the term of service of Federal district judges from a life term to that of a limited term of years; and another amendment which will empower Congress, in its discretion, to provide laws for the election of the district judges by the people of the districts in which they serve. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Speaker, laws concerning the election of Senators and Members of Congress rest upon entirely a different basis. A constitutional Congress means a free Congress elected by free voters. I have not the slightest disposition to have the Federal Government interfere with local election laws.

We are contending to-day with three great dangers to the purity and integrity of the American electorate. They are race prejudice—the prejudice which grows out of conflicts between organized labor and capital—and most eminent of all, the danger of the use of money in elections.

We welcome laws proscribing educational qualifications, secrecy of the ballot, and even property qualifications when necessary as a remedy for the first two of these evils.

All we ask of any section of the country is that these laws be fair and just in their application. But, Mr. Speaker, the last, "the use of money," is the most dangerous of the three, and its solution will aid greatly in obviating the evils of race prejudice and the contest between labor in elections.

It is evident that we have traveled far in the wrong direction since the day when the average citizen of the Republic awoke with a gasp at the news that in the year of 1884 Jay Gould had saved the credit and honor of a national campaign committee by the generous contribution of $50,000. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. JACKSON. Since then it has become fashionable, and at times not even unpopular, to mix a little "bad politics" with good business. It is a fact often given publicity and never denied that Mr. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, and no doubt other trust barons as well, contributed about equally to the campaign funds of the two parties of the country. And it is to be noted that through all the vicissitudes of party strife and fortune and the business depressions of high tariffs and low tariffs for a number of years the differential in favor of refined sugar has not suffered seriously, not even though it became necessary in the name of humanity to enter into reciprocal trade relations with Cuba and the islands of the seas.

In 1896, when the great issue of sound money was before the people for settlement, the standard bearers of the great parties were each as honest and as clean men as ever honored American politics with their services; and yet the campaign degenerated into a contest between the money barrels of the silver barons of the West and the great money houses of the East. Money was sent into nearly every State of the Union by the Republicans, and Chairman Jones of the Democracy made no objection, except that of the shortness of funds of his own committee. And now the extravagances of campaigning have so increased that we hear of national campaigns which have cost a million and a half and even two million of dollars.

I am far from asserting that any part of this money has been unlawfully or immorally expended in the common acceptation of that term. I am speaking now of the bad influence of extravagance in the use of such funds. It must be admitted, however, that two investigations into the honesty of elections ordered at one session by one branch of Congress, and in still another State from the ones in which these investigations are to take place the indictment for bribery of a large percentage of the entire electorate of a county, constitutes a condition of affairs unprecedented in the history of the Nation, and may well be heeded as a call to Congress to put forth its utmost power to stamp out this evil from the entire country.

Less campaign funds will tend to decrease the price of Chautauqua lectures. By reducing the number of professional spellbinders on the pay rolls of campaign committees at $500 and $1,000 per week we will increase competition on the lecture platform, if not the quality of the lectures. By reducing the number of "honest farmers" who must be paid for their time by campaign committees we may increase the corn crop; and with less milking of the committees and skimming of the cream of campaign funds we may increase the help badly needed by wives and children to do the milking on the farms and to market the cream.

The use of inordinate sums of money in campaigns is un-American and undemocratic. It puts a premium on greed and avarice and magnifies these qualities into political ideals of the Nation. It encourages machine and boss domination. Money from favored interests, pampered political pets, and jack-pot politicians constitute the levers, the burrs, the linchpins, and the steam rollers of every corrupt political machine of the country. The leaders of these machines sometimes reach the ears of judges on the bench with the clamors of the mob, thereby committing outrageous and hideous treason. And it has been intimated even that some contributors to campaign funds have disturbed the judicial mind, and thus the scales of justice, by rude hints of the rights of property and vested interests when the rights of the public were on the other side of the lawsuit.

It reaches the public press, and therefore poisons the public mind itself.

I have not argued, nor do I intend to intimate, that public opinion has ever been overridden by the power of money in politics where the issue was clearly drawn and the public aroused, nor can it ever be. But the people of this country have the right to a free fight and a fair deal on every public question. The courts have given to the corporations and the property interests the rights of persons under the law, but they have never yet been given the right to vote or the power of the ballot.

Mr. Speaker, in this and immediately succeeding sessions of Congress most important questions are for settlement. We can not afford to hesitate longer in getting our house in readiness for those important trials.

We are here now in the midst of summer grappling with a century-old problem. To paraphrase loosely the familiar words of Lincoln, this country can not continue half free trade and half protection; we can not continue long half depending on platform promises and the other half depending on the inaction of statesmen. We must come to a compromise on reasonable tariff rates, a definite means of their ascertainment and enactment into law.

We are facing the greatest upheaval of modern political thought on the question of combinations in trade and the distribution of property. A little lack of toleration on the part of the radicals or of wisdom on the part of the conservatives may threaten the safety of the Nation itself.

Pressing hard upon us for settlement upon the floors of Congress is the question of credit and the future monetary system of the country. Perhaps no other question comes so closely to the material welfare, or lack of welfare, of all the people as does this one. Credit means the power to wait and to bide one's time, to scorn drouth, and famine, and stress, and storm, and to act when better days arrive. Lack of credit means discouragement and failure under the withering blight of temporary misfortune. With credit there is ease and comfort and power on one side of every contract, and on the other, with lack of credit, there is misery and compulsion.

On all of these questions the people of this country have the right to a free election of free representatives. The present

Congress owes to them the duty of preserving the integrity of its elections, and by this means the wisdom and faithfulness of its membership. [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the same request to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Missouri 12 minutes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I will yield the 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama if he desires it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would have been very glad, indeed, if I had had the opportunity, with sufficient time, to express my views on the subject of this bill. To my mind it is an important bill, and ought to be thoroughly considered and digested. The fact is, this House repudiated this primary election feature of this bill when this bill first came before the House. I believe, Mr. Speaker, fully and frankly that it is a bill that is calculated to produce strife and to bring friction under certain circumstances where it is not needed or necessary. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] intimated very clearly when he made that investigation about how many votes were cast in certain districts in Alabama and other Southern States, what the purpose of this legislation might finally be. I am opposed to this bill, Mr. Speaker, because there is no authority given by the Constitution for the Congress of the United States to prescribe regulations or take control of the primary elections or conventions of the State for the nomination of Members of Congress or Senators. I am opposed to the bill, for there is no necessity or demand for the same. Alabama, and I think most all of the Southern States, have provided by statute for the publication of all expenses incident to a campaign for a nomination in a primary election or convention. I am opposed to this bill because it is vicious and ultimately means disturbance.

I am opposed to the bill, because every day since I have been a Member of this Congress I have been one of the most consistent advocates of peace and quiet and of a full restoration of all of the friendly patriotic relations between the North and the South. This bill means a menace to a continuation of these relations. I am no alarmist. I know as well as you do that many futile efforts have been made, for partisan purposes, to break up the established order for the regulation of suffrage in the Southern States. The real purpose of this bill is not publicity, for we have never tried to shun publicity, never sought to seek to evade anything of that kind, but under the necessities of the Southern States we have had to resort to certain procedure there, and that we never made any secrecy about what we did or how we did it. And I fear that legislation of this kind will open those old sores and will bring back unkind and unfriendly feeling that ought not to exist. At least it opens the way to efforts of that kind.

The South is getting along well. We have good laws there relative to publicity, relative to assessment, and to campaign expenses—laws that we made to suit our own tastes and ideas. It is, Mr. Speaker, an essential part of the police power of a State to prescribe rules for its primaries and conventions. What is the necessity of interfering with it? I have heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], in this discussion several times, throw out what I thought he hardly meant, or ought not to have meant, some reflections upon the South as to publicity. We are not afraid of publicity. We court it and ask it.

But I tell you, gentlemen, we are afraid, we are uneasy, and while that section of the country is progressing and developing so rapidly, we do not want any restoration of the bad feelings that came years ago between the sections. We are watchful and alert on that subject. The Supreme Court of the United States has twice, for instance, passed upon the constitutionality of the constitution of Alabama. Why do you want to disturb the decision of our highest court?

I have said in the course of this discussion on this floor today that there was a greater necessity for submitting a bill of this character to the arbitrament of a Democratic caucus than any bill of this extraordinary session of Congress. There we could have thrashed it out among Democrats without the biased suggestions of our Republican friends. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], who has manifested an unusual zeal in behalf of including primary elections and conventions for nominations in this bill, addressed our last Democratic caucus for quite an hour explaining that the Senate had added the primary feature to the bill. He did not ask to submit it to the caucus. No man pretends to deny that decided opposition was expressed in that caucus to the primary feature, which had already been voted down in the House.

But how does it come before us now? Under the guidance and direction of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] and his associate on the conference, the bill, by conference report, comes before the House containing the offensive features for the regulation, government, and control of State primary elections and conventions for nominations—which the House had recently rejected—to be arbitrated by Republicans, and thereby guarantee the certain discomfiture of opposing Democrats. I wish, Mr. Speaker, in order to show clearly what I mean, to quote the following paragraph from the conference report:

> Every person who shall be a candidate for nomination at any primary election or nominating convention, or for election at any general or special election, as Representative in the Congress of the United States, shall, not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day for holding such primary election or nominating convention, and not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day of the general or special election at which candidates for Representative are to be elected, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part; and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf, with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election.

Heretofore we have made our reports of this kind to our secretary of state, at Montgomery, Ala., and other States do likewise. Under this bill we must send these reports, as directed, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives. What good and sufficient reason can be given for this innovation? "I am afraid of the Greeks bearing presents." How easy would it be for a disappointed opponent to trump up some pretext to show that the nominating primary was not altogether regular, or something else of that kind. Listen to what the conference report says about the election of Senators:

> Every person who shall be a candidate for nomination at any primary election or nominating convention, or for indorsement at any general or special election, or election by the legislature of any State, as Senator in the Congress of the United States, shall, not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day for holding such primary election or nominating convention, and not less than 10 nor more than 15 days before the day of the general or special election at which he is seeking indorsement, and not less than 5 nor more than 10 days before the day upon which the first vote is to be taken in the two houses of the legislature before which he is a candidate for election as Senator, file with the Secretary of the Senate at Washington, D. C., a full, correct, and itemized statement of all moneys and things of value received by him or by anyone for him with his knowledge and consent, from any source, in aid or support of his candidacy, together with the names of all those who have furnished the same in whole or in part; and such statement shall contain a true and itemized account of all moneys and things of value given, contributed, expended, used, or promised by such candidate, or by his agent, representative, or other person for and in his behalf with his knowledge and consent, together with the names of all those to whom any and all such gifts, contributions, payments, or promises were made for the purpose of procuring his nomination or election.

What business has the Federal Government with matters of this kind? The authority of the Federal Government is clearly defined in the Constitution as to the time for election of Members of Congress and Senators. It is merely a direction, but can anyone say that the paragraphs above quoted are a direction? It is an explicit demand and command, and if not literally complied with would vitiate and annul the nomination made. I wish it distinctly understood that I am not opposing this conference report, because I am not opposed to the broadest and fullest publicity in matters that will tend to justify our elections. It is not on that ground that I oppose this bill, but it is because it is an unjust, unauthorized, and vexatious interference by the Federal Government with the internal local affairs of a State.

If the Federal Government can direct and control the primary elections of a State, what power or authority does the State possess that the same authority can not lay its heavy hand on? I believe in the lawful autonomy of the States, and I protest against the rapidly increasing centralization of the power and authority of the States at Washingon. I believe that this bill, enacted into law, will come to vex and harass us in the future. It is for these reasons and many others that I earnestly oppose this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I did not intend to participate in this discussion, and I would

not do so at this late moment but for the fact that I have heard on this floor echoes of statements that I have seen in the newspapers to the effect that the southern Members of Congress, who are conscientiously opposed to this proposition because of their constitutional belief, were seeking to shun publicity as to the primaries, which were their real elections. I want to say to the House and to the country that if there is a single Southern State that has not already a better law on publicity than this law I would like to hear its name called on this floor. So that, although the proposition is that we shall take a law in the exercise of paramount and possibly exclusive Federal power, that may supersede every provision of every State law of every Southern State, when that proposition is put before us and some of us can not agree to it, the charge is hurled at us across this aisle and on the floor, that we are doing it because we do not want any publicity in our primary elections, whereas the truth is and the fact is that we have got infinitely more already under our State laws than we will have under this bill, if it should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, just one word more and then I have finished with this matter. The Federal Constitution, section 4 of Article I, provides that the time, place, and manner of holding elections for Members of Congress may be regulated by Congress. I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] to tell me whether or not the election referred to was not the legal election, the election provided by the Constitution, and whether the word "election" as used in the Constitution could be held to include a party primary or must be held to mean only the legal election. I have heard no reply from him or anyone else. I am clearly of the opinion, after careful deliberation, that the "election" which Congress has the power to regulate is the election provided for in the Constitution itself. I can not therefore vote for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time. I wish I had the time in which to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, but I can not trespass on the courtesy of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in concluding this debate I must say I am surprised at some of the objections I have heard, both on this side and on that side, to the enactment of this bill into law. One of the most distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], is very much in favor of the principle of publicity, but must vote against this law because it is possible for somebody to construe some feature of it different from what somebody else would construe it. Does not the distinguished gentleman realize that such reasoning as he indulges in, if accepted, would prevent the passage of any bill which is now pending before this Congress, or which ever has been before this Congress during his long and honorable service here? Mr. Speaker, this law, like every production of the human mind, has its imperfections. Gentlemen like the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who believe in the great principle involved in this bill, should strive to strengthen its weak places and not to destroy it because it is not as perfect as they would have it. They should espouse it and embrace the legislation, believing and knowing that when imperfections are revealed a Congress which will come after us will cure such defects as we may leave in the measure.

Gentlemen on this side insist that the people of a certain section have no objection to giving publicity to contributions for campaign expenses in primary elections. I concede it. I have taken no position hostile to that contention. I believe they want to give publicity. I believe the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] really dotes on publishing campaign expenses in the primaries [laughter], but the trouble is he wants to act under a State law and not under a Federal law. I am sorry we can not oblige him and those who sympathize with him in the views he has just expressed.

I have learned long since to admire the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, not only for his lovable qualities and his genial good nature, but for his great learning as a lawyer and his simon-pure Democracy. I take no exception to his speech of criticism just delivered. Since I can not conform my judgment to his, I shall strive to survive his criticism and to recover from the body blows inflicted. One would be justified, perhaps, in concluding that the gentleman from Georgia and myself have come to the parting of the ways. I am reluctant to believe it. We have been friends so long I dread to sever the ties that bind us. If severed they must be, if, indeed, we have come to the parting of the ways, then in deep affliction I say to him in poetic language:

With all my soul, then, let us part,
Since both are anxious to be free;
And I will send you back your heart
If you will send mine back to me.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Speaker, there is no politics in this legislation. There is nothing in it except double-distilled Democracy, which our Republican friends, because of its superior quality, are trying to appropriate. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen can talk eloquently about telegrams having been received from distinguished Democrats and of great Democratic leaders who have spoken in behalf of publicity of campaign expenses, but who have not specifically included in their advocacy expenses incurred in primary elections; but I say to them the demand embraces the primary election. The demand for publicity can not be met unless we require a disclosure of money spent in the election which really elects, and this, in very many instances, is the primary election.

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

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

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LITTLETON. Will the gentleman tell the House how he would justify the control of the primary convention and election under the exercise of the power of Congress?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question very briefly, in this way: We can not control, and I have never attempted and never will attempt to control, a convention or primary election by Federal legislation. The trouble is, some gentleman insists on placing a construction upon this law which is wholly unwarranted and unjustified. This bill gives no Federal control over conventions, primary elections, or even over general elections. Who can find in the legislation here proposed one word which authorizes directly or by implication Federal interference with any State election? There is no provision in the bill which can be tortured into such authorization. No citizen can be proceeded against under this bill unless he violates its provisions, and if a candidate for a Federal office violates a Federal law, why should he not be proceeded against in a Federal court?

Mr. RICHARDSON. If a citizen of Alabama, under this primary law, is punished in a Federal court, would the gentleman advocate that?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. This law applies only to men who seek to become Members of this House or the other House at the other end of the Capitol. No man should be a Member of this House who will willfully violate a law enacted to safeguard and purify elections.

Mr. RICHARDSON. He would be tried in a Federal court, would he not?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Yes; the same as the man who is tried under the provisions of the interstate-commerce act, which the gentleman from Alabama took such pains to help enact. The only difficulty here is that gentlemen draw a finespun distinction between elections and primary elections. So far as my district is concerned, as I have stated before, my nomination is equivalent to my election; and if you excluded the primary election expense in such a district you might as well require no publicity, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman contend that the interstate-commerce law——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I do not care to talk about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You charged me with it. You will not let me answer. I did help to make that law.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to continue just one moment, I would like to say to this House that I believe your committee has brought in a measure that reflects the will of the people of the United States; and, let me add, it is the measure which I promised the Democrats in caucus and promised the House in session we would bring in. We have put nothing in the bill nor have we taken anything out of it that everybody did not know would be put in or taken out.

The measure is a wise and good one. It will tend to purify the ballot boxes of this country, and will guarantee that men who come here shall come with the support and backed by the judgment of the people and not as a result of corrupt methods. It will protect the people in the South and it will protect the people in the North. If enforced, as I hope it will be, it will restore the integrity of elections and protect the future manhood of our country from the blighting and damning consequences of the corrupt use of money.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield now. I have only one minute more.

Mr. MADISON. I only wish to ask one question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my friends on this side, who have voiced their opposition to some

of the provisions of this bill and indulged in some harmless criticisms of my action, will allow me to say that I take their criticisms kindly. I have discharged my duty. I submit to whatever of infliction they have imposed upon me, and now I invite them, not as a new leader, as my friend from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] said, but as a humble instrument in the hands of my party, I appeal to every man here to stand by his convictions, to stand by the expressed will of the people of the country, and help to drive corruption into hiding and make election to office honorable in the United States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each gentleman who has addressed the House may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARLETT. For how long?

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. For five days, on this bill.

Mr. MANN. If gentlemen want to extend their remarks, now is a very good time to ask permission.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I make that request in behalf of those who have addressed the House.

Mr. MANN. If there are any who desire that permission, let them make the request.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It will take that much more time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if I want to, to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 27, answered "present" 5, not voting 71, as follows:

YEAS—282.

Adair	Bathrick	Burleson	Claypool
Akin, N. Y.	Beall, Tex.	Burnett	Clayton
Alexander	Bingham	Butler	Cline
Allen	Borland	Byrnes, S. C.	Connell
Ames	Bowman	Byrns, Tenn.	Conry
Anthony	Brown	Calder	Cooper
Ashbrook	Buchanan	Callaway	Copley
Austin	Bulkley	Campbell	Cox, Ohio
Barchfeld	Burke, Pa.	Cannon	Crago
Barnhart	Burke, S. Dak.	Carter	Crumpacker
Bates	Burke, Wis.	Catlin	Cullop
Currier	Hamilton, Mich.	McDermott	Rouse
Dalzell	Hamlin	McGillicuddy	Rubey
Danforth	Hammond	McKenzie	Rucker, Colo.
Daugherty	Hanna	McKinley	Rucker, Mo.
Davenport	Hardy	McKinney	Russell
Davidson	Harris	McLaughlin	Sabath
Davis, Minn.	Hartman	McMorran	Saunders
Davis, W. Va.	Haugen	Macon	Scully
De Forest	Hawley	Madden	Sells
Dickinson	Hay	Madison	Shackleford
Dies	Hayes	Maguire, Nebr.	Sharp
Difenderfer	Heald	Maher	Sheppard
Dixon, Ind.	Heflin	Malby	Sherwood
Dodds	Helgesen	Mann	Simmons
Donohoe	Helm	Martin, Colo.	Sims
Doremus	Henry, Conn.	Martin, S. Dak.	Sloan
Doughton	Henry, Tex.	Matthews	Small
Draper	Higgins	Mays	Smith, J. M. C.
Driscoll, D. A.	Hill	Mondell	Smith, Saml. W.
Driscoll, M. E.	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Smith, N. Y.
Dupre	Holland	Moore, Tex.	Sparkman
Dwight	Houston	Morgan	Speer
Dyer	Howell	Morrison	Stack
Esch	Howland	Morse, Wis.	Stedman
Evans	Hubbard	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Cal.
Faison	Hughes, Ga.	Mott	Stevens, Minn.
Farr	Hull	Murray	Stone
Ferris	Humphrey, Wash.	Nelson	Sweet
Fields	Jackson	Norris	Switzer
Finley	Jacoway	Nye	Talcott, N. Y.
Fitzgerald	James	Oldfield	Taylor, Ala.
Flood, Va.	Johnson, S. C.	Olmsted	Taylor, Colo.
Floyd, Ark.	Jones	O'Shaunessy	Taylor, Ohio
Focht	Kahn	Padgett	Thayer
Foss	Kendall	Page	Thistlewood
Foster, Ill.	Kennedy	Palmer	Thomas
Foster, Vt.	Kent	Patton, Pa.	Towner
Fowler	Kindred	Payne	Townsend
Francis	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pepper	Turnbull
French	Knowland	Peters	Tuttle
Fuller	Konig	Pickett	Underhill
Gallagher	Konop	Plumley	Underwood
Garner	Kopp	Porter	Utter
Garrett	Korbly	Post	Volstead
George	Lafean	Pou	Vreeland
Gillett	Lafferty	Pray	Warburton
Glass	Lamb	Prince	Wedemeyer
Godwin, N. C.	Langham	Pujo	Weeks
Goeke	Langley	Rainey	Whitacre
Good	Lawrence	Raker	White
Gould	Lee, Pa.	Randell, Tex.	Wickliffe
Graham	Lenroot	Ransdell, La.	Willis
Gray	Lewis	Rauch	Wilson, Ill.
Green, Iowa	Lindbergh	Rees	Wilson, Pa.
Greene, Mass.	Linthicum	Reilly	Wood, N. J.
Gregg, Pa.	Lloyd	Reyburn	Woods, Iowa
Griest	Lobeck	Roberts, Mass.	Young, Kans.
Gudger	Loud	Roberts, Nev.	Young, Mich.
Guernsey	McCoy	Rodenberg	
Hamill	McCreary	Rothermel	

NAYS—27.

Adamson	Clark, Fla.	Hardwick	Richardson
Bartlett	Collier	Harrison, Miss.	Roddenbery
Bell, Ga.	Dent	Howard	Sisson
Blackmon	Dickson, Miss.	Humphreys, Miss.	Stephens, Miss.
Booher	Edwards	Lee, Ga.	Tribble
Brantley	Ellerbe	Littleton	Witherspoon
Carlin	Gardner, N. J.	McCall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Lever	Needham	Watkins	Wilder
Littlepage			

NOT VOTING—71.

Aiken, S. C.	Curley	Kitchin	Riordan
Anderson, Minn.	Denver	La Follette	Robinson
Anderson, Ohio	Estopinal	Latta	Sherley
Andrus	Fairchild	Legare	Slayden
Ansberry	Fordney	Levy	Slemp
Ayres	Fornes	Lindsay	Smith, Tex.
Bartholdt	Gardner, Mass.	Longworth	Stanley
Berger	Goldfogle	McGuire, Okla.	Steenerson
Boehne	Goodwin, Ark.	McHenry	Stephens, Tex.
Bradley	Gregg, Tex.	Miller	Sterling
Broussard	Hamilton, W. Va.	Moon, Pa.	Sulloway
Burgess	Harrison, N. Y.	Moon, Tenn.	Sulzer
Candler	Hensley	Murdock	Talbott, Md.
Cantrill	Hobson	Parran	Tilson
Cary	Hughes, N. J.	Patten, N. Y.	Webb
Covington	Hughes, W. Va.	Powers	Wilson, N. Y.
Cox, Ind.	Johnson, Ky.	Prouty	Young, Tex.
Cravens	Kinkead, N. J.	Redfield	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SULZER with Mr. LONGWORTH.

For to-day:

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. WATKINS.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4413) to place on the free list agricultural implements, cotton bagging, cotton ties, leather, boots and shoes, fence wire, meats, cereals, flour, bread, timber, lumber, sewing machines, salt, and other articles, Nos. 5 and 7.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

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

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

August 16, 1911:

H. R. 6098. An act to authorize the Campbell Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Francis River from a point in Dunklin County, Mo., to a point in Clay County, Ark.;

H. R. 11021. An act to authorize the Levitte Land & Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Bayou Bartholomew, in Drew County, Ark.;

H. R. 11477. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge, and approaches thereto, across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Matewan Station, in Mingo County, W. Va.;

H. R. 2925. An act to extend the privileges of the act approved June 10, 1880, to the port of Brownsville, Tex.;

H. R. 6747. An act to reenact an act authorizing the construction of a bridge across St. Croix River, and to extend the time for commencing and completing the said structure; and

H. R. 11303. An act for the relief of Eliza Choteau Roscamp.

THE TARIFF ON WOOL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read (S. Doc. No. 101):

To the House of Representatives:

I return without my approval House bill No. 11019 with a statement of my reasons for so doing.

The bill is an amendment of the existing tariff law, and readjusts the customs duties in what is known as Schedule K, embracing wool and the manufactures of wool.

I was elected to the Presidency as the candidate of a party which in its platform declared its aim and purpose to be to maintain a protective tariff 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 have always regarded this language as fixing the proper measure of protection at the ascertained difference between the cost of production at home and that abroad, and have construed the reference to the profit of American industries as intended, not to add a new element to the measure stated or to exclude from the cost of production abroad the element of a manufacturer's or producer's profit, but only to emphasize the importance of including in the American cost a manufacturer's or producer's profit reasonable according to the American standard.

In accordance with a promise made in the same platform I called an extra session of the Sixty-first Congress, at which a general revision of the tariff was made and adopted in the Payne bill. It was contended by those who opposed the Payne bill that the existing rates of the Dingley bill were excessive and that the rates adopted in the revising statute were not sufficiently reduced to conform to the promised measure.

The great difficulty, however, in discussing the new rates adopted was that there were no means available by which impartial persons could determine what, in fact, was the difference in cost of production between the products of this country and the same products abroad. The American public became deeply impressed with the conviction that, in order to secure a proper revision of the tariff in the future, exact information as to the effect of the new rates must be had, and that the evil of logrolling or a compromise between advocates of different protected industries in fixing duties could be avoided, and the interest of the consuming public could be properly guarded, only by revising the tariff one schedule at a time.

To help these reforms for the future, I took advantage of a clause in the Payne tariff bill enabling me to create a Tariff Board of three members and directed them to make a glossary and encyclopedia of the terms used in the tariff and to secure information as to the comparative cost of production of dutiable articles under the tariff at home and abroad. In my message to Congress of December 7, 1909, I asked a continuing annual appropriation for the support of the board and said:

> I believe that the work of this board will be of prime utility and importance whenever Congress shall deem it wise again to readjust the customs duties. If the facts secured by the Tariff Board are of such a character as to show generally that the rates of duties imposed by the present tariff law are excessive under the principles of protection as described in the platform of the successful party at the late election, I shall not hesitate to invite the attention of Congress to this fact and to the necessity for action predicated thereon. Nothing, however, halts business and interferes with the course of prosperity so much as the threatened revision of the tariff, and until the facts are at hand, after careful and deliberate investigation, upon which such revision can properly be undertaken, it seems to me unwise to attempt it. The amount of misinformation that creeps into arguments pro and con in respect to tariff rates is such as to require the kind of investigation that I have directed the Tariff Board to make, an investigation undertaken by it wholly without respect to the effect which the facts may have in calling for a readjustment of the rates of duty.

A popular demand arose for the formal creation by law of a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission. Commercial bodies all over the country united in a movement to secure adequate legislation for this purpose and an association with a nationwide constituency was organized to promote the cause. The public opinion in favor of such a commission was evidenced by resolutions adopted in 1909 and 1910 by Republican State conventions in at least 28 States.

In addition, efforts were made to secure a change in the rules of procedure in the House and Senate with a view to preventing the consideration of tariff changes except schedule by schedule.

The business of the country rests on a protective-tariff basis. The public keenly realized that a disturbance of business by a change in the tariff and a threat of injury to the industries of the country ought to be avoided, and that nothing could help so much to minimize the fear of destructive changes as the known existence of a reliable source of information for legislative action. The deep interest in the matter of an impartial ascertainment of facts before any new revision, was evidenced by an effort to pass a tariff-commission bill in the short session of the Sixty-first Congress, in which many of both parties united. Such a bill passed both Houses. It provided a commission of five members, to be appointed by the President, not more than three of whom were to belong to the same party, and gave them the power and made it their duty to investigate the operation of the tariff, the comparative cost of production at home and abroad, and like matters of importance in fixing the terms of a revenue measure, and required them to report to the Executive and to Congress when directed. Several, not vital, amendments were made in the Senate, which necessitated a return of the bill to the House, where, because of the limited duration of the session, a comparatively small minority were able to prevent its becoming a law.

On the failure of this bill, I took such steps as I could to make the Tariff Board I had already appointed a satisfactory substitute for the proposed tariff commission. An appropriation of $225,000, to continue the work until June 30, 1912, had been granted by Congress in the alternative, to be applied to the board I had appointed, unless a tariff-commission bill was passed. In this appropriation bill the nonpartisan tariff commission, if created and appointed, was directed to make a report on Schedule K by December 1, 1911. Accordingly I added two members to the Tariff Board from the opposition party, and directed the board to make report on Schedule K by December 1 next. The board differs in no way from the tariff commission as it would have been, except in its power to summon witnesses; and I am advised by the members of the board that, without this power, they have had no difficulty in securing the information they desire.

The board took some months to investigate the methods pursued in other countries in procuring information on tariff subjects and to organize its force. In October, 1910, its work of investigation began with a force of 40 that has now increased to 80. In addition to the "glossary," which is near completion, and other work connected with furnishing information in connection with the enforcement of the maximum and minimum clause of the Payne Tariff Act, and in respect to the Canadian reciprocity measure, its attention has been especially directed to comparative cost under Schedule K (wool and woolens), under Schedule M (paper and pulp), and under Schedule I (cotton manufactures). The report on Schedule M (pulp and paper) has already been sent to Congress. Full reports on wool and cotton will be submitted to Congress in

December. I have also directed an investigation into the metal and leather schedules, the results of which it is hoped can be submitted to Congress at its first regular session in time to permit their consideration and legislative action, if necessary.

The organization known as the Tariff Commission Association, made up of representatives of substantially all the commercial bodies of the country, for the purpose of securing the establishment of a permanent tariff commission, applied to me for an opportunity to investigate the methods pursued by the Tariff Board. This I was glad to grant, and a very full report of the competent committee of that association concluded as follows:

In conclusion, our committee finds that the Tariff Board is composed of able, impartial, and earnest men, who are devoting their energies unreservedly to the work before them; that the staff has been carefully selected for the work in view, is efficiently organized and directed, and includes a number of exceptionally competent technical experts; * * * that the work of the board, vast and intricate in detail, is already highly organized, well systematized, and running smoothly; and that Congress and the people can now await the completion of that work with entire confidence that it is progressing as rapidly as consistent with proper thoroughness, and that it will amply justify all of the time and expense which it entails. We believe that the value of the work when completed will be so great and so evident as to leave remaining no single doubt as to the expediency of maintaining it as a permanent function of the Government for the benefit of the people.

I have thus reviewed the history of the movement for the establishment of a tariff commission or board in order to show that the real advance and reform in tariff making are to be found in the acquiring of accurate and impartial information as to the effect of the proposed tariff changes under each schedule before they are adopted, and further to show that if delay in the passage of a bill to amend Schedule K can be had until December, Congress will then be in possession of a full and satisfactory report upon the whole schedule.

This brings me to the consideration of the terms of the bill presented for my approval. Schedule K is the most complicated schedule in the tariff. It classifies raw wool with different rates for different classes; it affords the manufacturer what is called a compensatory duty to make up for the increased price of the raw material he has to use due to the rate on raw wool, and for the shrinkage that takes place in scouring the wool for manufacture; and it gives him, in addition, an ad valorem duty to protect him against foreign competition with cheap labor. The usages which prevail in scouring the wool, in making the yarn, and in the manufacture of cloth present a complication of technical detail that prevents anyone, not especially informed concerning wool growing and manufacture, from understanding the schedule and the effect of changes in the various rates and percentages.

If there ever was a schedule that needed consideration and investigation and elaborate explanation by experts before its amendment, it is Schedule K. There is a widespread belief that many rates in the present schedule are too high and are in excess of any needed protection for the wool grower or manufacturer. I share this belief and have so stated in several public addresses. But I have no sufficient data upon which I can judge how Schedule K ought to be amended or how its rates ought to be reduced, in order that the new bill shall furnish the proper measure of protection and no more. Nor have I sources of information which satisfy me that the bill presented to me for signature will accomplish this result. The parliamentary history of the bill is not reassuring upon this point. It was introduced and passed in the House as providing a tariff for revenue only and with the avowed purpose of departing from a protective-tariff policy. The rate of duty on raw wools of all classes was changed from a specific duty of 11 cents a pound to 20 per cent ad valorem. On the average for the importations for the last two years this is a reduction from 47.24 per cent to 20 per cent. Rates on cloths were reduced in the bill from the present average duty of 97.27 per cent to 40 per cent and on wearing apparel from 81.31 per cent to 45 per cent. The bill was defeated in the Senate, and so was a substitute introduced as a protection measure. The proposed substitute fixed the duty on raw wool, first class, at 40 per cent, and on a second class of carpet wools at 10 per cent, and on cloths at 60 per cent, and on wearing apparel at the same rate. On reconsideration, a compromise measure was passed by the Senate, which was a compromise between the House bill and the Senate substitute bill, and in which the rate on first-class wool was fixed at 35 per cent, on carpet wools 10 per cent, and on cloth and wearing apparel 55 per cent. In conference between the two Houses the rate on all classes of raw wool was fixed at 29 per cent, this being an increase on carpet wools of 9 per cent as fixed in the House bill and of 19 per cent as fixed in the Senate bill. The conference rate on cloths and wearing apparel was fixed at 49 per cent. No evidence as to the cost of production here or abroad was published, and the compromise amendment in the Senate was adopted without reference to or consideration by a committee.

I do not mention these facts to criticize the method of preparation of the bill; but I must needs refer to them to show that the congressional proceedings make available for me no accurate or scientifically acquired information which enables me to determine that the bill supplies the measure of protection promised in the platform on which I was elected.

Without any investigation of which the details are available, an avowed tariff-for-revenue and antiprotection bill is by compromise blended with a professed protection bill. Rates between those of the two bills are adopted and passed, except that, in some important instances, rates are fixed in the compromise at a figure higher, and in others at a figure lower, than were originally fixed in either House. The principle followed in adjusting the amendments of existing law is, therefore, not clear, and the effect of the bill is most uncertain.

The Wilson Tariff Act of 1894, while giving the manufacturer free wool, provided as high duties on leading manufactures of wool as does the present bill, which at the same time taxes the manufacturer's raw material at 29 per cent. Thus the protection afforded to manufacturers under the Wilson bill was very considerably higher than under the present bill.

During the years in which the Wilson bill was in force the woolen manufacturers suffered. Many mills were compelled to shut down. These were abnormal years, and it is not necessary to attribute the hard times solely to the tariff act of 1894. But it was at least an addition to other factors operating to injure the woolen business. It is the only experience we have had for a generation of a radical revision of this schedule, and, without exaggerating its importance, one pledged to a moderate protection policy may well hesitate before giving approval without full information to legislation which makes a more radical reduction in the protection actually afforded to manufacturers of wool than did the Wilson Act. Nor does this hesitation arise only for fear of injury to manufacturers. Unless manufacturers are able to continue their business and buy wool from domestic woolgrowers the latter will have no benefit from the tariff that is supposed to protect them, because they will have to sell in competition with foreign wools or send their sheep to the shambles. Hence the woolgrower is as much interested in the protection of the manufacturer as he is in his own.

It may well be that conditions of manufacture in this country have changed so as to require much less protection now for the manufacturers than at the time of the Wilson bill; but in view of the possible wide suffering involved by hasty action based on insufficient knowledge, the wise course, in my judgment, is to postpone any change for a few months needed to complete the pending inquiry.

When I have the accurate information which justifies such action, I shall recommend to Congress as great a reduction in Schedule K as the measure of protection, already stated, will permit. The failure of the present bill should not be regarded, therefore, as taking away the only chance for reduction by this Congress.

More than a million of our countrymen are engaged in the production of wool and the manufacture of woolens; more than a billion of the country's capital is invested in the industry. Large communities are almost wholly dependent upon the prosperity of the woolgrower and the woolen manufacturer. Moderately estimated, 5,000,000 of the American people will be injuriously affected by any ill-advised impairment of the wool and woolen industries. Certainly we should proceed prudently in dealing with them upon the basis of ascertained facts rather than hastily and without knowledge to make a reduction of the tariff to satisfy a popular desire, which I fully recognize, for reduction of duties believed to be excessive. I have no doubt that if I were to sign this bill, I would receive the approval of very many persons who favor a reduction of duties in order to reduce the cost of living whatever the effect on our protected industries, and who fail to realize the disaster to business generally and to the people at large which may come from a radical disturbance of that part of business dependent for its life on the continuance of a protective tariff. If I fail to guard as far as I can the industries of the country to the extent of giving them the benefit of a living measure of protection, and business disaster ensues, I shall not be discharging my duty. If I fail to recommend the reduction of excessive duties to this extent, I shall fail in my duty to the consuming public.

There is no public exigency requiring the revision of Schedule K in August without adequate information, rather than in December next with such information. December was the time fixed by both parties in the last Congress for the submission of adequate information upon Schedule K with a view to its amendment. Certainly the public weal is better preserved by

delaying 90 days in order to do justice, and make such a reduction as shall be proper, than now blindly to enact a law which may seriously injure the industries involved and the business of the country in general.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 17, 1911.*

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to have the President's message referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, but prefer to have it lie on the Speaker's table, and to give notice at this time that on to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal, I shall move to pass the bill over the veto of the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the message will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of inserting page 10 and to the end of the first paragraph on page 11 of Senate Document No. 164, Sixty-first Congress, second session, being that portion of the President's speech delivered at Winona, Minn., September 17, 1909, in which he denounced the wool schedule of the Payne tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a part of the President's Winona speech. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman desires to insert the entire speech of the President, I have no objection. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the message of the President just read refers to the wool bill, and the part of the Winona speech I desire to insert refers particularly to the wool schedule of the Payne bill. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desires to object, very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object, unless the gentleman desires to insert the entire speech. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech of the President be inserted.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no right, under the rules, to object to the gentleman from Illinois making that request, and I will not, of course, object to the request if he really desires to insert the whole speech.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, whose request for unanimous consent was submitted by the Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asked unanimous consent to publish in the RECORD the entire speech the President made at Winona.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Inasmuch as the speech has been already published, Mr. Speaker, I object. [Cries of "Too late!"]

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

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

The speech is as follows:

MY FELLOW CITIZENS: As long ago as August, 1906, in the congressional campaign in Maine, I ventured to announce that I was a tariff revisionist and thought that the time had come for a readjustment of the schedules. I pointed out that it had been 10 years prior to that time that the Dingley bill had been passed; that great changes had taken place in the conditions surrounding the productions of the farm, the factory, and the mine, and that under the theory of protection in that time the rates imposed in the Dingley bill in many instances might have become excessive; that is, might have been greater than the difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production at home with a sufficient allowance for a reasonable rate of profit to the American producer. I said that the party was divided on the issue, but that in my judgment the opinion of the party was crystallizing and would probably result in the near future in an effort to make such revision. I pointed out the difficulty that there always was in a revision of the tariff, due to the threatened disturbance of industries to be affected and the suspension of business, in a way which made it unwise to have too many revisions. In the summer of 1907 my position on the tariff was challenged, and I then entered into a somewhat fuller discussion of the matter. It was contended by the so-called "standpatters" that rates beyond the necessary measure of protection were not objectionable, because behind the tariff wall competition always reduced the prices, and thus saved the consumer. But I pointed out in that speech what seems to me as true to-day as it then was, that the danger of excessive rates was in the temptation they created to form monopolies in the protected articles, and thus to take advantage of the excessive rates by increasing the prices, and therefore, and in order to avoid such a danger, it was wise at regular intervals to examine the question of what the effect of the rates had been upon the industries in this country, and whether the conditions with respect to the cost of production here had so changed as to warrant a reduction in the tariff and to make a lower rate truly protective of the industry.

It will be observed that the object of the revision under such a statement was not to destroy protected industries in this country, but it was to continue to protect them where lower rates offered a sufficient protection to prevent injury by foreign competition. That was the object of the revision as advocated by me, and it was certainly the object of the revision as promised in the Republican platform.

I want to make as clear as I can this proposition, because, in order to determine whether a bill is a compliance with the terms of that platform, it must be understood what the platform means. A free trader is opposed to any protective rate because he thinks that our manufacturers, our farmers, and our miners ought to withstand the competition of foreign manufacturers and miners and farmers, or else go out of business and find something else more profitable to do. Now, certainly the promises of the platform did not contemplate the downward revision of the tariff rates to such a point that any industry theretofore protected should be injured. Hence, those who contend that the promise of the platform was to reduce prices by letting in foreign competition are contending for a free trade, and not for anything that they had the right to infer from the Republican platform.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House, with Mr. PAYNE at its head, spent a full year in an investigation, assembling evidence in reference to the rates under the tariff, and devoted an immense amount of work in the study of the question where the tariff rates could be reduced and where they ought to be raised with a view to maintaining a reasonably protective rate, under the principles of the platform, for every industry that deserved protection. They found that the determination of the question, what was the actual cost of production, and whether an industry in this country could live under a certain rate and withstand threatened competition from abroad, was most difficult. The manufacturers were prone to exaggerate the injury which a reduction in the duty would give and to magnify the amount of duty that was needed; while the importers, on the other hand, who were interested in developing the importation from foreign shores, were quite likely to be equally biased on the other side.

Mr. PAYNE reported a bill—the Payne tariff bill—which went to the Senate and was amended in the Senate by increasing the duty on some things and decreasing it on others. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill was very much less than the newspapers represented. It turns out upon examination that the reductions in the Senate were about equal to those in the House, though they differed in character. Now, there is nothing quite so difficult as the discussion of a tariff bill, for the reason that it covers so many different items, and the meaning of the terms and the percentages are very hard to understand. The passage of a new bill, especially where a change in the method of assessing the duties has been followed, presents an opportunity for various modes and calculations of the percentages of increases and decreases that are most misleading and really throw no light at all upon the changes made.

One way of stating what was done is to say what the facts show—that under the Dingley law there were 2,024 items. This included dutiable items only. The Payne law leaves 1,150 of these items unchanged. There are decreases in 654 of the items and increases in 220 of the items. Now, of course, that does not give a full picture, but it does show the proportion of decreases to have been three times those of the increases. Again, the schedules are divided into letters from A to N. The first schedule is that of chemicals, oils, etc. There are 232 items in the Dingley law; of these, 81 were decreased, 22 were increased, leaving 129 unchanged. Under Schedule B—earths, earthen and glass ware—there were 170 items in the Dingley law; 46 were decreased, 12 were increased, and 112 left unchanged. C is the schedule of metals and manufactures. There were 321 items in the Dingley law; 185 were decreased, 30 were increased, and 106 were left unchanged. D is the schedule of wood and manufactures of wood. There were 35 items in the Dingley law; 18 were decreased, 3 were increased, and 14 were left unchanged. There were 38 items in sugar, and of these 2 were decreased and 36 left unchanged. Schedule F covers tobacco and manufactures of tobacco, of which there were 8 items; they were all left unchanged. In the schedule covering agricultural products and provisions there were 187 items in the Dingley law; 14 of them were decreased, 19 were increased, and 154 left unchanged. Schedule H—that of spirits and wines—contained 33 items in the Dingley law; 4 were decreased, 23 increased, and 6 were left unchanged. In cotton manufactures there were 261 items; of these 28 were decreased, 47 increased, and 186 left unchanged. In Schedule J—flax, hemp, and jute—there were 254 items in the Dingley law; 187 were reduced, 4 were increased, and 63 left unchanged. In wool and manufactures thereof, there were 78 items; 3 were decreased, none were increased, and 75 left unchanged. In silk and silk goods there were 78 items; of these 21 were decreased, 31 were increased, and 26 were left unchanged. In pulp, papers, and books there were 59 items in the Dingley law, and of these 11 were decreased, 9 were increased, and 39 left unchanged. In sundries there were 270 items, and of these 54 were decreased, 20 were increased, and 196 left unchanged. So that the total showed 2,024 items in the Dingley law, of which 654 were decreased, 220 were increased, making 874 changes, and 1,150 left unchanged.

Changes in the Dingley law by the Payne law.

Schedules.	Items in Dingley law.	Changes in Dingley law by Payne law.			Unchanged.
		Decreases.	Increases.	Total changes.	
A. Chemicals, oils, etc	232	81	22	103	129
B. Earths, earthen and glass ware	170	46	12	58	112
C. Metals, and manufactures of	321	185	30	215	106
D. Wood, and manufactures of	35	18	3	21	14
E. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	38	2	0	2	36
F. Tobacco, and manufactures of	8	0	0	0	8
G. Agricultural products and provisions	187	14	19	33	154
H. Spirits, wines, etc	33	4	23	27	6
I. Cotton manufactures	261	28	47	75	186
J. Flax, hemp, jute, manufactures of	254	187	4	191	63
K. Wool, and manufactures of	78	3	0	3	75
L. Silk and silk goods	78	21	31	52	26
M. Pulp, papers, and books	59	11	9	20	39
N. Sundries	270	54	20	74	196
Total	2,024	654	220	874	1,150

Attempts have been made to show what the real effect of these changes has been by comparing the imports under the various schedules and assuming that the changes and their importance were in proportion to the importations. Nothing could be more unjust in a protective tariff which also contains revenue provisions. Some of the tariff is made for the purpose of increasing the revenue by increasing importations which shall pay duty. Other items in the tariff are made for the purpose of reducing competition—that is, by reducing importations—and, therefore, the question of the importance of a change in rate can not in the slightest degree be determined by the amount of imports that takes place. In order to determine the importance of the changes, it is much fairer to take the articles on which the rates of duty have been reduced and those on which the rates of duty have been increased and then determine from statistics how large a part the articles upon which duties have been reduced play in the consumption of the country and how large a part those upon which the duties have been increased play in the consumption of the country. Such a table has been prepared by Mr. Payne, than whom there is no one who understands better what the tariff is and who has given more attention to the details of the schedule.

Now, let us take Schedule A—chemicals, oils, and paints. The articles upon which the duty has been decreased are consumed in this country to the extent of $433,000,000. The articles upon which the duty has been increased are consumed in this country to the extent of $11,000,000. Take Schedule B. The articles on which the duty has been decreased entered in the consumption of the country to the amount of $128,000,000, and there has been no increase in duty on such articles. Take Schedule C—metals and their manufactures. The amount to which such articles enter into the consumption of the country is $1,221,000,000, whereas the articles of the same schedule upon which there has been an increase enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of only $37,000,000. Take Schedule D—lumber. The articles in this schedule upon which there has been a decrease enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $566,000,000, whereas the articles under the same schedule upon which there has been an increase enter into its consumption to the extent of $31,000,000. In tobacco there has been no change. In agricultural products, those in which there has been a reduction of rates enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $483,000,000; those in which there has been an increase enter into the consumption to the extent of $4,000,000. In the schedule of wines and liquors, the articles upon which there has been an increase enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $462,000,000. In cottons there has been a change in the higher-priced cottons and an increase.

There has been no increase in the lower-priced cottons, and of the increases the high-priced cottons enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $41,000,000. Schedule J—flax, hemp, and jute: The articles upon which there has been a decrease enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $22,000,000, while those upon which there has been an increase enter into the consumption to the extent of $804,000. In Schedule J as to wool, there has been no change. In Schedule L as to silk, the duty has been decreased on articles which enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $8,000,000, and has been increased on articles that enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $106,000,000. On paper and pulp the duty has been decreased on articles, including print paper, that enter into the consumpton of the country to the extent of $67,000,000, and increased on articles that enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $81,000,000. In sundries, or Schedule N, the duty has been decreased on articles that enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $1,719,000,000; and increased on articles that enter into the consumption of the country to the extent of $101,000,000.

It will be found that in Schedule A the increases covered only luxuries—perfumeries, pomades, and like articles; Schedule H—wines and liquors—which are certainly luxuries and are made subject to increase in order to increase the revenues, amounting to $462,000,000; and in Schedule L—silks—which are luxuries, certainly, $106,000,000, making a total of the consumption of those articles upon which there was an increase and which were luxuries of $579,000,000, leaving a balance of increase on articles, which were not luxuries, of value in consumption of only $272,000,000, as against $5,000,000,000, representing the amount of articles entering into the consumption of the country, mostly necessities, upon which there has been a reduction of duties, and to which the 650 decreases applied.

Statement.

Schedules.	Consumption value.	
	Duties decreased.	Duties increased.
A. Chemicals, oils, and paints	$433,099,846	$11,105,820
B. Earths, earthenware, and glassware	128,423,732	.....
C. Metals, and manufactures of	1,221,956,620	37,675,804
D. Wood, and manufactures of	566,870,950	31,280,372
E. Sugar, molasses, and manufactures of	300,965,953	.....
F. Tobacco, and manufactures of (no change of rates)	.....	.....
G. Agricultural products and provisions	483,430,637	4,380,043
H. Spirits, wines, and other beverages	.....	462,001,856
I. Cotton manufactures	.....	41,622,024
J. Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of	22,127,145	804,445
K. Wool and manufactures of wool. (No production statistics available for articles affected by change of rates.)		
L. Silks and silk goods	7,947,568	106,742,646
M. Pulp, papers, and books	67,628,055	81,486,466
N. Sundries	1,719,428,069	101,656,598
Total	4,951,878,575	878,756,074

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

Schedule A. Chemicals, including perfumeries, pomades, and like articles	$11,105,820
Schedule H. Wines and liquors	462,001,856
Schedule L. Silks	106,742,646
Total	579,850,322

This leaves a balance of increases which are not on articles of luxury of $298,905,752, as against decreases on about $5,000,000,000 of consumption.

Now, this statement shows as conclusively as possible the fact that there was a substantial downward revision on articles entering into the general consumption of the country which can be termed necessities, for the proportion is $5,000,000,000, representing the consumption of articles to which decreases applied, to less than $300,000,000 of articles of necessity to which the increases applied.

Now, the promise of the Republican platform was not to revise everything downward, and in the speeches which have been taken as interpreting that platform, which I made in the campaign, I did not promise that everything should go downward. What I promised was, that there should be many decreases, and that in some few things increases would be found to be necessary; but that on the whole I conceived that the change of conditions would make the revision necessarily downward—and that, I contend, under the showing which I have made, has been the result of the Payne bill. I did not agree, nor did the Republican Party agree, that we would reduce rates to such a point as to reduce prices by the introduction of foreign competition. That is what the free traders desire. That is what the revenue-tariff reformers desire; but that is not what the Republican platform promised, and it is not what the Republican Party wished to bring about. To repeat the statement with which I opened this speech, the proposition of the Republican Party was to reduce rates so as to maintain a difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production here, insuring a reasonable profit to the manufacturer on all articles produced in this country; and the proposition to reduce rates and prevent their being excessive was to avoid the opportunity for monopoly and the suppression of competition, so that the excessive rates could be taken advantage of to force prices up.

Now, it is said that there was not a reduction in a number of the schedules where there should have been. It is said that there was no reduction in the cotton schedule. There was not. The House and the Senate took evidence and found from cotton manufacturers and from other sources that the rates upon the lower class of cottons were such as to enable them to make a decent profit—but only a decent profit—and they were contented with it; but that the rates on the higher grades of cotton cloth, by reason of court decisions, had been reduced so that they were considerably below those of the cheaper grades of cotton cloth, and that by undervaluations and otherwise the whole cotton schedule had been made unjust and the various items were disproportionate in respect to the varying cloths. Hence, in the Senate a new system was introduced attempting to make the duties more specific rather than ad valorem, in order to prevent by judicial decision or otherwise a disproportionate and unequal operation of the schedule. Under this schedule it was contended that there had been a general rise of all the duties on cotton. This was vigorously denied by the experts of the Treasury Department. At last the Senate, in conference, consented to a reduction amounting to about 10 per cent on all the lower grades of cotton, and this reduced the lower grades of cotton substantially to the same rates as before and increased the higher grades to what they ought to be under the Dingley law and what they were intended to be. Now, I am not going into the question of evidence as to whether the cotton duties were too high and whether the difference between the cost of production abroad and at home, allowing for a reasonable profit to the manufacturer here, is less than the duties which are imposed under the Payne bill. It was a question of evidence which Congress passed upon, after they heard the statements of cotton manufacturers and such other evidence as they could avail themselves of. I agree that the method of taking evidence and the determination was made in a general way, and that there ought to be other methods of obtaining evidence and reaching a conclusion more satisfactory.

Criticism has also been made of the crockery schedule and the failure to reduce that. The question whether it ought to have been reduced or not was a question of evidence which both committees of Congress took up, and both concluded that the present rates on crockery were such as were needed to maintain the business in this country. I had been informed that the crockery schedule was not high enough, and mentioned that in one of my campaign speeches as a schedule probably where there ought to be some increases. It turned out that the difficulty was rather in undervaluations than in the character of the schedule itself, and so it was not changed. It is entirely possible to collect evidence to attack almost any of the schedules, but one story is good until another is told, and I have heard no reason for sustaining the contention that the crockery schedule is unduly high. So with respect to numerous details—items of not great importance—in which, upon what they regarded as sufficient evidence, the committee advanced the rates in order to save a business which was likely to be destroyed.

I have never known a subject that will evoke so much contradictory evidence as the question of tariff rates and the question of cost of production at home and abroad. Take the subject of paper. A committee was appointed by Congress a year before the tariff sittings began, to determine what the difference was between the cost of production in Canada of print paper and the cost of production here, and they reported that they thought that a good bill would be one imposing $2 a ton on paper, rather than $6, the Dingley rate, provided that Canada could be induced to take off the export duties and remove the other obstacles to the importation of spruce wood in this country out of which wood pulp is made. An examination of the evidence satisfied Mr. PAYNE—I believe it satisfied some of the Republican dissenters—that $2, unless some change was made in the Canadian restrictions upon the exports of wood to this country, was much too low, and that $4 was only a fair measure of the difference between the cost of production here and in Canada. In other words, the $2 found by the special committee in the House was rather an invitation to Canada and the Canadian print-paper people to use their influence with their government to remove the wood restrictions by reducing the duty on print paper against Canadian print-paper mills. It was rather a suggestion of a diplomatic nature than a positive statement of the difference in actual cost of production under existing conditions between Canada and the United States.

There are other subjects which I might take up. The tariff on hides was taken off because it was thought that it was not necessary in view of the high price of cattle thus to protect the man who raised them, and that the duty imposed was likely to throw the control of the sale of hides into the hands of the meat packers in Chicago. In order to balance the reduction on hides, however, there was a great reduction in shoes, from 25 to 10 per cent; on sole leather, from 20 to 5 per cent; on harness, from 45 to 20 per cent. So there was a reduction in the duty on coal of 33⅓ per cent. All countervailing duties were removed from oil, naphtha, gasoline, and its refined products. Lumber was reduced from $2 to $1.25; and these all on

articles of prime necessity. It is said that there might have been more. But there were many business interests in the South, in Maine, along the border, and especially in the far Northwest, which insisted that it would give great advantage to Canadian lumber if the reduction were made more than 75 cents. Mr. Pinchot, the Chief Forester, thought that it would tend to make better lumber in this country if a duty were retained on it. The lumber interests thought that $2 was none too much, but the reduction was made and the compromise effected. Personally I was in favor of free lumber, because I did not think that if the tariff was taken off there would be much suffering among the lumber interests. But in the controversy the House and the Senate took a middle course, and who can say they were not justified?

With respect to the wool schedule, I agree that it is too high and that it ought to have been reduced, and that it probably represents considerably more than the difference between the cost of production abroad and the cost of production here. The difficulty about the woolen schedule is that there were two contending factions early in the history of Republican tariffs, to wit, woolgrowers and the woolen manufacturers, and that finally, many years ago, they settled on a basis by which wool in the grease should have 11 cents a pound, and by which allowance should be made for the shrinkage of the washed wool in the differential upon woolen manufactures. The percentage of duty was very heavy—quite beyond the difference in the cost of production, which was not then regarded as a necessary or proper limitation upon protective duties.

When it came to the question of reducing the duty at this hearing in this tariff bill on wool, Mr. PAYNE, in the House, and Mr. Aldrich, in the Senate, although both favored reduction in the schedule, found that in the Republican Party the interests of the woolgrowers of the far West and the interests of the woolen manufacturers in the East and in other States, reflected through their representatives in Congress, was sufficiently strong to defeat any attempt to change the woolen tariff, and that had it been attempted it would have beaten the bill reported from either committee. I am sorry this is so, and I could wish that it had been otherwise. It is the one important defect in the present Payne tariff bill and in the performance of the promise of the platform to reduce rates to a difference in the cost of production, with reasonable profit to the manufacturer. That it will increase the price of woolen cloth or clothes, I very much doubt. There have been increases by the natural increase in the price of wool the world over as an agricultural product, but this was not due to the tariff, because the tariff was not changed. The increase would therefore have taken place whether the tariff would have been changed or not. The cost of woolen cloths behind the tariff wall, through the effect of competition, has been greatly less than the duty, if added to the price, would have made it.

There is a complaint now by the woolen clothiers and by the carded woolen people of this woolen schedule. They have honored me by asking in circulars sent out by them that certain questions be put to me in respect to it, and asking why I did not veto the bill, in view of the fact that the woolen schedule was not made in accord with the platform. I ought to say in respect to this point that all of them in previous tariff bills were strictly in favor of maintaining the woolen schedule as it was. The carded-woolen people are finding that carded wools are losing their sales because they are going out of style. People prefer worsteds. The clothing people who are doing so much circularizing were contented to let the woolen schedule remain as it was until very late in the tariff discussion, long after the bill had passed the House, and, indeed, they did not grow very urgent until the bill had passed the Senate. This was because they found that the price of woolen cloth was going up, and so they desired to secure reduction in the tariff, which would enable them to get cheaper material. They themselves are protected by a large duty, and I can not with deference to them ascribe their intense interest only to a deep sympathy with the ultimate consumers, so called. But, as I have already said, I am quite willing to admit that allowing the woolen schedule to remain where it is, is not a compliance with the terms of the platform as I interpret it and as it is generally understood.

On the whole, however, I am bound to say that I think the Payne tariff bill is the best tariff bill that the Republican Party ever passed; that in it the party has conceded the necessity for following the changed conditions and reducing tariff rates accordingly. This is a substantial achievement in the direction of lower tariffs and downward revision, and it ought to be accepted as such. Critics of the bill utterly ignore the very tremendous cuts that have been made in the iron schedule, which heretofore has been subject to criticism in all tariff bills. From iron ore, which was cut 75 per cent, to all the other items as low as 20 per cent, with an average of something like 40 or 50 per cent, that schedule has been reduced so that the danger of increasing prices through a monopoly of the business is very much lessened, and that was the chief purpose of revising the tariff downward under Republican protective principles. The severe critics of the bill pass this reduction in the metal schedule with a sneer, and say that the cut did not hurt the iron interests of the country. Well, of course it did not hurt them. It was not expected to hurt them. It was expected only to reduce excessive rates, so that business should still be conducted at a profit, and the very character of the criticism is an indication of the general injustice of the attitude of those who make it, in assuming that it was the promise of the Republican Party to hurt the industries of the country by the reductions which they were to make in the tariff, whereas it expressly indicated as plainly as possible in the platform that all of the industries were to be protected against injury by foreign competition, and the promise only went to the reduction of excessive rates beyond what was necessary to protect them.

The high cost of living, of which 50 per cent is consumed in food, 25 per cent in clothing, and 25 per cent in rent and fuel, has not been produced by the tariff, because the tariff has remained the same while the increases have gone on. It is due to the change of conditions the world over. Living has increased everywhere in cost—in countries where there is free trade and in countries where there is protection—and that increase has been chiefly seen in the cost of food products. In other words, we have had to pay more for the products of the farmer—for meat, for grain, for everything that enters into food. Now, certainly no one will contend that protection has increased the cost of food in this country, when the fact is that we have been the greatest exporters of food products in the world. It is only that the demand has increased beyond the supply, that farm lands have not been opened as rapidly as the population, and the demand has increased. I am not saying that the tariff does not increase prices in clothing and in building and in other items that enter into the necessities of life, but what I wish to emphasize is that the recent increases in the cost of living in this country have not been due to the tariff. We have a much higher standard of living in this country than they have abroad, and this has been made possible by higher income for the workingman, the farmer, and all classes. Higher wages have been made possible by the encouragement of diversified industries, built up and fostered by the tariff.

Now, the revision downward of the tariff that I have favored will not, I hope, destroy the industries of the country. Certainly it is not intended to. All that it is intended to do, and that is what I wish to repeat, is to put the tariff where it will protect industries here from foreign competition, but will not enable those who will wish to monopolize to raise prices by taking advantage of excessive rates beyond the normal difference in the cost of production.

If the country desires free trade, and the country desires a revenue tariff and wishes the manufacturers all over the country to go out of business, and to have cheaper prices at the expense of the sacrifice of many of our manufacturing interests, then it ought to say so and ought to put the Democratic Party in power if it thinks that party can be trusted to carry out any affirmative policy in favor of a revenue tariff. Certainly in the discussions in the Senate there was no great manifestation on the part of our Democratic friends in favor of reducing rates on necessities. They voted to maintain the tariff rates on everything that came from their particular sections. If we are to have free trade, certainly it can not be had through the maintenance of Republican majorities in the Senate and House and a Republican administration.

And now the question arises, what was the duty of a Member of Congress who believed in a downward revision greater than that which has been accomplished, who thought that the wool schedules ought to be reduced, and that perhaps there were other respects in which the bill could be improved? Was it his duty because, in his judgment, it did not fully and completely comply with the promises of the party platform as he interpreted it, and, indeed, as I had interpreted it, to vote against the bill? I am here to justify those who answer this question in the negative. Mr. Tawney was a downward revisionist like myself. He is a low-tariff man, and has been known to be such in Congress all the time he has been there. He is a prominent Republican, the head of the Appropriations Committee, and when a man votes as I think he ought to vote, and an opportunity such as this presents itself, I am glad to speak in behalf of what he did, not in defense of it, but in support of it.

This is a Government by a majority of the people. It is a representative Government. People select some 400 Members to constitute the lower House and some 92 Members to constitute the upper House through their legislatures, and the varying views of a majority of the voters in eighty or ninety millions of people are reduced to one resultant force to take affirmative steps in carrying on a government by a system of parties. Without parties popular government would be absolutely impossible. In a party, those who join it, if they would make it effective, must surrender their personal predilections on matters comparatively of less importance in order to accomplish the good which united action on the most important principles at issue secures.

Now, I am not here to criticize those Republican Members and Senators whose views on the subject of the tariff were so strong and intense that they believed it their duty to vote against their party on the tariff bill. It is a question for each man to settle for himself. The question is whether he shall help maintain the party solidarity for accomplishing its chief purposes, or whether the departure from principle in the bill as he regards it is so extreme that he must in conscience abandon the party. All I have to say is, in respect to Mr. Tawney's action, and in respect to my own in signing the bill, that I believed that the interests of the country, the interests of the party, required me to sacrifice the accomplishment of certain things in the revision of the tariff which I had hoped for, in order to maintain party solidarity, which I believe to be much more important than the reduction of rates in one or two schedules of the tariff. Had Mr. Tawney voted against the bill, and there had been others of the House sufficient in number to have defeated the bill, or if I had vetoed the bill because of the absence of a reduction of rates in the wool schedule, when there was a general downward revision, and a substantial one though not a complete one, we should have left the party in a condition of demoralization that would have prevented the accomplishment of purposes and a fulfillment of other promises which we had made just as solemnly as we had entered into that with respect to the tariff. When I could say without hesitation that this is the best tariff bill that the Republican Party has ever passed, and therefore the best tariff bill that has been passed at all, I do not feel that I could have reconciled any other course to my conscience than that of signing the bill, and I think Mr. Tawney feels the same way. Of course if I had vetoed the bill I would have received the applause of many Republicans who may be called low-tariff Republicans, and who think deeply on that subject, and of all the Democracy. Our friends the Democrats would have applauded, and then laughed in their sleeve at the condition in which the party would have been left; but, more than this, and waiving considerations of party, where would the country have been had the bill been vetoed or been lost by a vote? It would have left the question of the revision of the tariff open for further discussion during the next session. It would have suspended the settlement of all our business down to a known basis upon which prosperity could proceed and investments be made, and it would have held up the coming of prosperity to this country certainly for a year and probably longer. These are the reasons why Mr. Tawney voted for the bill. These are the reasons why I signed it.

But there are additional reasons why the bill ought not to have been beaten. It contained provisions of the utmost importance in the interest of this country in dealing with foreign countries and in the supplying of a deficit which under the Dingley bill seemed inevitable. There has been a disposition in some foreign countries taking advantage of greater elasticity in their systems of imposing tariffs and of making regulations to exclude our products and exercise against us undue discrimination. Against these things we have been helpless, because it required an act of Congress to meet the difficulties. It is now proposed, by what is called the maximum and minimum clause, to enable the President to allow to come into operation a maximum or penalizing increase of duties over the normal or minimum duties whenever in his opinion the conduct of the foreign countries has been unduly discriminatory against the United States. It is hoped that very little use may be required of this clause, but its presence in the law and the power conferred upon the Executive, it is thought, will prevent in the future such undue discriminations. Certainly this is most important to our exporters of agricultural products and manufactures.

Second. We have imposed an excise tax upon corporations measured by 1 per cent upon the net income of all corporations except fraternal and charitable corporations after exempting $5,000. This, it is

thought, will raise an income of twenty-six to thirty millions of dollars, will supply the deficit which otherwise might arise without it, and will bring under Federal supervision more or less all the corporations of the country. The inquisitorial provisions of the act are mild but effective, and certainly we may look not only for a revenue but for some most interesting statistics and the means of obtaining supervision over corporate methods that has heretofore not obtained.

Then, we have finally done justice to the Philippines. We have introduced free trade between the Philippines and the United States, and we have limited the amount of sugar and the amount of tobacco and cigars that can be introduced from the Philippines to such a figure as shall greatly profit the Philippines and yet in no way disturb the products of the United States or interfere with those engeged in the tobacco or sugar interests here. These features of the bill were most important, and the question was whether they were to be sacrificed because the bill did not in respect to wool and woolens and in some few other matters meet our expectations. I do not hesitate to repeat that I think it would have been an unwise sacrifice of the business interests of the country, it would have been an unwise sacrifice of the solidarity, efficiency, and promise-performing power of the party, to have projected into the next session another long discussion of the tariff, and to have delayed or probably defeated the legislation needed in the improvement of our interstate commerce regulation, and in making more efficient our antitrust law and the prosecutions under it. Such legislation is needed to clinch the Roosevelt policies, by which corporations and those in control of them shall be limited to a lawful path and shall be prevented from returning to those abuses which a recurrence of prosperity is too apt to bring about unless definite, positive steps of a legislative character are taken to mark the lines of honest and lawful corporate management.

Now, there is another provision in the new tariff bill that I regard as of the utmost importance. It is a provision which appropriates $75,000 for the President to employ persons to assist him in the execution of the maximum and minimum tariff clause and in the administration of the tariff law. Under that authority I conceive that the President has the right to appoint a board, as I have appointed it, who shall associate with themselves, and have under their control, a number of experts who shall address themselves, first, to the operation of foreign tariffs upon the exports of the United States, and then to the operation of the United States tariff upon imports and exports. There are provisions in the general tariff procedure for the ascertainment of the cost of production of articles abroad and the cost of production of articles here. I intend to direct the board, in the course of these duties and in carrying them out, in order to assist me in the administration of the law, to make what might be called a glossary of the tariff, or a small encyclopedia of the tariff, or something to be compared to the United States Pharmacopœia with reference to information as to drugs and medicines. I conceive that such a board may very properly, in the course of their duties, take up separately all the items of the tariff, both those on the free list and those which are dutiable, describe what they are, where they are manufactured, what their uses are, the methods of manufacture, the quantity of the manufacture, the cost of production abroad and here, and every other fact with respect to each item which would enable the Executive to understand the operation of the tariff, the value of the article, and the amount of duty imposed, and all those details which the student of every tariff law finds it so difficult to discover. I do not intend, unless compelled or directed by Congress, to publish the result of these investigations, but to treat them merely as incidental facts brought out officially from time to time, and as they may be ascertained and put of record in the department, there to be used when they have all been accumulated and are sufficiently complete to justify executive recommendation based on them. Now I think it is utterly useless, as I think it would be greatly distressing to business, to talk of another revision of the tariff during the present Congress. I should think that it would certainly take the rest of this administration to accumulate the data upon which a new and proper revision of the tariff might be had. By that time the whole Republican Party can express itself again in respect to the matter and bring to bear upon its Representatives in Congress that sort of public opinion which shall result in solid party action. I am glad to see that a number of those who thought it their duty to vote against the bill insist that they are still Republicans and intend to carry on their battle in favor of lower duties and a lower revision within the lines of the party. That is their right and, in their view of things, is their duty.

It is vastly better that they should seek action of the party than that they should break off from it and seek to organize another party, which would probably not result in accomplishing anything more than merely defeating our party and inviting in the opposing party, which does not believe, or says that it does not believe, in protection. I think that we ought to give the present bill a chance. After it has been operating for two or three years we can tell much more accurately than we can to-day its effect upon the industries of the country and the necessity for any amendment in its provisions.

I have tried to state as strongly as I can, but not more strongly than I think the facts justify, the importance of not disturbing the business interests of this country by an attempt in this Congress or the next to make a new revision; but meantime I intend, so far as in me lies, to secure official data upon the operation of the tariff, from which, when a new revision is attempted, exact facts can be secured.

I have appointed a Tariff Board that has no brief for either side in respect to what the rates shall be. I hope they will make their observations and note their data in their record with exactly the same impartiality and freedom from anxiety as to result with which the Weather Bureau records the action of the elements or any scientific bureau of the Government records the results of its impartial investigations. Certainly the experience in this tariff justifies the statement that no revision should hereafter be attempted in which more satisfactory evidence of an impartial character is not secured.

I am sorry that I am not able to go into further detail with respect to the tariff bill, but I have neither the information nor the time in which to do it. I have simply stated the case as it seemed to Mr. Tawney in his vote and as it seemed to me in my signing the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THISTLEWOOD for 10 days, on account of sickness in family.

WATERWAYS.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a correction in the RECORD. In the RECORD of August 16, 1911, there was published a document on waterways as creators of prosperity. Some very valuable diagrams should have been attached to the document, and they are necessary to make it understandable. I wish to have the whole thing reproduced, because it does not make sense as it is at present in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD certain documents.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to any more unanimous-consent requests to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Friday, August 18, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13570) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 148), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12501) granting an increase of pension to Zebina M. Hunt; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to Jane Williams; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid 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. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 13770) for the erection of a public building at Mendota, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JACKSON: A bill (H. R. 13771) to erect a memorial to Dr. Josiah Gregg; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LITTLETON: A bill (H. R. 13772) to create an industrial and corporate commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 13773) granting constructive service to certain officers of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13774) providing for the sale of the old post-office property at Providence, R. I., by public auction; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 156) to admit the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona as States into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13775) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Redfern; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13776) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lattig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 13777) for the relief of the heirs of Julius P. Garesché, lieutenant colonel, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 13778) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13779) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Antrim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 13780) granting a pension to Edward Domine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13781) granting a pension to Josiah A. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13782) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda M. Le Gros; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13783) granting a pension to George H. Lozon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13784) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Anglin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 13785) for the relief of the estate of James H. Ashby, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 13786) granting an increase of pension to William E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13787) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose U. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13788) granting an increase of pension to Joshua W. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13789) for the relief of the estate of the late Thomas J. Rodman, brigadier general, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13790) for the relief of the estate of the late James Cooper Ayres, captain, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13791) granting an increase of pension to James W. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 13792) granting an increase of pension to Frank Church; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 13793) granting an increase of pension to Mary D. Sheeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13794) granting an increase of pension to William Starry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 13795) to correct the military record of George F. Reid and to pay his widow, Isabella Reid, a pension; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 13796) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 13797) granting a pension to William J. Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13798) granting a pension to Malinda Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13799) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13800) granting an increase of pension to William D. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13801) granting a pension to Benjamin Wardell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 13802) for the relief of Ramon Hernandez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13803) granting an increase of pension to Cyrenous Dalley; 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. BARTHOLDT: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of the heirs of Julius P. Garesché; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BORLAND: Petition of numerous residents of Kansas City, remonstrating against the proposed sale of land known as the Huron Cemetery, situated in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CALDER: Resolutions of the Union League Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing the reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Arizona Woolgrowers' Association, protesting against any proposed change in the tariff on wool and meats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of several residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that the duty on lemons be repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of numerous residents of Garden City, Mo., protesting against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Communication from Haverhill Central Labor Union, indorsing resolution passed by Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia on arbitration treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of the estates of the late James Cooper Ayres and Thomas J. Rodman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of residents of Cement, Kans., urging an investigation of the management of the Federal prison at Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions of the Alameda County (Cal.) Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT: Petition of Rev. John L. Robinson and others, of Barneveld, N. Y., favoring arbitration treaties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *August 18, 1911.*

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

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CULLOM and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT NEWARK, OHIO.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire to move a reconsideration of the votes on the third reading and passage of the bill (H. R. 13276) to provide for the disposal of the present Federal building site at Newark, Ohio, and for the purchase of a new site for such building, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. I move to amend the bill on page 2, line 1, by inserting the word "and" after the word "building," so as to read "building and site."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF BLACK WARRIOR RIVER, ALA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 943) to improve navigation on Black Warrior River, in the State of Alabama, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to change the detailed plans and specifications for the construction of Lock and Dam 17, on the Black Warrior River, Ala., so as to increase the height of the pool level over the dam crest of Lock 17 to a height of 63 feet above the pool level of Lock 16, so as to render unnecessary the building of Locks 18 and 19, as now authorized, and so as to provide for the extension of slack water up the Mulberry and Locust Forks of the Black Warrior River to Sanders Shoals and Nichols Shoals, respectively, and for the development of water power.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to have prepared such detailed plans and estimates as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act, and he is further authorized in his discretion to suspend operations during his investigations and to enter into supplemental agreements with the present contractors for Lock and Dam 17, providing for the annulment of existing contracts or for their modification so as to cover the work required for the construction of the higher lock and dam, as he may deem most advantageous for the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. That should the construction of the higher dam at site 17 be found advisable the appropriations and authorizations heretofore made for the cost of locks and dams on the Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala., shall be available for the construction of Dam 17 and such locks as may be necessary to overcome the lift between the pools created by Dams 16 and 17.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War is authorized and empowered to enter into a contract with the Birmingham Water, Light & Power Co. (hereinafter styled "the company"), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alabama, its successors and assigns, for the purpose of carrying out the stipulations and performances herein mentioned. It shall be provided in said contract that the company, its successors and assigns, shall have the right to construct, maintain, own, and operate, at its own cost, in connection with Dams and Locks 16 and 17, for a period of 25 years from the time fixed in this act for completion of the works herein authorized, electrical power stations and other structures for the development of water power for industrial and other purposes, and for converting to its own use, benefit, and profit the power developed with the surplus water not needed for lockage, including the right to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of said power: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War shall have the power to fix and regulate, from time to time, the rates which the said company may charge consumers for light, heat, and power: *And provided,* That the company shall furnish and deliver, free of charge to the Government, at Locks 16 and 17, all power necessary for the lighting and operation of said locks and for the lighting of the Government grounds and houses situated at said locks and dams: *And provided further,* That said company shall only sell light, heat, and power developed from said water power direct to the consumer. The said contract shall further provide for the payment by the company to the Government of an annual rental for its use of the water power developed at Dams 16 and 17. For a period of 20 years the rental shall be at the rate of not less than $1 per annum per horsepower developed, which rate shall be subject to be changed and fixed in his discretion by the Secretary of War at the end of that period and thereafter at the end of every 10-year period. Payment for the power developed at each dam shall begin one year after the locks and dam at 17 shall have been completed. Beginning with the year 1920, the minimum rental to be paid to the Government by the company shall be on the basis of 15,000 horsepower. The company shall have ingress and egress over Government lands for the construction and operation of its plants and works and the right to use Government