Sulzer parcel-post bill (H. R. 14); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of B. Grau and 19 other voters of North Dakota, opposing parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of E. A. Stillman, of South Dakota, asking reduction of tax on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of S. Hitchcock and 40 other citizens of the city of Hope, N. Dak., and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of that place, asking the speedy passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor-shipment bill (S. 4043 and H. R. 16214); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of California, in favor of parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Merchants' Association of San Jose, Cal., opposing parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of residents of San Francisco, Cal., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, memorials of Merchants' Association of Napa; Merchants' Association of San Diego; Yreka Improvement Club, of Yreka; Aurelia S. Harwood; Pasadena Board of Trade; Sausalito Promotion and Improvement Club; Board of Trade of Delano; Ferndale Chamber of Commerce; Sierra Madre Board of Trade; Niles Chamber of Commerce; Stockton Merchants' Association; Eldorado County (Placerville) Board of Trade; Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; Alameda Chamber of Commerce; G. Frederick Schwarz; Merced County (Merced) Chamber of Commerce; Alfred Braverman, Fresno; James B. Bullitt, San Jose; Santa Clara Commercial League; Osgood Putnam, San Francisco; Merchants' Association of Fresno; Ernest A. Mott, San Francisco; Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg; Edward T. Delger, San Francisco; Weinstock, Lubin & Co., Sacramento; Hon. William C. Clarke, Oakland; and Clinton C. Clarke, Altadena, all in the State of California, in favor of appropriation for improvement of the Yosemite Valley; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Sarah Williams Danielson Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Killingly, Conn., in favor of House bill 19641; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petitions of citizens of Brigham, Logan, and Ogden, Utah, for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Salt Lake Federation of Labor, protesting against Senate bill 3175; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of East Rutherford, N. J., for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of citizens of the State of Minnesota, in regard to oleomargarine legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Litchfield, Minn., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Group No. 972, of the Polish National Alliance, against restrictive immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Royalton, Minn., for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of Catholic societies in the State of Minnesota, in regard to measures relating to Catholic Indian mission interests; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of T. M. Osborn, of Auburn, N. Y., for passage of the Philippine independence bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCOY: Petition of First Congregational Church of East Orange, N. J., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of the Maritime Exchange of New York City, indorsing the action of Congress with respect to the battleship *Maine;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorials of the New York State Senate and the Brooklyn League, for construction of one battleship in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of the New York State Senate, for protection of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, for establishment of marine schools; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Business Men's Association of Elmira, N. Y., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Memorials of Heidleburg Grange, Lebanon County, Pa.; Halifax Grange, No. 1343, Dauphin County, Pa.; and East Hanover Grange, No. 1435, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring governmental system of postal express (H. R. 19133); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Memorial of the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, for establishment of marine schools; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of California State Retail Hardware Association, favoring Senate bill 4308 and House bill 17736, duplicates, for 1-cent postage on letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of citizens of Lincoln, Ill., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Cigar Makers' Joint Unions of Greater New York, for enactment of House bill 17253; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William G. Wagner, of New York City, for enactment of the Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the New York State Senate, for protection of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the American Anti-Trust League, asking that the Federal arbitration act be extended to the coal industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Trow Directory, Printing & Bookbinding Co., for reduction in the rate of letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorials of Thomas J. Carroll, president of Allied Printing Trades Council, and Samuel Rosenthal, president of the Technical Press, New York, urging immediate action on the Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TILSON: Memorials of Somers Grange, No. 105, Somers, Conn.; Plainville Grange, No. 54, Patrons of Husbandry; Housatonic Valley Pomona Grange, No. 10; Frank A. Jordan and others, Quinebaugh, Conn., favoring prompt and present action on general parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of the Singleton Silk Co., of Dover; the Liondale Bleach, Dye & Print Works (Inc.); and the Rockaway Rolling Mill, of Rockaway, N. J., protesting against House bill 21100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Elizabeth (N. J.) Typographical Union, No. 150, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of East Greenwich, R. I., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS: Papers to accompany House bill 22576, granting a pension to Benjamin F. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 30, 1912.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Father in heaven, increase our loving kindness that our hearts may expand and our sympathies go out in brotherly love to all mankind. We realize that the warm clasp of the hand, the sunny smile, the cheering word is easy if love is spontaneous and brings great reward, but if the heart is frigid the effort is hard and the returns meager. Increase, therefore, our loving kindness that we may be rich in the things which make for righteousness, peace, and good will, and Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

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

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 473.

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and it is hereby, authorized to sit during the sessions of the House of Representatives and during the recess of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, in a speech printed in the RECORD on the 22d of March there was added a clipping from the National Tribune of January 18, 1912, which contains some reflection upon the record of Charles Francis Adams. It is only proper that Mr. Adams should have a chance, since this has been printed in the RECORD, to give his version, and so I ask that a letter from Mr. Adams may also be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Gen. Charles Francis Adams. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what the letter is in reply to.

Mr. McCALL. I will read it if the gentleman desires.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care to have it read.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Adams says in a letter that—

It seems hardly fair that the RECORD should be made the medium of perpetuating falsehoods about individuals, and under these circumstances I think I have a right to ask that similar prominence and permanence be given to the facts in regard to my military record.

That is in a letter to Senator LODGE.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that Gen. Adams has had sufficient publicity in the RECORD, from his standpoint, in attacking the soldiers of the country, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

Mr. PAYNE. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Alabama, whether we can have some information as to when a motion will be made to close general debate. Of course the gentleman realizes the embarrassment that we are under of Members desiring to be heard and not knowing when general debate will be closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My purpose is that on Tuesday morning, after the reading of the Journal, to move to close general debate and take up the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAYNE. I will ask the gentleman whether it will inconvenience him or interfere with the procedure of the bill to get unanimous consent, which I think can be done, to have two hours of general debate Tuesday morning, commencing at 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing to have two hours' general debate on Tuesday morning if the House will agree that after two hours' debate on Tuesday morning the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule for two hours, subject to amendments, and then reach a vote.

Mr. PAYNE. I have no objection to that arrangement.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I do not believe I want to agree to any proposition that would do away or curtail the rights that Members have under the five-minute rule. I want to say that I do it without any idea that there is going to be any prolonged discussion under that rule. I would be perfectly willing, although I am not interested in that part of it, to agree to two hours of general debate on Tuesday, or Monday, if we can change Monday's work over to a subsequent day, and include the proposition that we meet on Monday at 11 o'clock. Under that agreement general debate would close at 1 o'clock and we could take up the bill under the five-minute rule and have plenty of time to finish before adjournment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to have any amendments offered under the five-minute rule, but I want to say that there are no amendments that are likely to come from this side of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think that we will take more than two hours under the five-minute rule, but I do not want to agree to two hours because that time might be taken up on one or two paragraphs, and we would never be able to reach the part of the bill to which some Members want to offer amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My purpose in limiting the time under the five-minute rule is not for the purpose of cutting off amendments, but simply to limit debate under the five-minute rule, which by striking out the last word and making pro forma amendments is liable to be prolonged.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is any disposition to do that. I would not be a party to it; I am acting in the best of faith. I have talked since yesterday with quite a number of Members on that side, and they said that they thought I was right in objecting, that they did not like the idea of cutting off debate under the five-minute rule, because there is where we get the most intelligent discussion. Can not we meet at 11 o'clock?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no objection to meeting at 11 o'clock on Monday, but the same bill has once been considered under the five-minute rule.

Mr. NORRIS. That is one reason why I think we will not have much debate on it. My idea is that it will not take two hours, but I would like to have every Member offer an amendment to any portion of the bill that he desires.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman from Alabama if it is contemplated to have Monday for general debate by unanimous consent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from New York suggested that we have two hours general debate on Monday. Of course, the regular order of Monday will have to be transferred to Tuesday by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. So that Monday will be devoted to general debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Only two hours of it. I will ask, Mr. Speaker, if there are any eulogies set for to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. There are none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next; that two hours be devoted to general debate, and at the end of two hours general debate shall be closed, the bill shall be taken up under the five-minute rule, and that the order of business on Monday shall be in order on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next; that general debate on this bill shall be continued for two hours, at the end of which time it shall be taken up under the five-minute rule, and that the business on Monday on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and suspension of the rules to discharge of committees be transferred to Tuesday. Is there objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Chair stated there should be general debate for two hours; he means two hours on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Two hours on Monday. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Alabama as to the control of the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We started out by allowing the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to control the time, and I wish to let it run in that way.

The motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Chair how much time has been consumed by this side in general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Two hours and two minutes on the Democratic side and 1 hour and 35 minutes on the Republican side.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the Chair certain about that?

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] consumed an hour, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWNSEND] consumed an hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] consumed 45 minutes, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to correct his statement. Two hours and forty-seven minutes have been consumed on the Democratic side and 1 hour and 35 minutes on the Republican side. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for one hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is a saying of Bacon that "Nations, like individuals, have their youth, their middle age, their old age, and they have their diseases."

As a Nation we are young in years, but old in the elements that compose us.

Ethnologically we are about all the nations of all the world and their descendants.

Zangwill compares us to a melting pot, in which all nationalities are being fused and transformed here on American soil

into a new nationality; but we are something more than a melting pot of nationalities. We are a melting pot in which all creeds, cults, ideas, ideals, and institutions are being fused and transformed.

And sometimes the more radical and revolutionary the creed, cult, idea, or ideal, the more attention it attracts for a time till some other creed, cult, idea, or ideal boils to the surface—and that keeps the pot boiling.

After centuries of warfare with caste, privilege, prerogative, kings, and dynasties, humanity is realizing here its ultimate ideal and the people are supreme.

But some people are more supreme than other people, just as they always were; some people are richer than other people; some people are wiser than other people; and some people are healthier than other people, just as they always were; and some people are going around telling other people about it and explaining how all these inequalities are largely due to the last election and how much better it would be for everybody if Mr. So-and-so could be given a political job, just as they always did.

"Vote for Proclinus to-day and he will vote for you tomorrow."

They found that proclamation placarded on the walls of Herculaneum after it had been there 2,000 years, covered with ashes, but Proclinus is still running for office and still soliciting votes on the same old terms.

After all, we are nearly all of us just folks, and, fortunately, most folks want to do right, and so long as most folks want to do right in a government by majorities, we shall continue to go forward on the upgrade.

But in the midst of so much confusion, in the midst of so much megaphonic political holiness, in the midst of so many shouters at the doors of so many political tents, each advertising his own "greatest show on earth just upon the inside," in the midst of so many political necromancers and jugglers and sword swallowers and serpentine dancers and tight-rope walkers, plain people, who simply want the privilege of living and paying taxes, sometimes find it difficult to determine whether, to paraphrase Dickens, we are living in the best of times or the worst of times, in an age of wisdom or an age of foolishness.

It is easy to imagine an ideal state. Humanity has been imagining an ideal state ever since time began.

It is all perfectly plain that everybody ought to be so good as not to need any laws or the makers, administrators, or construers of laws; and poverty ought to be abolished; and nobody ought to have to work too hard; and nobody ought to want to loaf too hard; and nobody ought to want to buy too cheap; and nobody ought to want to sell too high; and nobody ought to put the big potatoes on top, and a peck ought always to hold 8 quarts; and things ought always to be true to name without the aid of Dr. Wiley; and nobody ought to want to beat his neighbor in a horse trade; and nobody ought to want to move his line fence over on his neighbor; and nobody ought to want to fence in the public domain; and there ought to be no demagogues in politics; and there ought to be no politics; and everybody ought to tell the truth and shame the devil, but they don't do it. [Laughter.] And, so far as I have been able to observe, you would never be able to tell a man's politics by the way he runs his business, except that when he has no business at all he is likely to vote the Democratic ticket. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean to say that a man finds after he has voted the Democratic ticket that he has no business?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. He is very apt to.

It is a long way yet to the millenium.

Therefore, as Hamilton says in the Federalist—

Because the passions of men will not conform to the dictates of reason and justice without restraint, governments are instituted among men.

And since it is necessary to have officers to run governments, it is necessary to have elections to elect them, and since it is difficult to put one man out and another man in, merely because one man wants another man's job, it has generally been considered necessary to assign some other reason.

And inasmuch as the average man, being busy about his own affairs, knows less about tariff schedules than almost any other thing, the tariff has generally been regarded as an excellent political issue, about which orators can talk with fluency and impunity without knowing very much about what they are talking about.

It is therefore fair to assume that the tariff will again be the issue this year. [Laughter.]

"CONSTRUCTIVE STATESMANSHIP."

At a time, Mr. Chairman, when the country was blessed with universal welfare, and universal difficulty in keeping up with it, and paying the incidental expenses, the country elected a Democratic House of Representatives pledged to level down all the high places, level up all the low places, to repair the crumbling edifice of our liberties, and remove all dandruff from the hair. [Laughter.]

And we shall, of course, be invited in the coming campaign to consider with enthusiasm what the gentleman from Missouri, the honored Speaker of this House, calls "the splendid record" of the Democratic Party "for constructive statesmanship during the extra session of the Sixty-second Congress," which he expressed the hope would be duplicated this session.

If it were not for higher considerations, the mere partisan advantage to be gained by such an object lesson might warrant satisfaction that the gentleman's hope of duplication is being realized.

A Democratic majority in the extra session of the Sixty-second Congress, operating under a dehorned Speakership, [laughter] proceeded to reduce the country to a state of apprehension, entirely surrounded by investigations [laughter], and in about four and a half months passed three and a half bills.

That is to say, it passed an apportionment bill left over from the last Congress.

It passed a so-called free-list bill "so loosely drawn as to involve the Government in endless litigation and to leave the commercial community in disastrous doubt."

It passed an antiprotection, tariff-for-revenue-only wool bill, which was swapped in the Senate for a protection bill and lost its identity in conference.

It passed a cotton bill with which, some time during the dog days last summer, an anonymous steel schedule and a vagrant chemical schedule casually became connected [laughter] and nobody knew much about the cotton schedule, and nobody knew much about the steel schedule, and nobody knew any more about the chemical schedule than a June bug on a giant firecracker knows about the chemical contents of the firecracker. [Laughter.]

The "constructive statesmanship" of the extra session of the Sixty-second Congress passed these "measures" without taking testimony, but these gentlemen have the happy faculty of being able to impart information without first obtaining it [Laughter and applause], and the net result was three veto messages.

RULES.

Gentlemen denounced the Payne tariff bill because opportunity was not given in the House to amend it generally, although opportunity was given to amend it in certain vital particulars.

But when the "constructive statesmanship" of the extra session of the Sixty-second Congress passed the cotton bill, amended by an iron and steel schedule framed and reported by no committee and amended by a chemical schedule framed and reported by no committee, it was put through under a rule, reported by a regenerated Rules Committee, permitting two hours' debate on a side and no amendments, and when gentlemen were being criticized for proposing to pass a rule permitting no discussion and no amendment they did not deny it—they passed the rule.

There had been arguments, essays, speeches, and denunciations against putting bills through under special rules. New Members had made their political campaigns upon the iniquity of rules and rules committees, and had been elected upon the eloquence of their denunciation of things about which they knew little then and know more now. Old Members had disclaimed all responsibility and rioted in rhetoric about being the victims of superior malignant force.

It is impossible to expect men to be as good in Congress as they are in magazines and on the stump, but the virtue on which they solicited votes ought to have withstood at least one shock.

I suggest to you that the people have a right to test the sincerity of your denunciation of rules by your adoption of rules; that they have a right to test the sincerity of your denunciation of the methods of 1910 by your adoption of the methods of 1910 in 1911.

The "constructive statesmanship" of the extra session of the Sixty-second Congress passed a half of a trade agreement with Canada, the net result of which is free wood pulp and print paper.

When I first heard that story about Herman Ridder taking Uncle Joe up on the top of the Capitol and showing him all the zones of newspaper influence and telling him that all these would be for him for President if he would order the Ways and Means Committee to report a free wood-pulp and print-paper bill, it seemed to me like an oriental dream; but when the shouting and the tumult in the United States and Canada died away and nothing was left but free wood pulp and print paper

standing out, spared, solitary and alone, above the ruins of an otherwise repudiated transaction, I could not help wondering whether a Democratic House of Representatives, with its "splendid record of constructive statesmanship," had left it standing there inadvertently. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

DEFINITIONS.

This is the "splendid record of constructive statesmanship" to which the Speaker referred, and which he wants to see duplicated this session.

It will do no good to refer to it as the most grotesque thing in legislative history. People might think that was an exaggeration, and even conscientious Democrats might feel compelled to call it a campaign canard.

The story is largely written in the President's veto messages which actually saved Democrats from themselves, but immediately after these messages were transmitted to Congress Democrats, who were otherwise good, churchgoing citizens, felt constrained to refer to them as a tyrannical exercise of Executive power.

What they did do and what they would have done are quite different things, but if they had done what they would have done it would have been a good deal like one of Cæsar's campaigns written by himself, "having taken the city and killed the citizens, Cæsar invaded another tribe," and they would still have called it a "splendid record of constructive statesmanship."

Mr. Chairman, the word constructive has two meanings; one implies the power to construct something, the other implies something assumed, suppositious.

Let it pass, then, as a "splendid record of 'assumed,' 'suppositious,' 'constructive' statesmanship," which fortunately constructed nothing. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

THE YEAR 1910.

The year 1910 was a comet year, and, while there is no scientific basis for the theory, it would almost seem as if the tail of Halley's comet had whipped into the atmosphere of this particular sphere in passing mephitic gases conducive to hysteria, which found congenial lodgment in hospitable brains, which have ever since harbored and retained them.

In the year 1910 the public mind was predisposed to see things and to be seduced by stories of ghosts, hobgoblins, and chimeras, and even staid, old New England began to slip the moorings of her reason.

The year 1910 was abnormal also in that it produced discontent in a time of plenty. In 1910 times were good and prices were high. We all like high prices, but we like them for what we have to sell, and we all like low prices, but we like them for what we have to buy; that is, as Josh Billings said some years ago:

"It takes less philosophy to take things as they come than it does to part with things as they go." [Laughter and applause.]

But what we have to sell some one else has to buy, and what some one else has to sell we have to buy; and inasmuch as we are all buyers and sellers, it is obvious that we must all go up and down together, except when some monopoly locates itself at the commercial crossroads and collects toll from human necessity, and every law upon the Federal statute books against monopoly was written there by Republican Congresses. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the year 1910, however, the people were told that the Republican Party was the party of protection, trusts, and monopoly; that protection protects trusts, makes prices high, and rears a wall around the helpless victims of licensed plunder. [Laughter on Republican side.]

I can hear my friend from Missouri over there saying it now. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Why, in 1910 prices were high the world over and the Republican Party had not built a wall around the world.

Prices were high in Europe, high in South Africa, high in Australasia, high in China and Japan, high in South America, high in the United States and high in Canada, high in nations which protect their markets, and high in nations which impose a tariff for revenue only.

But nobody saw that. All the people saw was some feverish orator on a platform somewhere denouncing something. And the man who denounced something did not care much what effect his denunciation might have on the country so long as he won. As Mr. Dooley says:

"It was like gettin' fame by bein' among those present at a boiler explosion." [Laughter.]

The nations of Europe have been conducting investigations as to the cause of high prices in Europe, and the President of the United States now recommends an appropriation of $20,000 to pay our share of the expense of an international conference to be held at Washington, to propose plans to the nations of the world for "an international inquiry into the high cost of living."

THE LOGIC OF THE LAST CAMPAIGN.

Notwithstanding all this, you gentlemen won the last campaign by telling the people that "the iniquitous Payne tariff law" was the sum total of human depravity and the cause of high prices.

Nobody read the Payne law—that is, not many people did—but everybody knew that prices were high. And for campaign purposes it was sufficient to assume that because two things existed at one and the same time therefore one was the cause of the other. It was like saying there is malaria in Washington. Congress sits in Washington, therefore Congress is the cause of malaria in Washington. [Applause on the Republican side.] That kind of an argument was a good deal easier to make than to discuss the law of supply and demand or the quantitative theory of money.

You told the people who live in cities that prices were high, because, by reason of protection, farmers were getting too much for what they had to sell; and at the first way station out of town you congratulated the farmer on the high prices he was getting for what he had to sell to the people who live in cities, and you will do it again.

But you never read to the American workingmen what Samuel Gompers, after a tour of Europe, reported in June, 1910, as to the state of American labor in comparison with foreign labor—

"That millions of wageworkers now have a shorter workday by several hours than 30 years ago;

"That the present organization of employing capital has almost wholly eliminated the uncertainty formerly experienced by wageworkers as to getting their pay when due;

"That constantly increasing wages on the whole during the present generation, considerably excelling the rise in average prices, meantime can be shown by the records of the wage scales for the workers, organized and unorganized;

"That the conditions for the education and normal growth of the youth of America never were better than to-day."

And—

"That looking over our whole broad land there was never a greater proportion of home owners, never a higher level of comfort for America's workers." [Applause on the Republican side.]

You never read this to any audience of American workingmen. You told them prices were high, and you talked to them about the "iniquitous Payne tariff law."

You never explained to the American laboring man that his wages would be reduced to the level of foreign wages if protection were removed.

You simply told him he was a consumer, and that with lower tariff rates foreign manufacturers, paying lower wages than are paid here, would get a chance at this market.

But you did not tell him that by so much as the foreign manufacturer gets possession of this market, by so much he displaces production here; and that by so much as he displaces production here he deprives American labor of employment here and increases the employment of labor abroad; and that by so much as he forces prices down by competition, by so much he forces down American wages; and that by so much as he forces down American wages he forces down the purchasing power of American labor.

You never told the American laboring man that it is of no advantage to a man to be able to buy things 5 per cent cheaper when his wages are 25 per cent lower or he is out of work entirely.

And you never told him that if the foreigner got control of our market, prices would go up.

You never told him that in the last analysis the question of protection of American labor and American industry is a question of American manhood and American citizenship, and that one reason why the American laboring man is the best all-round man on earth, mentally and physically, is because he is the best fed, best clothed, and best housed man on earth [applause on the Republican side], and that it takes a well-fed, well-clothed, and well-housed man to make a good citizen.

You never told him these things. You never read to any audience of American laboring men that John Mitchell said in the Outlook in September, 1909, that "any reduction in wages means a lowering in the standard of living; and the standard of living among a civilized people can not be lowered without lowering in the same ratio the physical standard and the intellectual and moral ideals of that people." [Applause on the Republican side.]

You never told any audience of American laboring men that inasmuch as this is a Government of the people and by majorities the Government is not lodged in legislative, executive, and judicial branches in the last analysis, but is lodged under every man's hat, and that as a man thinketh, so is he, and that as a majority think, so goes the Republic, and that a man is not apt to think right on an empty stomach or when he sees his family in want.

You never reminded the American laboring man that the more people there are employed in factories the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell, and that the more people there are to buy what the farmer grows to sell the more the farmer sells of what he grows to sell, and that the more the farmer sells of what he grows to sell the more he buys of what the manufacturer makes to sell, and that the more the manufacturer sells of what he makes to sell the more people he employs to make more goods to sell to everybody and the more the railroads haul for everybody. You never told him any of these things. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You never told him that when a factory runs full time, at full capacity, each unit of production is made cheaper than when it runs haltingly, to supply a spasmodic demand, and that, therefore, consumers buy cheaper and laborers receive higher and steadier wages.

You never told him that other enlightened nations protect their own people and their own markets, and that by your policy we would be throwing open this twenty-eight billion dollar market for the exploitation of other nations which protect their markets against us. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You never told him that if our markets were thrown open to foreign producers one of two things would happen, either wages would go down or men would go out of work and factories out of existence.

You never told him any of these things.

And yet the fundamental reason for protection is that it does protect American labor, and the American laboring man never received better wages for shorter hours than now, and never had more money deposited in savings banks than now, and never went home to a better home than now, and the American school is the best school on earth, and the man born or naturalized under the American flag has the best chance on earth, and therefore the American flag is the best flag on earth [applause], and if any man born on foreign soil is disposed to deny this, why did he come here?

The Payne law did three things that place it far in advance of previous tariff bills in constructive legislation.

First, it established a Customs Court for the speedy and uniform construction of tariff law.

Second, it gave us equality of opportunity with all other nations in the markets of all other nations by a system of maximum and minimum rates.

Third, it provided for the beginning of a tariff board by which to seek to ascertain the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I regret I can not yield. I have only a limited time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Just one question, which will illuminate the subject.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I can not yield. I do not wish to stop to discuss the gentleman's question now. My time is limited.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I just wanted to ask——

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I differ with some of my associates in believing that the declaration in our platform of 1908 that duties should be so levied as to equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad was the declaration of the most enlightened policy of recent times, because it is a policy framed to meet conditions which have greatly changed in the comparatively brief time since the passage of the Dingley law.

SPEED.

Draper, in his "Intellectual Development of Europe," says, "Empires are only sand hills in the hourglass of time," and the running of the sand for a quarter of a century is swifter than a watch in the night.

Sometimes it runs red with blood, sometimes it runs golden with the harvests of peace, sometimes it is stagnant with doubt as if humanity were pausing which way to go, and sometimes it is electric, charged with the spirit of unrest and change, but always it is the seed bed and the graveyard of mankind, and always the sand runs on, and the old order is always passing away.

The occupant of the spot light plays his part and moves off the stage. The political faker of to-day becomes the laughing stock of to-morrow and a hazy memory next week.

Across the stage pass kings, conquerors, lawgivers, saints, harlequins, and jesters, in pomp or squalor, in ephemeral triumps or desperate reverses, and always the sand runs on.

The period since 1898 has been a period of swift and feverish evolution from what Carlyle called a "gross steam-engine civilization" into an electric civilization.

No one is willing to take 40 years or even 40 days now in trying to reach any kind of a promised land, but everybody wants to go by express in a Pullman car.

We live in an age of hurry and congestion. We hardly get our eyes fixed upon the moving picture before the moving slide has slid on.

In 30 minutes now, measuring life by its experiences and not by length of years, a man lives longer, sees more, hears more, and gets more indigestion and nervous prostration than old Methuselah did in all his stagnant years. [Laughter and applause.]

We do not want contentment and satisfaction. If we have them, we want something else. We want sensation.

And if we have a President who is going steadily along his unadvertised way, every day doing something substantial, the political gallery gods are dissatisfied, because they want him to smash something so they can hear it jingle. [Laughter and applause.]

THE TARIFF AND CENTRALIZATION.

We live in a world of rush and noise and machinery—in a tariff world and a world of centralization, in which industries are centralized regardless of free trade or protection.

Something like a hundred years ago Adam Smith, writing about corporations, said they could never hope to gain much ground because it is "inherent in men to manage more diligently their own property than the property of others."

But corporations nowadays are willing to manage not only their own affairs but everybody else's affairs.

Immediately after the passage of the Dingley law in 1897 the country entered upon a period of restored public confidence, in which men strained every resource to make the most out of a time of phenomenal prosperity.

Feeling the necessity of producing at central points commodities to supply increasing areas of trade, created by increasing facilities of transportation, communication, and exchange, resulting from the increasing use of steam and electricity, they organized new corporations and reorganized old corporations into new corporations until corporate combinations, organized under the laws of various States, have outgrown the States of their organization and become national and international in their scope.

For illustration, down to May 31, 1900, 2,160 theretofore separate, independent industries were organized into 185 trusts, and of these 185 trusts only 65 had been organized before 1897; and the sum of the capitalization of these 2,160 separate, independent industries was one and a half billion dollars, but the sum of the capitalization of the resulting 185 trusts was three and a half billion dollars.

This movement swept on into the opening years of the twentieth century, until now industries not only here but throughout the commercial world are reduced to a few large units, run by a few large units, each controlling an area of trade, within which smaller industries in the very nature of things can only exist on sufferance of their larger neighbors.

THE TARIFF PLANK.

What, then, is the relation of the tariff to centralized monopoly?

Down to 1897 it was easy to demonstrate that domestic competition would regulate prices, that when an industry was found profitable, A, B, and C, and so on down the alphabet would go into business, and by domestic competition reduce prices to consumers, even below the duty exacted on similar imported articles.

But now A, B, and C, and so on down the alphabet are organized into corporate combinations and competition no longer regulates.

Therefore, by as much as you raise the duty above the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, by that much you invite domestic monopolies to overcharge domestic consumers [applause]; and therefore, in our platform of 1908, we declared for duties which should equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

That plank has an upward limit and a downward limit.

An upward limit—why? To protect American consumers from being overcharged by American monopolies. A downward limit—why? To protect American labor from competition with foreign labor.

With the adoption of this policy it became perfectly apparent that some means must be devised to aid a Ways and Means Committee in ascertaining with some degree of scientific accuracy the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and the Payne bill provided the beginning of a Tariff Board.

The reason is plain. Before the present Ways and Means Committee was created by the Speaker, and the chairman of that committee was given the power to run the House as the vicegerent and alter ego of the Speaker—in the earlier and less holy days—it had been the custom of Ways and Means Committees to hold open hearings and take testimony, not assuming that they could impart information without first obtaining it and never assuming that they could frame a tariff bill based upon backstairs communications from selected, biased sources. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the earlier and less holy times it was the custom of Ways and Means Committees to take testimony, generally for months, before framing a bill.

But even then it was difficult to reconcile conflicting interests—difficult even to divide among the Democratic brethren the pabulum of protection which they wanted for their districts, so they could go out and yell the more lustily for free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

FRAMING A TARIFF BILL.

Let us along this row of seats for a moment imagine ourselves a Ways and Means Committee, if you can mount to the dizzy and rarefied atmosphere of such power and respectability all at once [laughter on the Republican side], and let us proceed to take testimony.

Now here comes an importer. He may run a department store and run a newspaper at one and the same time, and he says he does not need protection at all.

Here comes a great corporation, which solely for purposes of illustration I will assume to be momentarily represented by my friend from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER]. He says "We are large and we do not need much protection."

Here comes a corporation with smaller capital represented by my friend from Michigan [Mr. DOREMUS], who demonstrates that his corporation can not run at all without considerable protection.

Here comes a man from the great Northwest and he says that just across the international boundary line they are digging coal and sawing lumber with oriental labor and that his country can not compete without high duties.

Here comes a Representative from the Great Plains country, a little farther east. He says his people need cheap lumber and cheap coal and demands low duties or no duties.

A Member appears from a little farther east and demands protection for coal and iron.

Here is another from the Southwest. He says his people grow cattle with hides on, and he wants a duty on hides. But a Member from New England wants free hides and promises cheaper shoes and cheaper harnesses.

Mr. PAYNE. Do not forget peanuts. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The bill is framed, and you report it. It is a compromise in the committee and a further compromise on the floor. It goes to a Senate committee, where the balancing and compromising goes on. It is reported to the Senate and further overhauled. It goes to conference, where "the disagreeing votes of the two Houses" are further compromised, and finally it goes to the President.

EVOLUTION OF A TARIFF BOARD.

For these reasons, and because the maximum and minimum provisions of the Payne law made it necessary to have persons skilled in tariff matters to aid the President in securing information to enable him to conclude negotiations with other nations, the Payne law, in 1909, carried a provision authorizing the President "to employ such persons as may be required."

By a process of evolution, admirably stated by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], that provision was broadened into the present law in the first regular session of the Sixty-first Congress.

But the people were not satisfied with that provision, and in 1910 the Republican platforms of 28 States demanded a permanent, independent, nonpartisan commission; and in January, 1911, the National Tariff Commission Association met in Washington and adopted a resolution demanding "from the Sixty-first Congress, then convened in final session, the enactment of a bill creating a permanent nonpartisan tariff commission."

Pursuant to that demand a bill was reported unanimously by the then Committee on Ways and Means.

In support of that bill the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CLARK, now the honored Speaker of the House of Representatives, said:

> We are not afraid of information from any source. We welcome it. I think I am at liberty to say that it takes a vast amount of information to get up a tariff bill which anybody of good sense is willing to stand to in days to come.

But the importance of framing a bill upon information that would appeal to people of "good sense" seemed more pressing upon the gentleman from Missouri in January than it did in June. [Laughter.]

In support of that bill, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, among other things, said (and I read this in connection with the speech the gentleman from Alabama delivered yesterday):

> You know, and every Democrat here knows, that one of the greatest difficulties we have had to face is that when the Ways and Means Committee goes into session to ascertain the facts upon which to write a tariff bill, the only men who are sufficiently interested to come before us and give the facts are the protected industries of the United States, and yet to-day you would vote to continue that condition.

And therefore the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] argued for a tariff board a year ago. Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. CLARK have changed since then—degenerated into mere candidates for the Presidency [laughter]—but the principle for which they stood has not changed.

PRESENT METHOD OF FRAMING TARIFF BILLS.

The testimony of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], speaking on the steel bill, January 29 last, corroborates the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]; that is, it corroborates Mr. UNDERWOOD a year ago. He says:

> The committee has exercised patience with all of them, and has denied to no man the right to present his case in any way he saw fit, *except by taking up the time of the committee and of this Congress by holding public hearings before the full Committee on Ways and Means.*

That is to say, "interested" persons have been heard in private by the Democratic members of the committee, but not by the committee.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said a year ago that you were not afraid of information from any source.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said a year ago that one of the greatest difficulties a Ways and Means Committee has to deal with is that only men who are sufficiently "interested" come before the committee.

And now the only persons heard are "interested" persons, and they are not heard by the committee, but are heard in "private" by the Democratic members of the committee.

In the earlier and less holy times when you felt particularly reckless about language you used to berate the Republican Party unjustly for what you called its association with "the interests," but we never framed a tariff bill in secret, with the advice of unknown "interests." [Applause on the Republican side.]

We never framed a tariff bill upon secret communications of "interested" parties, who knew they would get a hearing because of sympathetic political affiliations.

I do not know why it is, but I am reminded of a prayer of the Chaplain which made an impression upon me at the time and which for some reason comes back to me now: "Since cant and hypocrisy are the worst of sins, preserve us, O Lord, from these." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The Republican Party had entered upon a rational, scientific plan for tariff adjustment.

That policy has been supplanted now by a policy of tariff revision, based upon star-chamber, backstairs, secret communications and political guesswork.

THE NEED OF POLITICAL SANITY.

But the country can stand all that. It has lived, thriven, and grown for 136 years, counting the Declaration of Independence as the beginning of things national, and during all that time there have been legislative political manipulations, political agitations, and political agitators.

Generation after generation has come into being in a land of constantly widening opportunities, and the exploitations of political showmen, keen to guess what sensation the public will want next and to pander to it, keen to exploit a political emotion and to pander to it, have apparently had no retarding influence.

The country can stand these things. They are the surface operations of the men of the hour dealing with surface manifestations for their own ephemeral uses.

But below these are the profounder problems of the social relations of the people, by whom and for whom this Government

was organized out of a dream of human equality, which ought to be realized more and more as the years go by.

But our population is becoming congested in great cities. Lines of caste are becoming more and more defined. The corporate machine employer and the corporate machine employee have taken the place of the old personal relation between man and man. We are building industrial towers of Babel, and we go our ways separately, although we jostle one another on the sidewalk. In short, the incubator is becoming more and more the mother of the chicken. [Laughter and applause.]

There never was a time of greater need of level-headed stability than now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The Nation was never more in need of the kind of patriotism and political sanity that rises above mere self-seeking than now.

And yet there never was a time when men were apparently more willing to fan any smoldering discontent into a blaze for personal political gain than now.

There never was a time when men were more willing to sow grudges and discontent than now.

There never was a time when men were more ready to strain or amend the Constitution than now.

On the other hand, there never was a time when a larger element of our population were susceptible to inflammatory influences than now.

There never was a time when a larger element of our population could be played upon by opera-bouffe, whirling-dervish methods than now.

And there never was a time when party fealty sat more lightly upon American citizenship than now.

DANGERS.

The danger to our Republic is not in a strong, central, constitutional government—a government of "indestructible States in an indestructible Union of States"—but it is in the clamorous contention of the men of the hour for the loosening of constitutional restraints. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The danger to our Republic is not the power lodged by our fathers in executives, courts, congresses, and legislatures, which serve in the open and can be called up or called down, but in the breeding of public want of confidence in our institutions and in the men temporarily intrusted with power to run them.

The danger to our Republic is not in the men drawn from the ranks and temporarily intrusted with power, but in the light, flippant, vaudeville, ragtime treatment by a part of our public press of the serious efforts of honest men in public office to better conditions; in the blighting want of confidence in public servants, engendered by a certain sort of journalism, which creeps like a pestilence among the people and not only poisons the sources from which patriotic service must be drawn, but atrophies the patriotism that ought to make a man proud to die for his country if need be. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It can not be that the greatest good of the greatest number can be subserved by destroying public confidence in our public men and our public institutions.

While punishment swift and sure should follow every act of official corruption, because it is wrong and because every unpunished act of official corruption lowers the public estimate of the whole service, at the same time the reputation of every honest public servant is part of the assets of the Nation, and generous credit ought to be given to every man who faithfully performs the trust reposed in him.

I want to read you what John Morley said of the English Parliament:

For my part—

He says—

after 25 years of experience my strong impression is that * * * in manly conscientiousness, quick and sure response to high appeal, in public duty and moral feeling, in a strong feeling for fair play—that in these things the House of Commons has not deteriorated, but, on the contrary, has markedly improved.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment that is true of the American Congress. [Applause.]

If I had my way I would not be anxious for far-flung boundary lines, but I would be anxious to widen the breathing space of American citizenship within our boundary lines—to try to prevent crowding and congestion—to try to get men to come out of crowded cities into the open country—to limit more and more the influx of undesirable immigration—to instill deeper patriotism and greater respect for our institutions, and to try to develop the sentiment of brotherhood among men.

Renan somewhere says:

What welds men into a nation is the memory of great deeds, done in common, and the will to accomplish more.

We have them—we have the memories of great deeds done in common—heroic memories stretching back to "Sea fights and land fights, grim and great, fought to make or save the State," and they are part of the heritage of every child born under the American flag. [Applause.] And we have the will to accomplish more against any foreign foe. But as Lincoln once said, if danger ever comes to us, it can not reach us from abroad. It must rise up from among ourselves.

The question whether government of the people and by the people will be able to continue to govern itself is no longer a far-off question; it is here.

On a lonely monument up in Birmingham churchyard, on the battle field of the Brandywine, there is an inscription taken from an address delivered by Lafayette at the Turks Head Inn, in 1825, which is just as applicable now as it was then:

"May the blood spilled by thousands with equal merit in the cause of independence and freedom be to ensuing generations an eternal pledge of unalloyed republicanism, Federal union, public prosperity, and domestic happiness." [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in nearly 20 years the Democratic Party has control of the House of Representatives, and this Congress has given it the opportunity to show to the people of the country its sincerity and earnestness in carrying out its preelection pledges.

The turning of a majority of 45 in one Congress into a minority of over 60 in the next is a fact of deep political significance. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The results of the election showed that the people of this country were thoroughly aroused. One issue had been growing in their minds with greater and greater distinctness. With each succeeding year the cost of living increased and at a much greater ratio than the returns for labor. As the cost of living grew higher the people became more and more convinced that the exactions of the protective tariff were a predominant factor in producing the results against which they struggled. This feeling naturally resulted in a demand for the lowering of the tariff rates.

Against this demand the leaders of the Republican Party, controlled by the high-protective interests, stubbornly contested. Forced by necessity, however, and coming face to face with the last presidential campaign, they were obliged to yield and insert in their platform, as one of their promises to the people, that there should be a revision of the tariff. Such a revision was said by their candidate for the Presidency and by all the Republican speakers, to mean a revision downward. That the people had confidence in that pledge was shown by the results of the election.

Intrenched once more in power, however, that Republican majority ignored its promises and failed to materially lower the tariff rates. The people were shown conclusively that they could look for no relief from a revision of the tariff by the party of high protection. Stung with a realization of the ineffectiveness of their demand, the voters in the next congressional election turned from this party, which had tricked and betrayed them, and placed in power the Democrats.

That the tariff was the dominant issue in the Democratic success of the State elections for 1910 will be shown by a glance at the State platforms. In five of our leading industrial States, where the Democratic Party incorporated in their platforms vigorous protests against the inconsistencies of the Payne law and insisted on a revision of the tariff downward, Democratic governors were elected to succeed Republicans.

STATE PLATFORMS ON THE TARIFF.

Let me quote briefly from the tariff planks of these five States, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Indiana, and Massachusetts:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF CONNECTICUT.

We believe that an extension of the free list and a reduction in many of the rates * * * would advance the prosperity of the mass of our people without leading to any injustice to invested capital or any reduction in the wages of employees.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF NEW YORK.

The Payne-Aldrich tariff law * * * was a flagrant breach of faith by the Republican Party. * * * We declare our belief that only by an honest revision of the tariff downward * * * can this excessive cost of living be lessened and the necessaries of life again be brought within reasonable reach of the people of the country.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF NEW JERSEY.

* * * We charge that the Republican Party through the present unfair tariff * * * is largely responsible for the high cost of living now burdening our whole people.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF INDIANA.

We denounce the Payne-Aldrich tariff act as a masterpiece of injustice, involving remorseless exactions from the many to enrich the few.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF MASSACHUSETTS.

We demand the removal of taxes upon foodstuffs and other necessaries of life.

Quotations from other State platforms could be given, but these will suffice to show that the Democratic Party was elected in both Federal and State contests with a definite commission to perform.

With the issue of the tariff thus clearly presented the people in these five States not only elected Democrats for governors in place of Republicans, but sent to the Sixty-second Congress 46 Democratic Representatives where in the previous Congress there had been but 28. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic House of Representatives, to which the constructive work of revising the tariff falls, went to work at the earliest possible moment to carry out its party pledges.

REVENUE DUTIES.

For over a year now I have had the pleasure, as one of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, of assisting in the preparation of bills which in a straightforward manner meet the party promises and which seek to lower the cost of the necessities of life and place in lieu of a high protective duty afforded to certain favored manufacturers the lowest duties consistent with producing an adequate revenue for our Government.

The difficulties of the situation have been met and the efforts of our committee have given effective expression to the purpose of our party to revise the tariff. That this has been done is in no small part owing to the untiring efforts and conscientious service, as well as to the character and ability of the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause.] His unfailing tact, judgment, and the constructive leadership of himself and the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Missouri, have enabled the Democratic Party to-day to point to tariff bills which are genuine revisions downward, and through their guidance the Democratic majority has so conducted itself as to win public confidence and approval. That such confidence will extend to greater responsibilities for the Democratic Party in the future seems assured. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE COST OF LIVING.

The ever-increasing cost of living brought home to our people the absolute necessity for calling a halt on the protective exactions of the Republican tariff. The present great advance in prices has been continuous since the year 1896. Bradstreet's Index Number shows an increase, from 1896 to the present date, of a little over 51 per cent in cost, or about 3.2 per cent a year. Even comparing February 1, 1912, with January 1 of the same year, we find that the Index Number works out a rise of a fraction over 1 per cent, though it is a drop of two-tenths of 1 per cent over December, 1911. It is, however, an increase of 2.1 per cent from February 1, 1911. This advance in prices diminishes the power to purchase of every wage earner and renders the struggle to obtain the necessities of life increasingly hard.

The prime necessities of life are food and clothing. In both of these the prices to the consumer has constantly increased, and in each case is fairly representative of the general increase of prices throughout the country at large. The prices of these articles are affected by the tariff rates in several ways. Certain of the products, more particularly clothing, have placed on them high duties, which in many instances give the manufacturers complete control of the American market. The fact that of the entire consumption of clothing in this country only 3 per cent of our woolen clothing and 6 per cent of our cotton clothing is imported shows that the duties on that commodity gave to the domestic manufacturers practically exclusive control of our market. In food products, while many of them are exported, yet those exportations are constantly decreasing in volume. The demand is rapidly overtaking the supply, and it is but a few years before many of them will cease altogether to be exported.

COMMISSION ON COST OF LIVING.

So insistent has become the demand for relief that the President sent a message to Congress on February 2, 1912, and recommended an appropriation to enable him to invite foreign governments to a conference on the subject, with which object I entirely agree. He says, in part, in his message:

> For some years past the high and steadily increasing cost of living has been a matter of such grave public concern that I deem it of great public interest that an international conference be held at this time for the purpose of preparing plans to be submitted to the various governments for an international inquiry into the high cost of living, its extent, causes, effects, and possible remedies.

The Democrats took steps to end one of the causes of the increasing cost of living in this country, and had the President seen fit to sign instead of to veto the Democratic tariff bills there would not now be so pressing a need for a commission on this subject. Even a commission on the cost of living composed of protectionists can not justify a tariff on food products.

My own State of Massachusetts appointed a commission on the subject of the high cost of living, and I wish to quote from its report (Mass. House, 1910, Doc. 1750, p. 384):

> But the tariff was never meant to apply seriously to the food of the people, save for the development of such industries as the growing of fruit in Florida or beets for sugar in the West. From the first it was designed to create and preserve manufacturing industries. The odium of the corn laws need but be suggested to show how obnoxious would be a serious tax on food. If we have reached the point where it is of real importance to us to have the product of the farms of the North, as well as that of the farms of the West, no tariff hindrance can be endured.

And, again, on page 530:

> It is not probable that the removal of the duty on farm products would diminish by a penny the wage rate of farm laborers anywhere in the United States. That rate is determined by the competition of the mill and the attractiveness of the city. * * *
>
> It is not our belief that removal of the tariff on the staple articles of food would speedily and greatly reduce the cost of living. The same causes are making food high in all the civilized world, and the difference between wholesale prices is not enough to warrant the expectation that a policy of what, for brevity's sake, would doubtless be called "free food" could change international transactions greatly and at once. Its importance comes from the fact that we are soon going to buy a material part of our food outside our own limits. It would further have the very beneficial consequence of removing what chance may now exist to "corner" food products—a chance that puts the public at the mercy of the speculator and the trust. To some extent, also, it would lessen our dependence on the seasons and the weather. Bad harvests rarely occur over all the world.
>
> We submit, therefore, that it is a wise, economic policy to give the people free access to those articles of food that call for the bulk of the expenditure of the masses. For purposes of revenue it may be wise to tax somewhat the comforts, and the heaviest duties should be levied on the luxuries, but the food necessities of life should be "free."

In carrying out its pledges to reduce the cost of necessities the Democratic Congress has passed bills which, among other important items, place on the free list the following necessities of life, and I have placed opposite them the taxes which the people now pay as imposed on them in the Payne-Aldrich Act:

Fresh beef, 1½ cents per pound.
Fresh mutton, 1½ cents per pound.
Fresh pork, 1½ cents per pound.
Hams, 4 cents per pound.
Bacons, 4 cents per pound.
Lard and compounds, 1½ cents per pound.
Sausage (except bologna), 25 per cent.
Flour, 25 per cent.
Bread, biscuits, wafers, 20 per cent.
Buckwheat flour, 25 per cent.
Oatmeal, 1 cent per pound.
Salt, 33 to 80 per cent.
Sewing machines, 30 per cent.
Lumber (average on rough and dressed), $2 per thousand feet.

COST OF FOOD.

The United States Commissioner of Labor has compiled a table showing the average cost of the various articles of food consumed by 2,567 average-size families.

Average cost of the various articles of the food consumed in average family of United States.

[Compiled from eighteenth report United States Commissioner of Labor. The statistics are based on returns secured principally in 1901 from 2,567 families of the average size of 5.31 persons.]

Articles.	Unit of measure.	Quantity.	Average cost.	Per cent of total expenditures.
Fresh beef	Pounds	349.7	$50.05	15.31
Salt beef	do	48.6	5.26	1.61
Fresh hog products	do	114.2	14.02	4.29
Salt hog products	do	110.5	13.89	4.25
Other meat	do	77.7	9.79	2.99
Poultry	do	67.7	9.49	2.90
Fish	do	79.9	8.01	2.45
Eggs	Dozens	85.2	16.79	5.14
Milk	Quarts	354.5	21.32	6.52
Butter	Pounds	117.1	28.76	8.80
Cheese	do	16.0	2.62	.80
Lard	do	84.4	9.35	2.86
Tea	do	10.6	5.30	1.62
Coffee	do	46.8	10.74	3.28
Sugar	do	268.5	15.76	4.82
Molasses	Gallons	3.6	1.69	.52
Flour and meal	Pounds	680.8	16.76	5.13
Bread	Loaves	252.7	12.44	3.81
Rice	Pounds	25.1	2.05	.63
Potatoes	Bushels	14.7	12.93	3.95
Other vegetables			18.85	5.77
Fruit			16.52	5.05
Vinegar, pickles, and condiments			4.12	1.26
Other food			20.40	6.24
Total			326.90	100.00

MEAT.

From this table it is seen that fresh beef and meat products amount to 28.45 per cent of the total expenditures. Under the present Payne-Aldrich Act these products pay an average duty of 21 per cent. The Democratic bill proposes to place them on the free list.

SUGAR.

In addition to this, the bill recently reported by the Ways and Means Committee and which the House passed two weeks ago

by so overwhelming a majority, takes from sugar its present tax and places it on the free list as well.

The following table shows the amount of dutiable and nondutiable sugar consumed for the fiscal years 1889–90, 1907–8, and 1910–11:

Amount, in pounds, of dutiable and nondutiable sugar for fiscal years of 1889–90, 1907–8, and 1910–11.

	1899–90	1907–8	1910–11
Free of tax	552,000,000	3,247,000,000	3,700,000,000
Taxed at reduced rate	.....	2,491,000,000	4,180,000,000
Paying full duty	2,607,000,000	1,045,000,000	263,000,000
Total supply	3,159,000,000	6,783,000,000	8,143,000,000

THE SUGAR DUTY.

It will be seen by this table that in the eighties practically five-sixths of the sugar consumed in this country was imported and paid the full rate of duty. To-day, in contrast, we find that between one-third and one-half of our supply of sugar pays no duty whatsoever, and that a little over one-half pays a duty at a reduced rate—20 per cent off. But one twenty-fifth of the sugar consumed paid the full duty during the last fiscal year.

CHANGE OF CONDITIONS OF SUGAR.

There has been, then, a complete turn within the last 25 years in the amounts of duty-paying and duty-free sugar. It is obvious that if free sugar were desirable under the McKinley tariff law of 1890 we have a very much stronger claim to free sugar to-day.

Let us see what has been the real significance of this change in the relative amount of sugar paying full duty. In brief, this change means that in the eighties practically the whole tax paid by the consumer of sugar went into the United States Treasury, while to-day about one-third of the bonus paid by the consumer for his sugar goes toward making up the Federal income; the balance—that is, the remaining two-thirds—goes into the pocket of the producer. In other words, we are taxed $3 every time we raise $1 of revenue.

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

Mr. PETERS. With pleasure.

Mr. BATES. I have not been able to avail myself of the privilege of hearing the entire speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I would like to ask, in his opinion, whether the passage of the House bill taking the tariff off sugar will give any benefit whatever to the consumer?

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I think it will give an enormous benefit to the consumer, and no better evidence or assurance of that could we receive than to say that in the nineties, when we had free sugar under the McKinley bill, there was a fall in price to the consumer almost exactly equal to the tax which that bill took off sugar at the customhouse. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. No. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, let me further ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, Was that not due to the fact that there were heavier crops those years, and, as a matter of fact, does not the yield of sugar and the manipulation of the sugar producers and the middle men control the price of sugar to the consumer the world round, without reference to the tariffs in this country or any other country?

Mr. PETERS. No better aid could be given to the manipulation of the price of any commodity than to have a tariff put upon that commodity; and if there is manipulation of the price of sugar in the United States by reason of the tariff there is likely to be much less manipulation when sugar is free, for then we can buy it in all the markets of the world, which makes it impossible to corner the local market. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BATES. No. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further permit me, the price of sugar is fixed, not with relation to the market of the United States, but with relation to the market of the world. For instance, is the gentleman aware that the same grade of coffee which is sold in the United States from Brazil is also sold in Germany, with a tariff paid, at a less price than it is sold here, where coffee is under free trade?

Mr. PETERS. The price will be the result of the supply and demand.

Mr. BATES. I think so.

Mr. PETERS. If we have here a tariff, the imported sugar which we buy in the world's market at Hamburg will come into this country, and the purchaser here will pay the Hamburg price plus the tariff rate which we impose on sugar, plus also the charges for bringing it from Hamburg here; and as long as we have to import part of our sugar, on which we pay full duty, that imported sugar will fix the price of all sugar to the American consumer.

Nothing can show that more conclusively than a study of the table of sugar prices in the nineties. When we had free sugar there was an immediate drop equal to just about the tariff rate which had been taken off that commodity.

Mr. Willett, of Willett & Gray, in his testimony before the Hardwick committee (Hearings, p. 3140) testified that the price of granulated sugar under the protective rates from 1886 to 1889 averaged 6.69 cents per pound, and under the free raw sugar of the McKinley bill, 1891–1893, fell to 4.41 cents per pound.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me to make the suggestion, the difference of the price of sugar in this country and Hamburg market is equal to the difference of the tariff rates at present.

Mr. PETERS. A perfect and complete answer.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, one other suggestion, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will good-naturedly allow me. I have been in grocery stores and seen barrels of sugar unheaded, and the first thing that greets the eye of the grocer and bystander is a placard in red paper with black letters, "This sugar costs so much per pound. If it were not for the tariff levied by the United States Government it could be sold to the consumer at so much per pound"—at less, of course. Now, that placard is put there by the sugar refiners, and that is one additional proof to the statement which has been widely made that this movement to get up blank petitions and send them to people to sign and send to myself and other Members of Congress originated with the sugar refiners, and it has raised a very grave doubt in my mind whether we are not by the proposed legislation taking $53,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and handing it over as a present to these trusts and monopolies, who fix the price of sugar here and the world around.

Mr. PETERS. Well, if the gentleman will allow me, I am trying to show the effect of this tariff on the consumer, and I hope to relieve the gentleman's mind from that suspicion.

Mr. BATES. I shall be very glad to follow the gentleman further in his argument, and I thank the gentleman for allowing the interrruption.

Mr. PETERS. The condition of affairs will be perfectly clear when one realizes that the price of all sugar to the consumer is the same, whether he buys sugar grown and refined in Europe, which sugar pays the full duty of $1.90 per hundredweight, or whether he purchases sugar grown in Cuba and refined in the United States, which pays the regular duty, less 20 per cent, or whether he buys sugar grown in the Philippines or in the Hawaiian Islands or in Porto Rico or in the United States, which pays no duty whatsoever. We all pay the same price at the corner grocery for our sugar, wherever it is grown. The reason for this is that the Hawaiian, the Porto Rican, the Filipino, and the local producer can furnish us with less than one-half the sugar which we need. We therefore go to Cuba, which is in a position, by reason of its 20 per cent reduction in the duty, to send sugar to the United States at a lower price than can European countries, which pay full duty. But after we have purchased all the sugar to be had from the small island of Cuba we are still short and are obliged to draw upon the products of European countries against whose sugar we collect full duty. The producer in the favored islands—Philippines, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Cuba—and the domestic producer know that we must purchase a certain amount of sugar elsewhere, on which we have to pay the entire duty. The island and the domestic producer realizes, therefore, that all that they need to do is to offer their sugar at a price just a trifle under the price of sugar abroad, plus the regular rate of duty, and that America, which must have sugar, will take all that they have to offer.

PRICE OF SUGAR.

The price of all our sugars is, therefore, about $1.90 per hundred pounds higher than it would be if all sugar were duty free. The Filipino and the Hawaiian and the Porto Rican producer, who pays no duty, keeps the $1.90 for himself; the Cuban, who pays 80 per cent of the duty, keeps one-fifth of the $1.90 per 100 pounds—all this is paid by the American consumer.

BURDEN OF SUGAR TARIFF OUTWEIGHS ITS BENEFIT.

It will be of interest to examine the following table and see the results of the present tariff on sugar. The table shows the benefit to the Treasury and to the producer and the cost to the consumer. To the domestic producer we pay about $30,000,000 annually, or a bounty of about 2 cents a pound on all the sugar that he raises. To the islander—the Cuban, the Hawaiian, the Filipino, and the Porto Rican—we pay over $50,000,000; or in all we pay about $90,000,000 excess profits to the producer, in order to realize revenue of about half that amount, $52,000,000. Certainly this is too expensive a form of subsidizing the industries of this country and our insular protectorates.

Estimated benefit of tariff duty on sugar to the Treasury and to the producer and the resulting cost to consumer.

1. Benefit to Treasury:			
Total duty collected on sugar for year of 1910–11			$52, 496, 000
2. Benefit to producer, distributed as follows:			
A. Island producers—			
Cuba (20 per cent of $1.90 times 41,800,000 cwt.)	$15, 884, 000		
Hawaii ($1.90 times 10,670,000 cwt.)	20, 273, 000		
Porto Rico ($1.90 times 6,400,000 cwt.)	12, 600, 000		
Philippines ($1.90 times 3,300,000 cwt.)	6, 270, 000		
Total benefit to island producers		$55, 027, 000	
B. Domestic producers—			
Beet sugar ($1.90 times 9,790,000 cwt.)	18, 601, 000		
Cane sugar ($1.90 times 6,840,000 cwt.)	13, 896, 000		
Total benefit to domestic producers		32, 497, 000	
Total island and domestic			87, 524, 000
3. Total cost to consumer			140, 020, 000

A very conservative estimate of the amount saved to the consumers by this bill would be 1½ cents a pound on the consumption of 7,633,000,000 pounds, or about $115,000,000.

CLOTHING.

Not only by bills reducing the price of food have the pledges to reduce the tariff been carried out, but every attempt has been made to lessen the price of clothing as well. The woolen schedule, Schedule K, has received the most general criticism and condemnation of all the schedules. Woolen clothing enters into the consumption of everyone in this country, and the importance of reducing these articles to the consumer was keenly felt by the committee. The average rate of duty of manufactures of woolens for the last year was 90.12 per cent. The wool bill recommended to this House, which is similar to the bill introduced and passed at the first session of this Congress, proposes to reduce these rates to 42.55 per cent, and effects an average reduction in the entire schedule from 59.23 per cent to 31 per cent. This reduction includes such necessities of life as women's and children's dress goods, the rates on which are lowered from 102.85 per cent to 45 per cent; blankets from 73.42 per cent to 30 per cent; flannels from 103.87 per cent to 30 per cent; and a total average reduction on wearing apparel from 81.31 to 45 per cent.

A revision of the cotton schedule made a reduction scarcely less in importance. The total duties on manufactures of cotton, in Schedule I, were decreased from an average ad valorem rate of 48.12 per cent to a rate of 27.6 per cent.

These bills have been followed by bills revising the chemical schedules, which reduced the average rate of 25.72 per cent on chemicals to 16.66 per cent. Most of the articles in this schedule are not themselves directly used by consumers, but they enter into many of our manufactures, and a tariff on them tends to increase the cost to the consumer.

A bill revising the steel schedule reduces the average rate of duty from 34.51 to 22.42 per cent.

WAGES AND THE TARIFF.

That the tariff itself increases the price to the consumer can not be questioned. The manufacturers, however, endeavor to impress the wage earner that a high tariff means high wages, and that in some way the wages of the operatives depend directly upon the percentage rate of protection that is applied to the industry. I have compiled a table based on the report of the statistics of labor for my own State of Massachusetts for 1908, and have arranged the leading Massachusetts industries, first, by the average yearly wage of the operatives, and then by the average rate of protection which they receive. It will be seen that the average rates of wages bear no relation to the average rate of protection given the industry. Worsteds and woolens, which have the highest protection, 90 per cent, is sixth in the average wage of employees; silk, which is second in the rate of protection accorded it, is eighth in the average return of its employees, and boots and shoes, which item is last in amount of protection, pays third from the highest wage.

This table, of course, does not permit of a positive conclusion. It is presented here simply to show the absolute independence of wages and tariff rate:

Table showing independence of wages paid and protection received.

Leading Massachusetts industries.	Average wage per year.	Number employed.	Present average ad valorem duty.	Same industries arranged in order of protection received.
1. Foundry and machinery	$601	31,112	34 per cent (total iron and steel manufactures)	Worsted and woolen goods, 90 per cent.
2. Chemicals	588	1,047	26 per cent	Silk manufactures, 54 per cent.
3. Boots and shoes	562	69,250	10 per cent	Cotton goods, 48 per cent.
4. Rubber goods	498	5,763	35 per cent (n. s. p. f.)	Rubber goods, 35 per cent.
5. Paper and wood pulp	489	11,390	29 per cent (total manufactures of paper)	Foundry and machinery, 34 per cent.
6. Worsted and woolen goods	450	41,969	90 per cent (average for total manufactures of wool).	Paper and wood pulp, 29 per cent.
7. Cotton goods	439	60,935	48 per cent (average for total manufactures of cotton).	Chemicals, 23 per cent.
8. Silk and silk goods	429	3,235	54 per cent (average for total manufactures of silk).	Boots and shoes, 10 per cent.

[1] Statistics showing wages and number of employees compiled from tables on pp. 135 and 137 of Scott Nearing's book on Wages in the United States 1908–1910.

VETO OF BILLS.

The Democratic Congress passed the bills I have mentioned and so did its part toward removing the exactions of a high protective tariff. The bills which our committee brought in passed at the first session of the Congress, went through the Senate, and in modified form came to the President for his signature, and were all vetoed on the grounds, substantially, that no report of the Tariff Board had been made on those industries. Rumor gives to their successors, should they reach him, a similar fate. In his veto message of August 17 of the wool bill, the President quoted from his message to Congress on December 7, 1910, as follows:

> 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.

And later, in the same message, the President said:

> 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.

The majority views of your committee on this attitude were expressed in its report on House bill 11019, in which it said:

> It would be trifling with the people to give further consideration to Republican counsels of more delay in this matter, whether with regard to statistical data concerning cost of production, promised at a future date, or for any further reason.

The report of the Tariff Board on Schedule K was finally made and was sent to the House on December 20, 1911, with a message, in which the President says:

> On the basis of these findings I now recommend that the Congress proceed to a consideration of this schedule with a view to its revision and a general reduction of its rates.

The majority members of the committee took the hope held out by the President on August 17, and despite the difficulty of reconciling the views of protection and of revenue tariffs, made a careful analysis of the Tariff Board's report. As a result of this study the committee again recommends the same bill it passed before, and that bill is now before us for consideration and will undoubtedly again receive the overwhelming indorsement of the House.

THE TARIFF BOARD REPORT.

A study of the report shows the futility of attempting to deduce revenue rates from a report which is based solely on investigations along the line of discovering the difference in the cost of production. The important person in our minds is the consumer, and no information is contained in the report of the Tariff Board as to the cost of an article to the consumer.

The wool report of the Tariff Board was disconcerting to those who have opposed any change in the Payne tariff law. The cotton report, made to this House and now being printed, is even more so. Whatever may be deduced from these reports, they demonstrate the impossibility of arranging a tariff on the

basis of the difference in cost of production, the basis set forth in the last Republican platform, and which the protectionists have recently tried to stand on. Weary of the trading of the old tariff system, the Republican Party thought in this new war cry it had secured a fresh prop for the falling fortunes of protection. A single quotation from the cotton report shows the futility of attempting to fix a rate based on this evershifting factor:

Taking all the mills covered by the investigation of each country, there were wider variations in the American costs secured than in the English costs, due partly to the fact that the English mills were all in the Manchester district, where wages and other conditions are well standardized, while the American costs were taken from mills covering a much wider area, with much greater differences of labor and other conditions. Another reason for the wider variations in American costs is that the English mills for which figures were secured are of a modern and efficient type, while some of the American mills included were old and of low efficiency.

The inclusion of some American mills that were "old and of low efficiency" certainly may explain the "wider variation in American costs" and is no doubt an interesting matter of statistical fact. It also shows conclusively the utter impossibility of deciding on what we shall take as the American standard for cost. How much are we to-day paying to support concerns in all directions that need the tariff tax on the people to keep them going? This very report shows that in the cotton industry in many instances the American labor cost per unit of product is less than the foreign in spite of our higher wages. This is owing to the superior efficiency of American labor and organization. It also shows that the incomparable low wages of the Japanese workmen, on account of their lack of effectiveness, produces a labor cost only slightly lower than ours.

Why should the people of this country, by levying a protective tax sufficient to protect the inefficient and poorly equipped factories, lose the full benefit of superior efficiency where it exists? We must also remember that the wage to the American workman has far less purchasing power than that of his English or Japanese competitor. He has to purchase in a market in which the prices are artificially raised by the tariff barriers, which take from one of his pockets far more than they put into the other.

CONCLUSION.

Mr. Speaker, in the election of the last Congress the people of this country demanded in no unmistaken terms a downward revision of the tariff. Such a revision has been accomplished, so far as the action of their Representatives in this House is concerned. That such a revision is not complete and that the people still have placed on them the exorbitant protective rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill is owing to the veto of the Executive. In the hands of the Republican Senate and Republican President rests the responsibility for failure to enact into law the people's wishes.

No more clear issue could be presented to the people of this country than the Payne-Aldrich bill, drawn on the principles of protection, and the bills offered by Mr. UNDERWOOD, which are drawn on the principles of revenue and in the interests of the consumer. The people have repudiated the principles of Republican protectionism, have elected a Democratic House of Representatives, and now await the moment when they may elect a Democratic President. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 45 minutes. The Chair desires to call to the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts the fact that under the plan we are proceeding he can not yield back any time. There is no one to yield time to, but the gentleman can simply abandon it; or if some one else on his side desires to use that 15 minutes, he can do so.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. RUSSELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Platt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to furnish a copy of the daily and bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 1. An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico.

THE WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to my colleague [Mr. SWITZER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for one hour, and he yields three minutes to his colleague [Mr. SWITZER].

THE RAW-WOOL PRODUCT OF OUR COUNTRY—THE FARMERS' FINISHED PRODUCT.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the Tariff Board report discloses that it costs more to grow wool in the United States than in any foreign country, and that it costs more to produce wool in the State of Ohio and the contiguous territory than it does anywhere else on earth. But while that is true, we would have you recollect that we produce the best wool on earth. We not only produce the best material out of which to make the clothing for the people of this Nation, but we produce the best material to make rulers for the Nation, and our last product, our last addition to the long line of Presidents of this Nation is the best. There are a great many people of this country who are coming to the conclusion that President Taft is hard to beat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I shall address my remarks chiefly to that part of the proposed legislation under consideration which bears directly on the raw-wool product of this country—the farmers' finished product.

This is a matter of the utmost importance to the people of my State, and especially so to a considerable portion of the agricultural class of my district.

It is important to the nearly 5,000,000 people of Ohio for the reason that any material depression of one of our leading industries or its extinction not only directly affects those engaged in the industry so depressed or annihilated, but its far-reaching and disastrous consequences are noticeably felt by all other classes of our citizens.

And I assume that what is true respecting the sheep-raising industry of Ohio is equally true respecting this great industry in nearly all of our Northern and Western States, as well as several of those of the Southland.

My observation during my short experience as a legislator leads me to believe that articles are placed on the free list of our tariff law solely by the grace of arbitrary, despotic force. Certainly no person can successfully contend that the proposed addition of sugar to the free list of our tariff law is the logical sequence of any well-considered revenue policy.

On the other hand, no so-called tariff-for-revenue measure has ever been proposed, to my knowledge, but what has always contained manifest discriminations in its proposed tariff rates. Along with all such measures there is usually to be found much protection lurking, accidentally or incidentally, within its innocent-looking folds.

And, upon the whole, I have failed to find any improvement in this respect in the proposed revision of the tariff on the part of our Democratic friends by the piecemeal plan.

During the first session of this Congress, on the floor of this Chamber, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHENRY] stated:

We have heard much argument about this school and that school of the tariff, about this fundamental principle and that fundamental principle, but the only school we recognize or the only principle we will adhere to will be that principle which works for the good of the great mass of the people of the United States.

As this statement met with universal applause on the majority side of this body, I take it to be an ideal exposition of the present-day Democratic position on the tariff question. It is undoubtedly exceedingly illuminating. It assumes that Democracy is endowed with that peculiar foresight which enables it to readily discern just what will work for the future good of the masses of our people.

But of this assumption I am somewhat skeptical. I would like for some one, after taking a retrospective view of the sheep industry of this country, to demonstrate just in what way free wool worked for the good of the masses of our people under the Wilson-Gorman law. And if it failed to work for the good of the masses then, what assurance have we but that it would be a failure now?

What assurance have we that if the known protective duty on raw wool be removed and a measly tariff-for-revenue only be substituted therefor but that the consequences will be as disastrous as in 1896? None whatever but the assurance of that party which wrecked the country and finally itself in 1896.

Democracy scattered the shepherds' flocks to the uttermost parts of the earth under the Wilson-Gorman law; and now, after 16 long years, you have mustered up sufficient courage to again face this rehabilitated fold; but you come up to the scratch with much fear and trembling.

There have been rumblings of party discord concerning the advisability of again laying violent hands upon the frolicsome animal that proved such a boomerang to your party in 1896. To many of your old "war horses" throughout the Central and Western States "free wool" revives unpleasant recollections of a disastrous political past and chills the very marrow in their bones.

And as a result of your internal strife and nervous fright you have again reported a bill which not only rings the death knell of the sheep industry of this country, if enacted into law, but takes down with it the textile woolen industry, employing 168,239 persons and paying an annual wage of $79,214,000.

During the debate on the reciprocity and free-list measures at the first session it was frequently asserted by gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber that the American farmer had to sell his products in the free-trade markets of the world and that he was compelled to purchase his farm implements and machinery and practically all his necessities other than those produced by himself in a highly protected market.

This was reiterated so often and with such vehemence as to give it the impress of absolute sincerity, and it was one of the chief reasons given for urging the passage of the free-list bill.

Now, I desire to call the attention of my "tariff-for-revenue" friends to the fact that the wool product of the American farmer is not sold in the free-trade markets of the world, but, on the contrary, practically every pound of it is sold in our home-protected wool market.

The sheep-raising industry is a very peculiar industry; so much so that in my opinion it stands in a class to itself. And it seems to have strongly appealed to your notion of incidental protective relief. And while you profess to levy a tariff for revenue to meet the alleged extravagant expenditures of the party in power during the past 14 years, you are praying long and hard that some calamity may overtake the foreign sheep raiser, or something may happen which will enable you to demonstrate to the American woolgrower that your strictly revenue duty on imported raw wool has afforded him full and adequate protection.

Wool is unlike wheat or some agricultural product which we produce in much larger quantities than necessary to amply supply our needs and demands.

While we can and do produce wool, yet we produce only about two-thirds of the quantity our factories consume.

So it must be apparent to every fair-minded person that this important product of the farm is necessarily sold in our American-protected wool market.

If I am correctly informed, our factories consume about 500,000,000 pounds of wool annually, and we produce somewhere in the neighborhood of 300,000,000 pounds. We therefore not only consume the whole of our own production but an additional 200,000,000 pounds of imported wool, upon which we derive an annual revenue of about $20,000,000—a large sum, and which will be much needed should the majority side of this body succeed in having enacted into law their proposed free sugar and similar bills.

As I understand it, it is proposed to divert from a protected market to a free-trade market the wool product of the farmer, having an annual value of upward of $60,000,000, and the American farmer and sheep raiser who has his all invested in this great industry will not only be driven to the wall, his property confiscated, and an important industry destroyed, but he and his thousands and thousands of employees will be driven into other overcrowded fields of labor and compelled to embark in other overcrowded business enterprises and thereby make competition the more strenuous where it is not needed, to the great detriment of the masses of our people. The proposed bill spells ruination to the American woolgrower for the reason that all experience conclusively shows that this industry can not thrive in this country without adequate protection.

Certainly there has been no demand made on Congress by our woolgrowers, or any noticeable part of them, to have this product exposed to the tender mercies of a free-trade wool market.

It is an industry that should not only be fostered and encouraged but built up to such an extent as to make us independent of all other nations of the earth.

It was asserted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON] in a speech on the free-list bill during the special session that the true foundation of protection, as enunciated by the fathers who inaugurated the protective policies in this country, can be expressed in few and simple words, "Protection to infant industries."

And, as I understand it, he favors a protective policy of this kind. And further along in his speech he expressed his sentiments on the question of protection in the following words, to wit:

> Protect a legitimate industry up to a point where the industry fills the home market, but at that point protection should end. There might be an exception in the case of a product necessary to make our country independent of the rest of the world, for which we have not the natural conditions for competition, where protection would have to be permanent, but this would apply to few, if any, of our great industries.

Applying the foregoing principles, there should be a protective duty on wool for at least two reasons:

First. Our wool product is yet insufficient to supply or fill our home market.

Second. A product, like wool, which furnishes material for the clothing of the Nation, is certainly of sufficient importance as to require its development and production to such an extent as to make us independent of the rest of the world. And as our competitors in the production of raw wool enjoy to a high degree more favorable natural conditions for its production, it is clear that in order to be independent of the world there must be a permanent protection afforded our domestic woolgrowers.

It has been claimed by many Democrats for years that the tariff levied on farm products under the Dingley law and the Payne law did not afford any protection to the product claimed to be protected by the framers of the bills.

Granted for the purpose of argument that in many instances no protection was thereby afforded, yet it is clear and indisputable that the present and past tariffs on wool have afforded protection to this product. Now, what reasonable excuse can be given for removing it?

Certainly it can not be on the theory that the American farmer is selling wool too high, for the price of domestic wool was lower last year than it has been for years.

The average cost of producing a pound of fine wool in the Ohio region is 19 cents, and the average cost per pound to produce fine wool throughout the United States is 12 cents.

Similar wools can be produced in South America at a cost of 4 to 5 cents per pound, and in Australasia at a much lower cost. As the average cost per pound of producing wool of all grades and varieties throughout the United States is 9½ cents per pound, there can be no question as to the ultimate result if this product is admitted from foreign countries duty free, or if the domestic industry is not sufficiently protected.

As illustrative of the accuracy of the Tariff Board report as to the cost of producing Ohio wool I desire to submit a letter, written me by a sheep raiser of long experience, Mr. F. H. Parker, of Rutland, Ohio, bearing date of June 12, 1911:

Hon. R. M. SWITZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take pleasure in acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, soliciting information in regard to the "cost of raising sheep and cost of production of wool," and of submitting the following estimate in reply. I beg leave to offer my own flock of 145 head of sheep as an example, four months of feeding from December 1 to April 1, and eight months of pasture, allowing during the feeding season 1⅔ pounds of hay and ½ pound of grain per head per diem:

To hay 4 months, at 50 pounds each per month, 29,000 pounds, at 50 cents per hundredweight	$145.00
To grain 4 months, at 15 pounds each per month, 8,700 pounds, at 1 cent per pound	87.00
To pasture 8 months, at 10 cents each per month	116.00
To tagging and shearing, at 8 cents per head	11.60
To hired hands—feeding, housing, and care, 4 months	40.00
Total	399.60
By 1,160 pounds unwashed wool, at 25 cents per pound	290.00
By 30 head lambs or mature sheep sold	100.00
By 10 tons of manure, at 90 cents per ton	9.00
	399.00

In northern Ohio, I think, one month more of feeding, less one month of pasture, should be added.

In this account no estimate has been made of loss occasioned by death of sheep by accident, old age, or disease, nor of time and expense involved in the treatment of sick ones, nor of time lost on chasing after the predatory dog.

Where, pray tell, is the owner's salary to come from, and the taxes, repairs, and interest on the investment?

In my opinion, any such reduction in duty as contemplated in the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives would be ruinous to the woolgrowing industry, as was the case during the early nineties under the administration of the Wilson bill.

Respectfully,

F. H. PARKER.

This letter shows it costs 25 cents per pound to produce raw wool in Ohio, and upon this proposition Mr. Parker is corroborated by half a dozen large woolgrowers of his county, whose letters I have in my possession. Mr. Parker's computation includes an item of $40 for labor in feeding, housing, and caring for his flock of 145 sheep; and his item for grain consumed is based on the market price, while the estimate of the Tariff Board is based on the actual cost of producing the

grain fed. The board offsets the cost of labor in caring for the flock by the benefits derived from the sheep keeping the farm clear of weeds and the fertilizing value of the flock.

So, deducting the cost of labor and putting the grain item in Mr. Parker's estimate at the cost of production, it will show a cost of about 19 cents per pound to produce his wool. Therefore it is very evident to me that the Tariff Board, in its estimate, has resolved all doubts against the woolgrower and have followed those methods which show the lowest cost per pound possible to produce wool, and that their results are exceedingly accurate. The Tariff Board report is based chiefly on conditions existing in 1909 and 1910. The sheep industry suffered a great depression during the past year; and as a large portion of last year's clip sold from 16 cents to 20 cents per pound, and as sheep and lambs also depreciated in value, those engaged in the industry in Ohio—or, at least, nine-tenths of them—lost money during the past year; and, generally, throughout the country woolgrowers suffered severe losses.

The Tariff Board report shows that the Ohio farmer, or woolgrower, made a profit of 45 cents to 55 cents on all the wool used in making a suit of clothes in 1910; certainly no consumer of woolen cloth will contend that this is an unreasonable or exorbitant profit; but as the Ohio farmer or woolgrower during the past year furnished the wool for a suit of clothes at about cost—in other words, donated his profits, his compensation for his labor, and capital employed in the industry—I fail to see any valid complaint that the ultimate consumer can lodge against the farmer; and it is not just for our Democratic friends to now impose on the past year's liberality of our woolgrowers by insisting that they make further donations on their part or surrender their industry as a sacrifice to the fallacious doctrine of free trade.

It is apparent from the Tariff Board wool report that American raw wool has not been receiving the full protection intended by the framers of the existing tariff law, for the reason that the rates of duty on imported wool are based on a fallacious assumption, and it has been easy for importers of foreign wool to circumvent the law, and by a scheme of "skirting" wool they have been able to greatly increase the advantages in their favor, arising from the unequal shrinkage of home and foreign wool. The report discloses that our rates of duty on imported wool are based on the assumption that all wool will shrink 66⅔ per cent, when, in fact, Ohio and other fine domestic wools shrink 60 per cent, and the shrinkage of the lower grades of the domestic wools of our country is about 45 per cent. The national average shrinkage is between 55 and 60 per cent. South American crossbred wools now being imported shrink an average of 33⅓ per cent, and Australian crossbreds about 30 per cent.

So on account of the difference in its component parts and by removing from the fleeces the stained or inferior locks, such as grow on the belly, legs, and necks of the sheep (skirting), the importer, under a decision that such a trimmed fleece is not sorted wool, has been able to bring into this country upon payment of the duty of 11 cents per pound (on unwashed wool) an immense quantity of wool, a pound of which will produce as much cloth as 1½ to 2 pounds of our domestic wool, and some of it yielding as much pure wool per pound as 2½ pounds of our domestic clip. So that our duty of 11 cents likely affords a protection to the American woolgrower of only 7 or 8 cents per pound on a large part of his product.

The pending bill proposes an ad valorem duty of 20 per cent on practically all imported wools. During the past year, if this could have been honestly administered, it would have been equal to a specific duty of 4 to 5 cents per pound on imported wool in the grease.

But on account of its susceptibility to fraudulent invoices on the part of importers the apparent equivalent specific duties would be much less than 4 or 5 cents per pound.

These proposed duties do not begin to equal the difference in the cost of producing domestic and foreign wool, and can not by any stretch of the imagination be shown to afford any protection whatever to the domestic woolgrower.

An ad valorem duty on imported wool is also subject to another criticism, viz, that it will produce the largest amount of duty and afford the most protection when prices of wools are exceedingly high, and at such times our woolgrowers need less protection than when prices of wool are low.

Our consumers of raw wools would be compelled to pay larger amounts of duties on imported wool when it is most needed by them and at a time they can least afford it.

So the tendency of an ad valorem duty on wool is to work hardships on both consumer and producer when there is a scarcity of the domestic product and prices thereby high; and it will give the woolgrowers less protection when the domestic product is plentiful and prices low, at a time he needs the highest protection.

In order to avoid the inequities arising in the administration of the present tariff act, the Tariff Board, after a long and thorough investigation of the wool question and woolen duties, point out the probable failure of an ad valorem duty to give an adequate and equitable protection to our woolgrowers, and recommend that a specific duty based on scoured wool, or clean contents, be levied on all wool imported in the grease, as will appear on pages 396, 397, and 398 of its report, to wit:

A SPECIFIC DUTY ON THE SCOURED CONTENT.

A third method of remedying the unequal working of the present law lies in substituting for the specific duty on the grease pound a specific duty on the scoured content of wool. Such a duty would rest upon the material as it actually stands available for the use of the manufacturer, and would not involve the taxation of the great quantity of grease and impurities that raw wool contains. Furthermore, it would admit on equal terms wools of light and of heavy shrinkage, which our present method fails to do.

The proposal to levy a duty on the scoured pound of wool implies that it is possible to select samples that are fairly representative of a consignment of wool, and to ascertain the clean content of the consignment by scouring and conditioning such samples. It also implies the establishment of conditioning houses to be maintained by the Government at leading ports of entry. The Tariff Board has carefully investigated this matter and, with the aid of the Bureau of Standards, has reached the conclusion that it is not only possible, but it is relatively a simple matter to test wool by sample at the time of importation. It has also ascertained that the machinery required for scouring and conditioning wool in small lots is inexpensive and could be promptly installed, and the cost of operation would be light. If Congress should deem it wise to adopt this method of collecting duties upon raw wool, it would seem that the details necessary for its prompt, efficient, and economical administration may safely be left to the proper administrative officers of the Government.

In this connection the following table of equivalents becomes of value and interest. It shows for wools of different shrinkage the equivalent duty on the grease pound after applying certain specific duties on the scoured content:

Specific scoured pound rates, with grease pound equivalents, on wools of various shrinkages.

Shrinkage.	Grease pound equivalents.					
	Duty per scoured pound 33 cents.	Duty per scoured pound 30 cents.	Duty per scoured pound 25 cents.	Duty per scoured pound 20 cents.	Duty per scoured pound 18 cents.	Duty per scoured pound 15 cents.
75 per cent	$0.08½	$0.07½	$0.06½	$0.05	$0.04½	$0.03¾
70 per cent	.09 2/10	.09	.07½	.06	.05⅜	.04½
65 per cent	.11 1/10	.10½	.08¾	.07	.06 3/10	.05¼
60 per cent	.12½	.12	.10	.08	.07½	.06
55 per cent	.14 7/10	.13½	.11¼	.09	.08 1/10	.06¾
50 per cent	.16⅔	.15	.12½	.10	.09	.07½
45 per cent	.18 3/10	.16½	.13¾	.11	.09 9/10	.08¼
40 per cent	.19⅔	.18	.15	.12	.10⅝	.09
35 per cent	.21 9/10	.19½	.16¼	.13	.11 7/10	.09¾
30 per cent	.22 7/10	.21	.17½	.14	.12⅜	.10½
25 per cent	.24¼	.22½	.18¾	.15	.13½	.11¼
20 per cent	.26⅔	.24	.20	.16	.14⅜	.12

Objection is made to a flat rate upon the scoured pound on the ground that it would not be fair to subject wools of varying value to a uniform rate of duty. It must be conceded that there is some reason in this, but in any event it would give access to all fine, heavy fleeces on equal terms with the lighter-conditioned wools, thus meeting one great objection to the existing law. So far as the low-priced product of the skirting and sorting processes, warehouse sweepings, etc., are concerned, it may be said that their value would probably rise under the stimulus of American competition to a point where the imposition of a flat rate would not place the importer at such disadvantage as might at first appear. It appears that this cheap wool does not reach London in the grease in any quantity. The records of the year ending November 1, 1911, at that point show that out of 960,750 bales sold only 1,603 bales brought less than 8 cents per pound in the grease. There were during that period record of but 13 bales sold in London for as low a price as 2 cents per pound. * * *

* * * * * * *

In this connection it should also be added that a considerable quantity of merino wool appears in London for sale in a scoured condition. Such wool universally represents the heavy shrinkage wools of Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, which, were they to reach London in their natural condition, would have paid so heavily in freight on the grease and dirt contained as to have lessened materially the return to the growers. To offset this, scouring stations have been established in those sections where the heavy-shrink wools are reduced to a scoured condition and freight paid only on the clean wool therein contained, thus netting the grower a more remunerative price than if shipped to market as shorn from the sheep. The presence of this large quantity of scoured wool in London eliminates a certain amount of wool which would raise to a higher figure the average shrinkage of wools as offered from the above-named countries if they appeared in these public auctions in their original condition. The present duty on scoured wool of 33 cents per pound is prohibitive, because so greatly in excess of the duty on the grease pound. If all wool were imported on the basis of clean content, the above-mentioned scoured wools would probably become available to the manufacturer of woolens.

It is true that the refuse of over 325,000,000 pounds of domestic wool is already available at very low prices, as well as the entire spring and fall clips of short Texas and California. This, however, does not alter the fact that the present duty excludes the scoured "off sorts" of the foreign-grown clips.

The fixed charges on importation that rest upon weight alone, as against value, such as freight, cartage, etc., aggregate quite an appreciable amount, and this in any case operates to put more or less of a premium on lighter shrinking wools.

A full consideration of the above facts would seem to indicate that some method of assessing a specific rate on the clean content would

remedy most of the primary faults of Schedule K; that it would best safeguard the important revenues derived by the Government from wool duties; that it would insure greater stability in the industries directly concerned than any other system.

Refusing to see the light shed by this voluminous report and absolutely ignoring the board's recommendations, the majority side of this body have reported the pending bill, providing an extremely low ad valorem duty on imported raw wool; and the minority side, heeding the mature judgment and wise suggestions resulting from a nonpartisan investigation, have reported a bill in conformity to the basic principles suggested by the Tariff Board, which will be offered as a substitute to the pending nonprotective measure.

This bill divides all imported wool into two classes and levies a duty of 18 cents per pound on the clean content of all wool imported in the grease under class 1, and a duty of 19 cents per pound on imported scoured wool.

The duties on wools included in class 2, chiefly the coarser and lower grades, if imported in their natural condition, shall be 7 cents per pound, and if scoured, 19 cents per pound, excepting certain wools used in the manufacture of carpets, which are admitted duty free.

Class 1 of this bill embraces practically all wools included in classes 1 and 2 of the existing tariff act; and by referring to the foregoing table of rates of scoured duties and their equivalents in grease wool of different shrinkages, worked out by the Tariff Board, one can readily see that a duty of 18 cents per pound (scoured) on clean content of grease wool will be the equivalent of 7½ cents per pound on imported wool shrinking 60 per cent, 8$\frac{1}{10}$ cents on wool shrinking 55 per cent, 9 cents on wool shrinking 50 per cent, 9$\frac{9}{10}$ cents on wool shrinking 45 per cent, 10⅔ cents on wool shrinking 40 per cent, and 11$\frac{7}{10}$ cents on wool shrinking 35 per cent.

The 20 cents duty scoured-pound column shows that wool shrinking 45 per cent would be dutiable at 11 cents per greased pound, and in my opinion a duty of 20 cents per pound should be levied on the clean content of wool imported under class 1, to give to the American woolgrower the full measure of protection due him, as shown by the Tariff Board report; but as this report discloses that wools of this class now imported, and which come into strong competition with our domestic wools of similar fineness, have a much less shrinkage than our wools; and that the larger portion of such imported wools have a shrinkage of less than 40 per cent, while similar domestic wools shrink 45 per cent and more, it may be fairly contended that 18 cents per pound on the clean content of wool imported in the grease gives to the domestic woolgrower a more equitable and actual protection than he enjoys under the existing tariff law, although the duties now in force, as provided by Schedule K, on the whole are reduced 40 per cent.

The Tariff Board report shows that it costs more to produce the fine Ohio wools in Ohio and contiguous territory than anywhere else on earth, and that it is the best wool produced. But in South America wools approaching the Ohio wools in quality and equally as fine as much of the Ohio wool, can be produced at a cost of 4 or 5 cents per pound; and on account of favorable climatic conditions, an abundance of natural forage, cheap labor, and no housing, and a profitable return from mutton produced, it practically costs nothing to produce wool in Australia.

The average total annual receipts from all sources of our western flocks is $2.56 per head. It is estimated that the corresponding figure for Australia would normally be about $2.23 and for South America about $2.12.

While the annual operating cost per head in our Western States is estimated at approximately $2.11, in Australia it is $0.93, and in South America $1.15 per head. The cost of operation in Australia is less than half of what it is in the United States, and in South America but little more than half of what it is here.

Where sheep can be kept and clipped at a yearly expense of 93 cents per head it can be readily seen that a moderate return for the mutton yearly produced will pay all operating expenses and that the wool clip costs but little or nothing. So the proposed chopping of our import duty on raw wool in two by the decree of the Democratic House caucus would let the lifeblood out of the sheep-raising industry of the United States and necessarily result in its utter destruction.

Believing in the Republican principle of protection and that it is impossible for our domestic sheep-raising and woolen industries to thrive or even exist without adequate protection, I shall vote against the pending measure and support the Republican substitute therefor, which I believe to be in the interest of the woolgrowers and farmers, sheep herders and farm laborers, and which will enable the textile woolen industries of our country to continue in operation, giving employment to several hundred thousands of mill hands in our woolen factories, and thereby assist in building up and maintaining our greatly diversified industries, so necessary for the thrift and prosperity of the whole people.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it becomes more increasingly difficult day by day to take seriously the various tariff bills brought in by the majority, and the bill that we have before us now caps the climax. If it were not for the fact that we upon this side of the House have introduced a bill to revise and reduce the duties in Schedule K as a substitute for this, it would be a mere wanton waste of time even to debate it. As a revision of the woolen schedule, designed to be ultimately enacted into law, this Underwood wool bill is not to be taken seriously. It is the same bill precisely that passed this House last summer, was amended in the Senate, went to conference, where the duties were increased nearly 40 per cent, finally reached the White House, and was vetoed by the President. Does anyone contend that this bill would meet with any other fate? Does anyone contend that it has the remotest chance of becoming a law? Even if it were possible to secure its passage in another body, amended as it was last year, is there anyone so blindly sanguine as to believe that the President of the United States would reverse his position, and particularly when subsequent developments have proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that he was right then?

When the American people shall have repudiated the principle of protection, when the foes of protection shall occupy the seats of the mighty in the United States Senate, when a Democrat shall assume the reins of government in the White House, then, and not until then, can such a bill as this become a law, and we hope, for the sake of the happiness and prosperity of the people of America, that that day is in the dim and nebulous future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, then, are we confronted with this same old proposition? Why has the "cat come back"? I do not assume to speak by the card, but I think I can guess. It was because the proponents of this bill were afraid to submit it again to the tender mercies of the Democratic caucus. It was because they feared to again run the gauntlet of the supporters of free wool. It was because the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] hoped to be able to save some portions of his face, so badly damaged by free sugar last week. There is a reason, Mr. Chairman, and the reason is that with the successful advocates of free sugar beckoning them to advance the Democratic caucus, beyond the shadow of a doubt, would have made raw wool free as the air.

And why not, Mr. Chairman, from their point of view? Is there a single argument that can be offered for free sugar that can not be offered with even greater force for free wool? If it is unjustifiable to leave any duty upon an article which flavors some of the things the people eat and some of the things they drink, is there any justification for imposing a duty upon the clothes they wear? If, as the gentleman from Alabama says, we may not tax a man's belly, by what conceivable mental process can we reconcile our consciences to tax his back and legs? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I commend to your consideration the humble truths enunciated in this classic verse:

You may live without poetry, music, or art;
You may live without conscience, you may live without heart;
You may live without kin—cousins, uncles, or aunts—
But civilized man can not live without pants.

[Laughter.]

After voting, as you did the other day, for free sugar, it no longer lies in the mouth of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] or anyone else to say that the revenue from raw wool is necessary. You sacrificed three times as much revenue when you put sugar on the free list as you expect to retain by this bill. You disregard the example of every civilized nation of the world. No nation but this, excepting only Russia, imposes any duty upon raw wool. Every nation in the world imposes a tax on sugar. In the economic policy of the rest of the world sugar has always been considered a legitimate source of revenue; but wool, except in one case, has never been so regarded.

You are pursuing, gentlemen, a policy that you can not justify even by your own arguments. Only the other day you blithesomely threw away $60,000,000 of the annual revenues of this Government, and here you cling like grim death to a paltry $20,000,000 or so. You offer the consumer a gift with one hand and you take a part of it back with the other.

From our standpoint the revenue derived from imports of wool is purely a secondary consideration. The reason we impose a duty on wool is because we think that sheep ought to be raised in this country. We know that without a duty, or with an insufficient duty, the sheep industry would vanish from American soil, and whatever benefit might come to the American consumer by reason of a reduction in the price of clothes—assuming that any reduction in fact came—would be far more

than offset by the irreparable damage that would result to the farming interests of the country.

We do not believe in legislating for the city man alone. We believe that the man who tills the soil, who raises agricultural products and cattle and sheep is entitled to at least as much consideration at our hands as is the city man.

Three months ago the President of the United States transmitted to this body a report from the Tariff Board on the wool and woolen industries. So singularly thorough is this report, so complete, scientific, accurate, and exhaustive that thoughtful men in this country have admitted it to be the most valuable collection of data relating to a great industry that has ever before been gathered together in any country. And this is true not only in this country. I quote a few words from a letter written to a friend of mine on this subject. The writer of this letter is Dr. Richard Schüler, of Vienna. He is one of the three experts in the Austrian Ministry of Commerce. His work for the last 20 years has been in making industrial investigations as a basis for tariff legislation, and it was upon these investigations that the last two revisions of the Austrian tariff were made. He says:

It—

That is, the wool report—

is an excellent standard work. The Tariff Board has come within a very short time to the head of the similar boards established in other countries. It is really true that no legislative body has ever had presented to it a better report on a tariff question. It will also be entirely impossible not to take your results in mind in proceeding to a revision of the tariff. It were a great mistake to stop the work of the board, and it would soon be necessary to reestablish it.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

I would rather take the testimony of this distinguished tariff expert than that of some of the alleged tariff experts whom we have heard in the last day or so decrying the work of the Tariff Board. But it is for that very reason, Mr. Chairman, it is for the very reason of the excellence of this report, that it has brought no joy to the hearts of the Democratic leaders.

The bitterness of their humiliation crops out in every line of the report they have submitted to us, and it cropped out yesterday in the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I regret to say that, in my opinion, the gentleman from Alabama did not quite live up to his reputation for fairness and accuracy of statement in that speech.

This report was a crushing blow to the Democracy, for it completely disproved almost everything that they said last summer, and wholly overthrew many of their most cherished theories of tariff making. The Tariff Board is to-day the bugbear of the Democratic Party. No lovesick swain ever courted his inamorata more ardently than have Democratic leaders courted the Tariff Board—at times. No maiden was ever more ruthlessly deserted by her lover than has been the Tariff Board by these same Democratic leaders at other times. "He loves me, he loves me not; he loves me, he loves me not," the maiden for centuries has said as she plucked out the petals of her daisy.

And it seems to me that that old refrain about suits the love affair between the Democratic Party and the Tariff Board. At the present writing it is a case of "he loves me not," and the reason is not far to seek. It is because the report of the Tariff Board has "put it all over" the Democratic wool bill, and they know it. It has not left them a leg to stand on.

This report proves beyond all question of doubt three important things:

First. That it costs very much more to grow wool in this country than it does in any other country.

Second. That the cost of manufacturing wool, not only so far as material and wages are concerned, but in actual cost of labor, is far greater in this country than in any competing country.

Third. That the price of clothing to the American consumer is not increased by anything like the full amount of the duties of the present law upon wool and woolens.

As to the first proposition, this report shows conclusively that a tariff of 20 per cent comes nowhere near equaling the difference between what it costs to produce wool in this country and wool in any other country whose wool clip competes with ours. It shows that a duty of 20 per cent would be as disastrous to the sheep-raising industry of this country as no duty at all.

With regard to manufactures of wool, the report shows that we are at a disadvantage as compared with every country with which we compete. The cost of our plants is greater. We have to import most of our machinery. Our wages average twice as high and the actual efficiency of our labor is less.

The third proposition, that only a small portion of the duty is added to the consumer's price, is the most damaging blow that antiprotectionists have received in years. They have been going about proclaiming from the housetops that every man in this country who wears a suit of clothes has been taxed by at least the amount of the duties imposed in the wool schedule. But this report shows, and proves beyond question of doubt by actual samples of goods produced here and abroad, that the duty is not by any means added to the price the American consumer pays for clothes, but on the contrary, that competition has kept the price down so that the American consumer pays little more than the foreign consumer pays for precisely the same thing in his own country.

Mr. HILL. And the actual samples are in the possession of the Ways and Means Committee—the samples of cloth, with the figures on them.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have no doubt of that; but if we are to judge by the report of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means the fact seems plain that none of them have had the time, or at least the inclination, even to read the report of the Tariff Board. I am forced, then, to assume that they have not had time to examine those samples.

Mr. MONDELL. Have they read their own report?

Mr. LONGWORTH. As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggests, it seems very possible that they have not even read their own report. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman from Ohio will allow me to interrupt him, I would say to him that no one of the 14 gentlemen whose names are appended to that report had anything at all to do with the writing of it. It was written by a newspaper correspondent of the New York Journal of Commerce, who enjoys the title of professor of political economy in Georgetown University, and I doubt whether any one of the 14 Democratic gentlemen of that committee have read it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. None of them have said that they have read it, and the speeches we have heard would not serve as an indication that they have received any information from any source whatever, even from the report kindly written for them by the individual referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Thus the whole Democratic theory that the tariff on a competitive article is a tax which is paid in full by the American consumer falls crumbling to the ground. No wonder the report of the Tariff Board displeases the majority. It has effectually undermined the entire structure of their policy of tariff making.

The bill which the majority offer to revise the wool schedule and the bill which we of the minority offer for the same purpose are perfect examples of the relative positions of the two parties to-day upon the tariff. By your bill you repudiate the Tariff Board; by our bill we indorse it. In your bill you disregard all of its findings; our bill is made in exact accordance with its findings. Furthermore, we submit to the American people that the report of the Tariff Board on the wool schedule has completely justified the necessity for its continued existence. [Applause on the Republican side.] We think that no more reactionary step could be taken at this time than to abolish the Tariff Board [applause on the Republican side]; that no more reactionary step could be taken than to cut off the appropriation that is necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.

We go further than that. We believe that true progress demands the creation of a permanent tariff board or commission or whatever you may choose to call it. [Applause on the Republican side]. A board nonpartisan in character, removed as far as possible from the domain of active politics, which shall investigate every schedule from A to N of the tariff in the same thorough way that the present board has investigated Schedule K, and report to Congress its findings.

The proposition contained in several bills introduced by gentlemen on the other side of the House that such a board shall be appointed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is a mere sham and a begging of the question. We believe that a tariff commission ought to rank in dignity and importance with any commission in the land. To make it a mere tool of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would be to utterly destroy its real usefulness to the American people. We demand that members of the Tariff Board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, so that its findings may be removed as far as possible from any suspicion of political bias and can be accepted as facts by the American people.

The avowed object of this Democratic wool bill is to surrender the American market both for wool and woolens to the foreign producer.

The object of our bill is to retain the American market for the American producer.

Our bill is designed to bring prosperity to the American manufacturer, the American workingman, and the American farmer.

Your bill is designed to bring prosperity to the European manufacturer, the European workman, and the farmer in South America and Australia. Both bills substantially reduce the duties in Schedule K. The Democratic bill, in some respects, reduces the duties more than our bill, but, on the other hand, our bill reduces some of the duties more than does the Democratic bill. They are both downward revisions of Schedule K. But there is one substantial difference between the two bills, and that is that the Democratic bill retains all the old concealed duties in the wool schedule and our bill wipes them out altogether.

The issue presented by these two bills is plain and clear. Stripped of all misleading arguments and unnecessary verbiage, it is just this: Shall we or shall we not have a downward revision of Schedule K at this session of Congress?

This House is Democratic, but the Senate is Republican, and we have, thank God, a Republican President in the White House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You know and the American people know that this Democratic bill can not become a law during this administration. You know and the American people know that our bill can become a law during this administration. If you will only allow us to take our bill to the President, he will gladly sign it. If you stubbornly insist on your bill or nothing, you will get nothing. You say you want a downward revision of Schedule K. We point the way to get it. The way is clear and the time is here for you to show the sincerity of your professions. A vote for the Democratic bill is a vote to leave Schedule K as it stands to-day on the statute book for two years more. [Applause on the Republican side.] A vote for our bill is a vote to revise downward the duties of Schedule K and make it effective in two months. [Applause on the Republican side.] To vote for our bill is to progress. To vote for the Democratic bill is to stand pat. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

We welcome your support even though you be standpatters. [Laughter.] We urge you to cast aside petty party politics and, facing to the front instead of to the rear, to join with us in enacting speedily into law a measure which, while it will allow American sheep to live on American soil and will allow Americans to make clothing for their fellow Americans, will nevertheless bring about that consummation devoutly to be wished—a downward revision of Schedule K.

That is the question that confronts us, and my closing suggestion to my friends on the other side of the aisle is to either put up or shut up. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Thirty-seven minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, after the masterly address of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], explaining in full the details of the bill which we offer as a substitute, it would seem as if there was but little further to be said with reference to its provisions, but I wish to speak briefly at this time concerning some matters which the gentleman from Connecticut, owing to lack of time, was compelled to some extent to pass over.

I have observed in this discussion two methods of debate. One is dealing in generalities, and the other in existing circumstances and particular facts. It is admissible at times, and may perhaps always be admissible, to deal in generalities, but I wish to congratulate our friends on the Democratic side of the House upon the ease and freedom with which they are able to divorce themselves entirely from the facts and even from mathematics. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In the previous discussions of this bill I have observed that although the tariff is a very dry subject our Democratic friends found that it afforded a vehicle for poetry and imagery. Soaring aloft on the pinions of their imaginations they have painted the clouds with their eloquence and rhetoric; and, somewhere in dreamland, they have constructed a new America, under the influence of their bill, which should enormously increase its purchases abroad and yet have as much money left here as before; in which great quantities of its products heretofore made at home were to be manufactured in foreign lands, and yet there would be as much employment for the laborer as ever and the manufacturer would sell as many goods; in which wages everywhere would be higher, and the products of labor in some way cheaper as a result; in which the food products would be down to the very lowest point, and in some way the farmer paid more than he has ever received for the beef, pork, and grain which he produced.

I shall not stop to consider at this time whether this Utopian commonwealth could under any circumstances exist, nor shall I go into a discussion of the protective and free-trade doctrines. So far as the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House are concerned, it would be useless; so far as the gentlemen on this side are concerned, I hold it to be entirely unnecessary. We have had our differences on some subjects—we have differed as to schedules, as to rates, and methods of making a bill. There may be some differences at this time, although I think there ought not to be any as to this particular bill. Standpatters or progressives, we are all protectionists. Nor do I have any doubt as to the sentiment of the Nation at large. The recollection of the effects of the Wilson bill still sends gripes of hunger to the stomach of the laboring man and the mechanic; and even the Democratic farmer of my own State still has a shiver run down his spine when he remembers those dark days under it. It is unnecessary that I should pursue this subject further; the people at large, the great majority of the Nation are protectionists. Over and over again they have ratified by enormous majorities the principle of protection.

After the law now in force was put in operation people studied it and came to the conclusion that some of its provisions were too high; that some worked out unequally and unfairly. There was a disposition manifested in favor of its revision and modification, and the people began to consider how this should be done. They knew that heretofore in the hearings which had been held, and complained of it, too, that to a certain extent these hearings were one sided; that the manufacturer was represented, but not the consumer to the same extent, owing to the natural difficulty of getting them before the committees. And so, when it was asked what should be done, the natural answer was that a nonpartisan, fair, skilled board should be appointed which was capable of finding and ascertaining the facts upon which an improved bill should be based. This sentiment spread all over the country. It seemed to prevail among the Republicans and Democrats alike, if I am to judge by the utterances of prominent Democrats made upon this floor; and in pursuance of that sentiment the President of the United States appointed the present Tariff Board. Let me say right here that the most captious critic of the administration never ventured to intimate in the slightest degree that better men could have been obtained for the position they now fill and for the purpose for which they were appointed, namely, to ascertain the facts upon which a tariff should be based. The most partisan opponent of the board has never questioned its fairness or its honesty. The bitterest foe of the President never has suggested that the selections which he made in making up this board were not made without fear or favor and with an utter absence of desire to protect any interests except the interests of the people at large. The members of this board went to work and have produced the report which we now have before us. The facts found by them have not suited the gentlemen on the other side, and for that reason they challenge it and refuse to accept its conclusions. For no other reason that I can ascertain are they unwilling to accept the verdict, the finding of the facts, which this great jury, the Tariff Board, has rendered to the American people.

It has been intimated here, and possibly asserted, that the Tariff Board merely took the statement of the manufacturers as to the cost of their products. The fact is exactly the contrary. I think perhaps that my colleague Mr. PICKETT and myself are as well acquainted with the methods used by the Tariff Board to obtain the facts upon which their report is based as any gentleman in this House. My colleague and myself have made an exhaustive examination as to the methods and workings of the board. We found that nothing had been taken for granted and no statement was accepted by the board until it had been verified by a personal examination by its experts.

The system used was this: The board sent to each factory two experts—one who had a practical knowledge of the business investigated, the other an expert accountant. The accountant went through the books of the company; the other expert made sure that there were no manipulations. Together they made such an examination as some concern would have made which was considering a purchase of the business. From the books of the company elaborate tabulations were made showing the cost of material and work in every particular and with the most painstaking accuracy. It seems to have been thought because the board only submitted in its report its findings with reference to certain samples, numbered from 1 to 120 and A to N, that this was all of the samples upon which the cost was computed. It could have been ascertained by anyone who visited the office of the board that they have had the figures upon hundreds of samples—too many to be included in the report, and therefore only those in more general use were selected. The report as a whole is a monument to the skill, ability, thor-

oughness, and fairness of the board, and has so been received both in this country and in Europe.

Gentlemen of the majority, you talk of abolishing this board. Abolish it if you will and thus proclaim to the Nation what we know here to be the actual truth—that you dare not meet and face the facts which are contained in their report.

I know that upon this floor, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the facts and figures and, to some extent, the conclusions of this board have been attacked as unworthy of credit; but upon whose authority was that attack made? I know not his age, his name, or station, nor do I care, but I understand from statements recently made here that he was some newspaper correspondent who also held a chair in a small college; but whoever he may be and wherever he may be, I assert, and will show before I get through, that he needs and ought to take a grammar-school education in percentages. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think that he has ever passed through the kindergarten course?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have some doubt about it, and I think when I give the figures to the gentlemen here they will doubt it also; but before I take up his calculations I want to make a comparison of the two bills now before the House.

THE REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC BILLS COMPARED.

I propose to show that these two bills have been prepared by altogether different methods. In olden times when a man wanted an article of furniture for his house the pioneer went out to the timber, chopped down a tree, split off a log, drove in some pegs, and made himself a bench. He hewed out his furniture with a broadax.

As civilization advanced and means were at hand this crude method of preparing his table or chair would not answer, and now the parts are measured and fitted with accuracy. This describes the two ways in which these two different bills have been formed. One has been split out with an ax, chopping out or lopping off a chunk here and there with little regard as to how the parts should fit. The other has been prepared with scientific precision, has adjusted the tariff to meet the needs and wants of the American people, and while the Republican bill has lowered the tariff almost to the same extent as the Democratic measure now proposed, this lowering of the tariff in accordance with its provisions will not ruin any American industry.

There are protectionists, free traders, and tariff-for-revenue men in this House. Discussion might fairly arise as to which method was the better, but who is there so bold as to say that a bill which reduces the burden of taxation without injuring our American industries is not better than a bill which merely lessens taxation to the same extent and in its operation must necessarily destroy many thriving American industries and deprive thousands of workingmen of the opportunity to gain a livelihood at reasonable wages? No one, surely, but the ultra free trader, who would have nothing manufactured here which could be made cheaper abroad and who would put his theories into operation regardless of the consequences to our factories and their employees.

ADVANTAGES OF THE REPUBLICAN SCHEDULE.

The first provision in each bill establishes the rate upon wool itself. The Democratic bill provides for a tariff rate of 20 per cent ad valorem—that is, upon the cost of wool abroad. It may be safely said that no nation pretending to have any scientific adjustment of its tariff levies it by the ad valorem method. All students of the subject concur that it opens wide the door to fraud and enables the dishonest importer to drive out of business those who honestly state how much their importations have cost, while the proceeds of the fraud go not to the people but into the pockets of those practicing it. But this is probably not the worst feature of this schedule. If the figures presented by the Tariff Board are accepted by the American people—and I firmly believe they will be—this rate is too low to enable the American farmer and the sheep raiser to continue in the business. It is shown by the report of the board that the cost of producing wool in Australia is practically nothing, as the mutton alone will pay for the expense of raising the sheep, and the greater portion of the wool which we import comes from Australia.

In New Zealand it is only 2 cents a pound; in South America it is about 4½ cents a pound, while the average throughout the United States is 9½ cents. The tariff rate proposed by the Democratic bill amounts to about 5 cents per pound. That the woolgrower of our country can not survive under it is apparent. Thus it is proposed by the Democratic bill to destroy the sheep-raising industry in this country except in so far as sheep may constitute a sort of by-product of the farm, and to require the American to purchase abroad the greater portion of the wool that has heretofore been grown at home. Some amount would probably still be raised here, but the Democratic report accompanying their bill admits that if it goes into effect at least $60,000,000 more will have to be sent abroad annually to pay for additional wool and woolen goods imported, and our citizens, who have before received this same amount, would have just that much less to pay for foodstuffs and manufactured goods and to give employment to labor.

The Republican bill recognizes that there are two classes of wool, the clothing wools and the carpet wools. Upon the clothing wools it fixes a rate of 19 cents a pound on the scoured contents or 18 cents if unscoured. This method does away with the "joker," known as the "skirting clause," contained in the present law under which the present duty is evaded and which was criticized so severely by the late Senator Dolliver in his famous speech. It also does away with the inequalities resulting from the different shrinkages of the various wools and prevents all fraud or evasion on the part of importers. The present duty on scoured wool is 33 cents per pound; on raw wool 11 cents. The duty under our bill on raw wool would be a little less than 7½ cents per pound. There are many parts of the United States where this duty would not put the home woolgrower on an equality with the foreign producer, and, with the exception of regions where wool is merely a by-product of the farm, none where it would more than make up the difference between the cost of producing wool at home and abroad.

One of the most striking features of the new Republican bill is that the duty upon carpet wools is removed when they are used in carpets, and the amount thereof used in clothing is so small as to be hardly worth considering. The removal of the duty on carpet wools will cause a loss of over four and one-half million dollars in revenue, of which the people will receive the benefit; but there is no reason why there should be any duty whatever on wools used in carpets, as they are not produced in this country. I am speaking now from a protection standpoint. Of course, the Democratic theory is that the tariff should be levied upon noncompetitive products, and following this rule they have placed in their new chemical schedule a tariff upon medicines and necessaries that are in common use, like pepper, which under the present law are free. I suppose that if they should succeed in taking off the tariff entirely upon sugar, and thereby destroying the sugar industry in this country, they would then put the tariff back—at least they would have to do so in order to be consistent, but consistency is not a virtue to be expected from the Democratic majority of this House.

It has been asserted by a prominent Democratic Member of this House that the coarse carpet wools were used in making cheap clothing for poor people and in the cheaper classes of blankets. Such a statement betrays an absurd ignorance of the real facts. A small quantity is, indeed, used in making heavy clothing when it is desired to get a rough and hairy appearance, but this cloth is very expensive and used only by those who care little for expense and most for the vagary of style that calls for cloth having this appearance. It has been claimed on the other side of the House that this coarse, hairy wool was used in underwear for the poor. To do so would be to produce an instrument of torture, the composition of which may be judged by examining the texture of felt boots, which are made of carpet wools. It is equally absurd to talk about this class of wool being used in blankets, except horse blankets, for which it would not be assessed under our bill. The filling for the cheap blankets can even now be obtained cheaply. Under the Republican bill the duty on the material used for this purpose is cut to 2 cents per pound, and low-priced blankets would be much cheaper than now if this bill is enacted.

It is also urged that this reduction of duty upon the carpet wool would simply go to the benefit of the manufacturer, but I shall show later on that the corresponding and, indeed, a greater reduction is made on the carpets when manufactured from it, according to the Republican bill.

I have not time to discuss and compare all of these schedules. The Republican bill lowers the present duties all through, the average reduction being about 40 per cent, but I wish particularly to compare the duties on cloth under their respective bills.

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPECTIVE DUTIES ON CLOTH.

The Democratic bill levies a duty of 40 per cent on all cloth containing any wool, even though it be made principally of cotton. So far has this erroneous method of levying duty been carried that if a pair of suspenders contained somewhere in its webbing a little wool, the duty would be levied upon the whole cost of it, including the cotton, leather, and rubber; and if a button has any wool about it the tariff is levied upon the metal components as well. It would seem, in exercising the broadax method of chopping out the tariff bill, as if an extra chunk might have been taken out when the schedule was prepared for these articles. There are many similar instances which might

be mentioned showing not only the unfairness of the duties now proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, but also what an exorbitant rate will at times be imposed by his bill.

The Republican bill levies the duty on cloth and such articles as have just been mentioned ONLY UPON THE WOOL CONTENT THEREOF, and no one has undertaken to give any reason why it should be done otherwise. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asserted that its rates upon cloth were so fixed as to make the poor man pay a heavier duty upon the cloth he used than the rich. The real fact is, and it is one of the great merits of the Republican bill, that it makes its greatest reductions upon the cloth and articles used by the poor and levies a much lower rate upon them, as I shall now proceed to show by actual examples, using cloth described in the tariff report, and computing the actual amount of tariff paid thereon.

I hold in my hand a portion of the cloth described in the report of the board as sample No. 2. I had part of this sent to the Bureau of Standards for analysis, and it was found to be 81 per cent cotton. In other words, less than one-fifth of this cloth, which is known as a fancy worsted with cotton warp, was wool. The duty under the new Republican bill would be 5 cents per pound and 30 per cent ad valorem. Under the present law it is 33 cents per pound and 50 per cent ad valorem. This is an example of the great reductions made on the cheaper classes of goods by our bill. [Applause on the Republican side.] The whole rate on ad valorem basis on this cloth, taking the figures for the foreign cost as shown in the report of the board, is about 40 per cent, or as low as it would be under the Underwood bill.

Sample No. 26, which I now present, is a cotton-warp worsted which I had analyzed in a similar manner and discovered it was practically one-half cotton. This is a style of goods, as you will see from examination, which presents a very good appearance and is often worn by those who desire to economize in their clothing. I shall not elaborate the figures, which may be computed by anyone after taking the English cost price from the tariff report and having the result of the analysis above given. It will show that the total ad valorem rate thereunder on our bill would be 60 per cent.

A fair example total ad valorem rate on the class of goods worn by the wealthy can be obtained by computing the duty on sample No. 47 of the Tariff Board. This is an unfinished worsted weighing 16 ounces to the yard and costing 91.5 cents per yard in England. Without going into the calculations, which are quite involved, the total ad valorem rate is nearly 75 per cent, or almost twice as much as upon the sample of cheaper goods first referred to, and a computation of the rate per yard shows that it is about eight times as much.

Under our bill, as the cloth gets more expensive, and particularly as it runs into the finer grades of imported fancy worsteds, the rate advances.

As I stated before, the Democratic bill lays a flat duty of 40 per cent upon all cloths. The rate should increase with the price, not only because there is more work per yard, as a rule, in the more expensive goods, but because those who are able to wear imported suitings are well able to pay a higher tariff, and I am in favor of making them do so. It is true that the cloth schedule in the Underwood bill, as a whole, is lower than in ours, but that it will absolutely drive out the manufacturer of certain lines of cloth in this country will be demonstrated by an examination of the statement of the costs at home and abroad of the representative samples selected by the board and specified in its report. These costs are given not only in the tariff report but in a most remarkable table which I will now discuss.

This table was introduced yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and in giving some figures from it he attempted to show that high rates were imposed by our bill upon the cheaper goods. The unfairness and inaccuracy of this table becomes evident when it is seen that no attention is paid to the fact that these goods almost invariably contain a large percentage of cotton, but this table gives the rate on such goods the same as if it was *all* wool. Such figures are not merely worthless, they are deceiving. I assume that they were made by the same gentleman to whom I have heretofore referred, and whose education in mathematics has been so sadly neglected.

The table to which I refer is found on page 57 of the majority report on the wool bill, which I am informed was compiled by him. In this table you will observe that the cost of each sample in the United States and in England is given, and he undertakes to state in the last right-hand column the amount of tariff duty which would measure this difference. In so doing it will also be observed that he has entered into a very elaborate calculation, although he had a very simple problem before him. He takes from the report the American and English conversion cost, which, with the difference between them, he shows in the table. He then finds the percentage of this difference to the English cost and adds that to the assumed duty on yarn, which he estimates at 30 per cent, and gets the total of 55.99 per cent for sample No. 1. There are two fundamental errors in this method. First, 30 per cent on the cost of yarn is not the same as 30 per cent on the English cost of the finished cloth, as any school child would know; second, taking the arbitrary figure of 30 per cent utterly ignores the board's statement as to the cost of materials in the particular sample, for by consulting the report, on page 652, it will be found that the stock cost to the American manufacturer was nearly double that of the English. After all, the problem, as I stated before, is an exceedingly simple one. In this particular table, contained in the majority report, the cost of sample No. 1 in the United States is $0.295; in England, $0.1535. It will at once be seen that the American cost was almost twice as much as the foreign cost, and therefore this sample cost the United States almost 100 per cent more than it did in England. Dividing the difference in costs by the English cost, it will be found that the actual rate necessary to be imposed on the English goods to equalize the difference is 92 per cent and a fraction instead of 55 per cent, as stated in the table. On sample No. 3 it is 63 per cent instead of 56 per cent, as stated in the table. On sample No. 27 the figures given by this most remarkable statistician is 60.59 per cent for the duty. A mere glance at the respective costs would show that it should have been over 100 per cent.

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

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I will ask if it is not understood that this statistician was not a member of the committee and not employed by the committee or the Government?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He was not employed by the Government, and I doubt whether he was employed by the committee.

Mr. SLOAN. That being true, is not this a legitimate conclusion that he was the result of a free trade in tariff experts?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Nebraska is correct.

Not a single one of these figures of the resulting tariff duty given on page 57 of the majority report are correct, and the most of them are from 25 per cent to 40 per cent out of the way. The whole majority report is a most remarkable document in the way in which it juggles the report of the Tariff Commission, and to present to the American people such a table as has just been referred to, in order that they may ascertain therefrom what the duty ought to be to put the American manufacturer on an equal with his European competitor, is something worse than a blunder. It is a farce and a fraud.

If we were to take from this table—certainly the most extraordinary conglomeration that I have ever fixed my eyes upon—the tariff rate necessary to protect the American manufacturer it will be found that the average rate for this purpose is given by it as 55 per cent, while the rate, granted by the Democratic bill is only 40 per cent. As a matter of fact, the correct figures are much higher than this average, for, although the system used in making this table has in a few instances resulted in making the rate too high, the greater portion of the figures for this purpose are far too low. The Republican bill is the result of careful computations, made from the report of the Tariff Board, which computations were then worked out in the bill.

I think it is not necessary to say anything further with reference to this table, except that, so far as the members of the committee are concerned who present it, I exempt them from any responsibility other than that which follows from their duty to at least casually examining figures before presenting them to this House and the public.

The tariff on blankets is levied by our bill only on the *wool content;* by the Democratic bill on the whole weight; with the result that on the cheaper goods of mixed cotton the duty is much less in the Republican bill. In fact, on some of the cheaper grades of blankets and underwear the duties proposed by our new bill are only a little over half those provided by the present law.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] undertakes to state what the tariff would be on some cheap blankets under the Republican bill without knowing how much wool was in them. This does not trouble his statistician, but it produces results far and away in error.

It ought to be said in this connection that notwithstanding the great outcry made by our Democratic friends as to the inability of the American people to wear woolen goods and the tearful tales which are told with reference to those who have been deprived of suitable clothing and underwear by a Repub-

lican tariff, the real fact is that, notwithstanding the advance in the price of such goods, the American workman, enjoying as he does the highest wages paid anywhere in the world, is taking and using more and more woolen goods every day.

In the decade ending 1910, the value of woolen goods used in America has increased far beyond the proportionate increase in population. At the same time, as shown by the report of the board, the percentage of cotton-mixed goods has decreased, notwithstanding the well-known fact, which is also stated in the report of the board, that for hygienic and other reasons all-wool underwear is not nearly as popular as it once was even among those to whom price cuts no figure.

The rates on carpets under our bill for the common grades have been reduced 50 to 60 per cent and on all grades are lower than those of the Underwood bill, with the exception of two classes, one of which has practically gone out of use, the other is the expensive grades of Aubusson, Axminster, and oriental carpets, used by the well-to-do and the wealthy, upon which the rate in the Republican bill is 50 per cent, while our Democratic friends concluded to fix it at 40 per cent, but this is only another example of how our bill discriminates in favor of the poorer classes and levies its rates upon the goods used by those who are best able to pay—an admirable feature which is nowhere found in the Democratic bill.

The rates provided by the Underwood bill are substantially lower than the Wilson bill and are levied in the same manner and with the same disregard of American industries. The Wilson bill, with free wool for the manufacturer, put so many of them out of business that they were unable to use the wool grown at home, and 7,000,000 pounds of it had to be sold abroad in one year. The decrease in manufacturing and in various employments which would be brought about by the Democratic bill would cause the American workingman a loss of not less than $20,000,000 in wages annually. Why, then, adopt the Democratic bill?

The Republican bill would keep our money at home, stimulate trade, and reduce the tariff. The Democratic bill would send $60,000,000 per annum abroad, close our mills in certain lines, reduce wages, slaughter sheep as effectively as did the Wilson bill, and all without making prices to the consumer materially lower than the Republican bill. Nor is this all. The members of the majority, in season and out of season, on the floor of this House and upon the stump, have proclaimed with all the powers of their voice and with every emphasis of which they are capable, that they were ready to take advantage of any opportunity "to reduce the burdens upon the American people" which they claim exist under the present law. They voted for the La Follette bill, the duties of which were higher than the bill which we now present, but now say they will vote for the bill they have brought out of the committee, which I have described, the duties of which are only a little lower than the one which we have offered. They know that their bill never can become a law during this Congress. Ours can and should be enacted, and in refusing it they refuse to give the people any relief whatever.

Gentlemen of the majority, we have now reached the parting of the ways. We know now how hollow your pretenses were when you said that you wished to reduce these duties. We know now what a wretched sham this talk has been about lightening the burdens upon the people, and we will go out at the next campaign to meet you upon the issue presented by these two bills, in full confidence as to what the verdict of the American people will be. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I feel like a bloated monopolist here to-day. By the generous indulgence of the House I have been accorded one whole hour in which to discuss the pending legislation and to endeavor to afford some enlightenment upon the situation. I am, however, as usual, as respects these tariff bills, somewhat in a position which has been described as "between the devil and the deep sea." I am enamored of a few of the provisions of the bill of the minority and, similarly, with a portion of the bill of the majority, but I am absolutely opposed to some of the features of the one as well as to some of the provisions of the other. But, as I have intimated, it is not an anomalous position in which I find myself.

Since I came to Congress I have felt compelled to occupy the center of this middle aisle most of the time. Last summer when I went home, after that very hot session, an old lady friend of mine, who was strangely impressed with my spiritual characteristics, asked me how I stood it down in Washington; if it did not remind me of another world, and if I was not prepared to reform my life and live a better one in the contemplation of possibly going to an even hotter place. I remarked that indeed the weather there was very hot, but that it was not alone the weather that made me hot. I suggested also that I was by no means the only victim of atmospheric oppression, for one of my Republican friends, during that intense period, narrated a rather harrowing dream which he had had a few nights before. He dreamt that he had died and that his disembodied spirit, in its perambulations, had wandered far from its natural bailiwick and descended into hades, where he was strutting in that same pompous and self-satisfied way which was formerly characteristic of my Republican friends [laughter], when of a sudden, from the roominess of the well-populated place, there appeared his satanic majesty, who, approaching him with jealous mien, sarcastically observed, "Well, stranger, you act as if you owned this place." The shade replied, "Yes; I do, for I am a Republican Member of Congress and the Democrats gave it to me at the last session." [Laughter.] My experience during that session almost persuaded me to become a Christian.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to convey the impression here that I am an expert in tariff legislation, nor do I venture to pose as a flockmaster, and yet there never has been a time within my recollection when I was not in the stock-growing business. Until I was 12 years of age I had never worn a suit of clothes the material of which was not spun upon my father's place, clipped from his flock, and woven into goods upon the farm. That was at an early period. I may say, in passing, that I have now arrived at the sensitive time of life when I do not inform even my most intimate friends just how long ago that was, and, being a widower and observing so many beautiful and possibly many marriageable ladies in the galleries, I will be pardoned for refraining now. [Laughter.] I am content with the true significance of Shakespeare, that "the habit oft proclaims the man," and at this age in life I have returned to some extent to the homely habit of my youth.

During the past session of Congress, as will be recalled, there was much discussion as to how much money we wool raisers received from a suit of clothes. We undertook to show that upon an ordinary suit of clothes 45 cents was approximately the sum, and we further contended that that was not robbing the American people very much; that they would not willingly put out of existence a great industry in this country because of a desire to save 45 cents upon a suit of clothes. I then determined to investigate that feature of the subject thoroughly. So I had some wool from my own clip used for the purpose of ascertaining the facts as to the cost. I had to have some assistance in this matter, however, notwithstanding the fact that I began by indicating that I felt like a monopolist. [Laughter.]

I belong to the National Woolgrowers' Association, and I doubt not that some of our Democratic newspapers will charge that I have been subsidized on this occasion, because when I received this clip I turned it over to the National Woolgrowers' Association, stating that I desired a suit of clothes made from it, and they came to my assistance and did so. I subsequently received a letter from the secretary of the association stating the cost of the suit. I was greatly surprised at the amount until I discovered that in my vanity I had somewhat overshot the mark in the desire to be, if possible, better dressed than others, and on the principle that "fine feathers make fine birds" and because of my pardonable ambition to compensate in this manner for my natural deficiencies if I am to be respectable at all [laughter], I chose some goods that were a little bit beyond the average cost, and that product of the tailor's skill I wear on this occasion. [Applause.]

This is what the secretary, Dr. S. W. McClure, writes me about this:

Judge A. W. RUCKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I have the honor to give you the following information relative to the suit of clothes which was made and presented to you by the National Woolgrowers' Association.

The following items of cost entered into the making of this suit.

3.6 yards of cloth, at $1.92	$6.910
1⅝ yards of mohair serge lining	2.030
1½ yards of vest and sleeve lining	.375
½ yard of haircloth	.250
¼ yard of padding	.125
1¼ yards of canvas	.440
1 yard of pocket lining	.200
Lining for trousers, buttons, and buckles	.350
Buttons for coat and vest	.150
	10.830
Cost of tailoring	24.370
Total cost of suit	35.200

The cloth used in this suit is a high-grade, medium-weight worsted, all pure wool, and represents about the highest quality and cost of cloth made for men's suiting. While the cloth in the average all-wool suit of clothes ordinarily is sold by the manufacturer at from $1 to $1.40 per yard, you selected a cloth representing almost the extreme of high value produced by the American mill. While the manufacturer received $6.91 for the cloth in this suit, $2.37 of this represents what

he paid for the wool laid down at his factory; the balance must cover all the expense of handling the wool, converting it into cloth, and placing it upon the market, as well as his profit. The manufacturer's profit on this suit was between 15 and 20 cents.

It required 11.59 pounds of Colorado wool, shrinking 62 per cent, to make this entire suit; your woolgrower might receive for this wool to-day 17 cents per pound; therefore, for all the wool in the suit he received $1.97. In addition to making the suit, this 11.59 pounds of wool produced about 6 cents worth of waste, which, deducted from $1.97, leaves $1.91 as the share your woolgrower received from this suit, or 5.4 per cent of the total cost of the suit.

In order that you may understand exactly the way the costs to the woolgrower were distributed, I submit the following figures, based on the findings of the Tariff Board:

The average sheep in Colorado shears 6.1 pounds of wool; therefore, to produce 11.59 pounds of wool as required by this suit, 1.9 sheep had to be run for the entire year.

The average investment per sheep for improvements on your Colorado ranches is 44 cents, and for the wool required to make this suit the investment would be 83.6 cents.

The average value of Colorado sheep is $4.15, and for the 1.9 sheep would be $7.844; this makes the investment to produce the wool for this suit $8.72, excluding all investment in lands.

In producing this 11.59 pounds of wool your grower paid to labor $1.14, for feed for the sheep he paid 49.4 cents, and his miscellaneous expenses for the sheep were $1.71; the interest on his investment at 8 per cent was 69.7 cents, making the total costs to produce this wool $4.037.

This, however, represents the total cost of maintaining 1.9 sheep for one year, and as there was other income from them than that derived from wool, such income must be deducted in order to determine the actual cost of the wool. The Tariff Board estimates that the increase among Colorado sheep is 61.9 per cent, and that the income from sources other than wool for 1.9 sheep would be $2.28. This, deducted from the total cost of $4.037, leaves $1.757 actual expenditures which must be met from the sale of wool. If the receipts from the sale of wool in this suit were $1.97 and the cost of its production was $1.757, your woolgrower had remaining as his profit on 1.9 sheep just 21.3 cents, or a profit per sheep of 11.2 cents, amounting to 1½ per cent on his investment.

In determining the cost of producing this wool we must not fail to recognize the fact that the Tariff Board credits the woolgrower with an average loss of sheep amounting to 3 per cent, when every western woolgrower believes that the loss is at least 6 per cent. And again, that the 49.4 cents' worth of feed consumed by these sheep represents, if produced on the owner's ranch, not the market value of the feed, but the actual cost of production. And also the fact that the board reports the average price of wool in Colorado last year to have been 14.2 cents per pound, and I have credited your woolgrower with receiving 17 cents per pound for the wool in this suit. And neither should we neglect to recognize that this profit of 11.2 cents per sheep was made at a time when the tariff on wool of this class represented 46 per cent ad valorem. May I therefore ask you, Judge, how is this woolgrower to survive if the Underwood bill reducing the tariff 60 per cent becomes a law?

Of course, Judge, you will understand that the tailor who made this suit for $24.37 was one of the reasonable-price tailors of the city of Washington, and plenty of tailors in this city would have charged as high as $40 for making this suit. Investigation convinces me that if this suit of clothes were purchased from the tailor under ordinary circumstances it would cost you not less than $55, and if purchased in a store probably $35.

Very respectfully, S. W. McCLURE, *Secretary*.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Are you sure you have got all your buttons?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I am sure I have not missed a buckle. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that while the manufacturer of the cloth received $6.91 for the cloth in this suit, $2.37 of it represents what he paid for the wool laid down at his factory and the balance must cover all the expense of handling the wool, converting it into cloth, and placing it upon the market, as well as his profit. The manufacturer's profit on this suit was between 15 and 20 cents.

I shall not discuss that feature of the argument. I find that we are very scarce here upon our wool end of it, and yet at the same time truth must out, even if it be in favor of the manufacturer.

You will observe that the interest on my investment, as stated, at 8 per cent was 69.7 cents, making the total cost to me of producing this wool $4.037.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman whether that is the ordinary rate of interest?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Eight per cent?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes; 8 per cent.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Yes; 8 per cent, but that depends a good deal upon your indorser. [Laughter.] The ordinary sheepman in that territory can not borrow any money at any rate without an indorser. [Laughter.]

This, however, reduced the total cost of maintaining 1.9 sheep for one year, and inasmuch as there are other sources of income from them than that derived from the wool alone such income must naturally be deducted in order to determine the actual cost of the wool. My correspondent, you will observe, states that the Tariff Board estimates the increase among Colorado sheep 61.9 per cent and that the income from sources other than wool for 1.9 sheep would, therefore, be $2.28. This deducted from the total cost of $4.037 leaves $1.757 actual expenditure, which must be met from the sale of the wool.

You will observe that in the enumeration of items of cost there is one of 12½ cents for one-sixth of a yard of padding. Of course I had to be padded. [Laughter.] Then there is 1 yard of pocket lining, at 20 cents. The tailor, observing that I was a cowboy, made a pocket, of course, on my right side for my gun and one on my left side for my flask. [Laughter.] In fact, they loaded me down with pockets. I think probably there are some pockets for dirk knives, tobacco, and so forth, which I may not have discovered. [Laughter.]

I have never had as handsome and as good a suit of clothes in my life as I now have upon my back, and I now desire to publicly extend my thanks to the association for having discovered my needs and satisfied my vanity. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been the subject of divers hopeful experiments in a good many pursuits of life. I had my initiation as a farmer's boy. I entered upon the practice of the law as soon as I could get into it. I was tried at that. Then I was the subject of the more ambitious experiment as judge. They tried me as a farmer and then tried to make me governor, and after ascertaining that I was not adapted for any of those occupations they finally made me just a plain, ornery Member of Congress. [Laughter.] My patient and devoted constituency has been all these years acting upon the assumption that I must certainly be good for something. [Laughter.] As an illustration, my father had an old negro by the name of Isaac. Isaac owned a dog which he claimed was the best coon dog in the country. On one occasion a man came along who desired a coon dog, and the trade having been made, the man took the dog home. In about a week he returned and said, "Isaac, you old scoundrel, you cheated me in that dog trade." "How is that, massa?" "You said that dog was a good coon dog, and he won't pay any attention to coons." "Dere sure must be somethin' wrong about dat," said Isaac, scratching his head in a puzzled way, "'cause I done tried that dog wid squirrels and possums and rabbits, and he wouldn't pay no attention 'tall to them varmints, and in course you must know, as well as I do, dat dat dog must be good for something." [Laughter.]

Now, if I have accomplished any real good since I have had the honor to be in Congress, and not proven an entire disappointment to my constituents, my one act of pulling you Republicans from your obstructive attitude in the doorway of the prosperity of the sheep grower of this country—where you have consistently stood since you have been in power—stands out, if I may modestly so express it, like a beacon. Not until I came here, a coyote from the wild and wooly West, and demonstrated to this House the absurdity of your tariff legislation, enacted nominally in the interest of the stock grower, was there ever introduced a bill to put the duties on wool upon a specific basis on the scoured content. That amendment I offered in the House on the 20th day of last June, and I think it received four or five votes on the Republican side. I know just exactly how many votes it received on this side. It received one vote. That vote was my own. [Laughter.] Not one of you Republicans, in the whole history of your legislative lives, have until now supported such a measure. You are now engaged in a wild and rather flattering effort to steal my thunder. Of all the Presidents you have had, but one, the present Executive, has ever suggested in a message that a specific duty should be placed upon wool, and that it should be upon the scoured content.

When the first wool bill was passed, it was upon the theory that all wool shrunk 66⅔ per cent. That was supposed to apply to foreign wool as well as to American wool, and it did at that time. Immediately upon that bill becoming a law, and operations began under it, the foxy foreigner evolved a method of cheating the woolgrower of this country, as well as the Treasury. He proceeded at first to wash the wool on the sheep's back. Then he winnowed out all the rubbish, dirt, straw, and vegetable matter that he could eliminate in that manner, and reduced the shrinkage to somewhere in the neighborhood of between 40 and 50 per cent by that method. But, in view of the exactions of the tariff and freight, that did not satisfy his greed, so by some hocus-pocus he secured the passage by Congress of what is known as the "skirting clause," which left the fleece stripped of most of the grease and foreign matter. That still not being entirely satisfactory he winnowed it and brought it into this market with a shrinkage of not to exceed 40 per cent.

It must be remembered that during all this time we were in competition with the foreigner, who was bringing his wool here with that shrinkage of 40 per cent, while our wool always remained the same—a shrinkage of 66⅔ per cent.

It is therefore manifest that under the 11 and 12 cents per pound duty we have never received more than 4 or 5 or, at the most, 5½ cents protection under a Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, there is an element of contagion in this matter. It is akin to the subject of conservation. Conservation is

a contagious disease. [Laughter.] You Republicans took the initiative in promulgating the doctrine of conservation. A Republican President had two bills before him—one an act declaring that there should be no more land withdrawn from the public domain unless it should be specifically under an act of Congress, and the other a proclamation withdrawing 200,000,000 acres of land in our Western States and Territories from settlement and the taxing power. One piece of paper seems to have been more conveniently within his reach than the other, and he signed the last first, and thus ignored the wishes and instructions of Congress as evidenced by the bill lying by the side of the one he first signed.

But that is apart from the story. It is simply an indication of the fact that my Democratic friends at times manifest symptoms of the disease which they have contracted from you.

This situation is contagious. You Republicans first, by specious provisions, closed the mouth of the woolgrower. Convention after convention was held between the woolgrower and the manufacturer, but there never was a convention held west of Washington. They were all held up in the section of the country where there are four or five manufacturers to one woolgrower. There was no representation of the western interest or sheep grower. This select coterie met and formulated this legislation to which I have referred. The confiding woolgrower was beguiled by the promise that at the next session of Congress the duty would be raised a little. He rested content in this assurance, only to discover that when the Democrats came into control the infection had extended its baleful influence to this side of the Chamber.

And now what do my Democratic friends propose to do? They say, "The credulous old woolman has been fooled for a long time by the Republicans. We must not be outdone. We will now, as a fitting climax, put on the capsheaf and take all of the protection from him"; for that is the logical interpretation of the bill under consideration. Obviously the 20 per cent ad valorem duty upon the grease content is no protection to the sheepman.

I am not at all amazed that my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS] failed to say a word concerning the raw-wool proposition in his speech to-day, nor as to its effect upon the sheepman. When he made his speech at the last session he electrified us by tracing these sheep from the rocky hills of Vermont down through Connecticut, on through this country, eating up everything they could reach—land had gotten so high that the sheep could not justifiably be raised upon it—following them diligently out across the American desert and across the trackless plains, making them climb the snowcaps of the Rocky Mountains, driving them, with their tongues lolling out and their tails hanging behind them, through the desert of Death Valley and beyond into the Pacific Ocean, where he left them eating crabs. [Laughter.]

To-day there is a different story. A change has "come over the spirit of his dream." There has been an appreciable bit of ground swell. The people of the West are a little dissatisfied. Ohio is a big wool State and they are looking a little to the future. The sheep business is not disintegrating so rapidly after all, and it may become necessary for us to hold on to it a little longer, and this impression has prompted some faint effort to show that we can survive under this bill.

There is but one substance in the mineral kingdom that is indestructible, and that is gold. Its usefulness is not greater than its indestructible counterpart in another kingdom, namely, wool. It has only three enemies—one, the nonfurtiveness of the ragpicker; another, the moth; and, third, fire. On another occasion I said to you:

> Many of you doubtless have in your households treasured antiques a thousand years old. There are prayer rugs known to be over 4,000 years old, the wool in which might have been clipped by Abraham, and as they are rare, there are many imitations of them. I bespeak for you, my friends, in the hour, yea hours, of your atonement for the sin you will commit in the passage of this bill the peculiar appropriatness of a prayer rug woven from the fleece of the American sheep, that your hands may be raised alike in supplication for pardon and benediction of the home-grown product which makes so much for American greatness. From the cradle to the grave, from the clipper's hand to the tailor's shears, its fruitful coat of down has ever thrown its benign protection around young and old. The babe in arms, the rugged mountaineer, the aged and infirm alike are secure within its ample folds, and the best that is within us should be devoted to its safety and not its sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, of course I can not support the pending bill, and I am utterly unable to understand how any Democrat can consistently do so. It would amount to absolute stultification for anybody who voted for a duty of 29 per cent ad valorem last session to now, after the Tariff Board has reported and notwithstanding there has been no untoward change of conditions in any direction, favor free wool at least. There is no justification for us to now stultify ourselves by voting for 9 per cent less duty at this session of Congress.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is nearly 30 per cent.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. No; it is 9 per cent lower than the conference bill that we passed at the last session.

The bill proposed by the minority is equally objectionable to me. The bill introduced by me at the last session put the duty at 30 cents a pound. Thirty-four cents a pound is exactly what the western sheep grower must have in order to compete with the Australian woolgrower. Of course if it is proposed to eliminate the sheepman altogether—if it is the desire to put him out of the business entirely; if we are to say to him, "Notwithstanding here is an industry as old as Abraham himself, and which is contemporaneous with the glorious history of our country and has brought to it so much enduring prosperity, we must let it go"—if we are to ignore not only the history of our own country but that of all countries as to its great value as an integral part of our national greatness, then pass this bill providing for a 20 per cent ad valorem, and it will effectually give it its quietus.

As a matter of fact I do not know that we could enact any legislation that would resuscitate the sheep business at the present time, because of the fact that the sheep people are so much discouraged by the tariff agitation. They have lost millions of dollars by reason of this agitation since last June. The speculator has been quick to take advantage of the possibility of this bill becoming a law, and the woolgrower has become bankrupt in his effort to keep his flocks and his possessions out of the hands of the banker, of whom he has borrowed money on them, and it has been an unequal struggle.

Mr. Chairman, England did not abandon the protection policy, in so far as the wool business was concerned, until she had established the industry, and she is now almost the third nation in the world in the production of both wool and mutton. She does not now permit sheep to remain over 24 hours on her soil or get beyond the docks before it is slaughtered. She is still vigorously protecting her sheep industry.

Until 104 years ago, and for 130 years before that, England had a statute requiring the dead to be enshrouded in woolen cloth with a view to protecting and nurturing the woolen industry. As an evidence of solicitude for the safeguarding of that industry the mother country forbade our Colonies to export any of their wool. In Virginia in 1664, the Commonwealth passed a statute by which she gave 5 pounds of tobacco—the only money she had at that time—for each yard of homespun cloth that might be manufactured. Two years afterwards she passed a law by which she put into every county in the Commonwealth looms and weavers for the manufacture of wool.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 35 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Massachusetts in 1645 passed a law compelling each family to weave 1 yard of cloth out of wool flax or cotton for 30 weeks during each year. She also gave to her weavers a bonus of 30 acres of land. In those days it was the unanimous judgment of all that it was imperatively necessary to develop and sustain this industry. Will anybody be good enough to tell me when there has been a time when this industry needed to be built up more than at the present? We produce 70 per cent of the wool we consume. Now, if it is demonstrated, as I believe it must be, to our Democratic friends that if we pass such a law as this it will mean the annihilation of the sheep industry of this country I am entirely sure no one would longer indulge in the sophistry that it would be in the interest of the consumer. When by a simple arithmetical process you subtract 70 per cent of our consumption from the total, does it appeal to anyone's reason that it would tend to lessen the price? Is it not convincing to the analytical mind that the result will be diametrically the opposite, and is it not a solecism to pretend that to subtract from means to add to; that in order to cheapen the price you must lessen the supply? And yet that, Mr. Chairman, is irresistibly the character of philosophy that must be invoked in justification of the passage of a bill of this kind.

Another and equally vicious feature of the proposed legislation would be the surrender of our domestic market to the foreigner, thereby vesting him with power to arbitrarily fix prices. Listen to what is said in the last issue of the Australian Pastoralist Review:

> The writer ventures to state that if the duty upon wool in America is removed for any length of time sheep numbers in the United States of America will, as they did before, rapidly diminish. This would be a bad thing for the States, but a good thing for Australia and New Zealand.

To digress for a moment. We are all aware of the proverbial æsthetic taste of the good people of Massachusetts. In 1684 William Foster, a representative from this country to Spain, purchased three rams at auction for $1,500 apiece and shipped them to a friend in Massachusetts for breeding purposes. However, unmindful of their other attributes and of the intent and

purpose of their shipment, the gentleman in Massachusetts slaughtered them and ate them, writing a very cordial letter of thanks to Mr. Foster for remembering him with such delicious meat.

As a matter of fact and in the interest of truthful history, it may be said that those rams were smuggled into this country because of the rigid statutes of Spain upon the subject of the exportation of sheep. Under the Spanish law at that time it was an offense punishable by death to ship sheep from that country. But our friend from Massachusetts did not enjoy an exclusive monopoly in that inhibited industry, for there lived at that period another smuggler of no less prominence than Thomas Jefferson, who was, as we all know, well versed in international law and ethics, and as an evidence of whose lively interest in the development of the wool industry of this country at all hazards I desire to read from a letter written by him to the American representative at that time in Spain. Among other things, he says:

An American vessel, the property of a respectable merchant of Georgetown, on a voyage to some part of Europe for general purposes of commerce proposes to touch at some part of Spain with a view of obtaining merino sheep to be brought to our country. The necessity we are under and the determination we have formed of emancipating ourselves from a dependence on foreign countries for manufactures which may be advantageously established among ourselves has produced a very general desire to improve the quality of our wool by the introduction of merino sheep. Your sense of the duties you owe your station will not permit me to ask you, nor yourself to do, any act which might compromise you with the Government with which you reside or forfeit that confidence on their part which can alone enable you to be useful to your country; but as far as that will permit you to give aid to the procuring and the bringing away of some of the valuable race, I take the liberty of soliciting you to do so. It will be an important service rendered to your country.

[Laughter.]

I cite these two prominent instances as showing that for the advancement of the great wool industry in this country, not only did a citizen of the law-abiding and thrifty Commonwealth of Massachusetts, but that great Virginian, the father of Democracy, himself risk the dire international and personal consequences of the detection of such an act. If perchance he had been caught on Spanish soil he would have been indicted as particeps criminis and liable to the penalty of death under the statute to which I have referred.

It will thus be seen that Massachusetts and Virginia, the two oldest and most conservative Commonwealths, joined hands for the upbuilding of this important industry.

To return to my line of thought. It is clearly impossible to add to by dividing. How can it be sensibly or reasonably maintained that by taking 70 per cent of our consumption from the total we will lower the price upon wool? At the risk of repetition I desire to emphasize that inquiry. If I have not already done so, let me state now that the wool man, especially of the West, is to-day realizing his only revenue upon the lean sheep that he may be able to drive to the market, he being absolutely helpless in any other respect.

Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words more. I am not a very good statistician, and I have difficulty in following the line of argument of those gentlemen who deal in fractions. I come from the western country where those who play poker play with blue chips. They do not use the white ones. I prefer to deal with larger sums than fractions.

Upon the subject of statistics, if I may again digress, I am minded of a darkey who was captured by old Jubal Early in one of his raids through Virginia. He was nearing his old town, and he produced his pencil and paper and was noting the names of some of the people who lived in his old home town, and calculating how many graves he would have to dig when he got there. There was one particular man whom he desired to inquire about, and as this darkey resided in the neighborhood he supposed he would be able to secure accurate information from him. Early said, "Sam, do you know a man down there by the name of Sandford?" "Oh, yas, sir, yas, sir; I knows Mr. Sandford very well." "What does he do?" pursued Early. "Well, Massa Jubal, he keeps a kind of little grocery sto' and he sells medicine, and when I gets a stummick ache sometimes he gives me medicine and I gets well right away." "Orderly," said Jubal sternly, "take this nigger out and have him shot. There is only one fellow down there by the name of Sandford and he is a lawyer." Sam, apprehending that he was about to be shot, cried out quickly, "Hold on there, Massa Jubal, I think we's both right, but you is more wrong than I is. I knows dat dis is de same man, fur he did run for dat dere office but he got lef'." [Laughter.]

In my school days I found extreme difficulty in mastering the science of arithmetic, and I confess that I am not near so skillful in the art as my friend UNDERWOOD and some of my other associates on this floor. However, when I reflect upon my restricted scholastic opportunities this is not to be wondered at, and I am glad now of the opportunity to forsake the smaller figures for the larger and more important ones.

I desire to refer for a moment to a statement made by my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yesterday to the effect that the sheep growers of this country have ample protection, that there was a healthy competition existing, and that the report of the Tariff Board would show this. There is a striking dissimilarity between his present line of thought and that of last year, when he, too, indulged in the pleasing occupation of driving these sheep clear out into the Pacific Ocean as a preliminary to our relinquishing the sheep-growing business entirely.

With a view to my further enlightenment upon the subject, I took occasion to analyze this report to some extent, and discovered a few large figures, minus the fractions, which accommodated themselves to my understanding.

I find that the total labor cost, including the shearing of the sheep and their handling in this country and the competing countries, Australia and South America, was as follows: In the United States, on 52,000,000 sheep—that is all we now have—lambs and all, $47,580,000; in South America the cost was $15,080,000; in Australia it was $7,280,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to agree with my friend UNDERWOOD in one respect with reference to the Tariff Board. I do not think it was necessary for them to go to that country to get this information. Most of the material information concerning these costs was available in any trade journal. We are perfectly familiar with the geography of that country. We know its climate, we know its area, we know of its immense pampas, we know how many sheep they have, we know also the character of the labor they employ. We know they have hatless, shirtless, shoeless, breechclouted bushmen to attend their flocks. I have a picture here which I would be glad to show some of you. Here it is. My word painting of him is not in the least exaggerated. He is also languageless. He is unable to comprehend in the dark and conveys his meaning by gesticulations. These bushmen, the Arapaho Indians, and the Fiji Islanders are in a class by themselves. They are the only known people who are unable to make themselves understood in the dark.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says we know these things. We do not know it except from the report of the woolgrowers in the United States.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. That is good enough evidence for me.

Mr. PAYNE. It is for me, in some respects, and still your people are always raising the question that we only get one-sided information from people who are interested. How could we get evidence to satisfy the gentleman from Alabama unless we sent some one over there?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I think the gentleman from Alabama knows more than he "lets on." I think he was satisfied, just as I was.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; he was never satisfied with anything that came from the woolgrowers.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama, as well as many of these questions, are peculiarly suggestive of the man who imagined he had discovered in the distance a great conflagration, while the closer observer perceived but the golden glory of a newborn day. The sun was just rising. [Applause.]

Now, I desire to go just a step further in this——

Mr. GARNER. The sun of the gentleman from Alabama is just rising; that is all right.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I accept with pleasure the interjection of the gentleman from Texas.

With regard to the cost of feeding these 52,000,000 sheep, and dealing in these large figures again, we find that in the United States it is $23,400,000; in South America it is $18,200,000; in Australia, our competitor, as is recognized by everybody, it is only $4,160,000, as against $23,000,000 in the United States. That, it will be observed, is for feeding. Of course the climatic condition there is a matter of common knowledge. The sheep can run the year round. The growers there procure a lease for 40 years and are at liberty to fence the land in. I believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] knows something about the sheep business——

Mr. LONGWORTH. He has goats.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Well, he is not one. Besides, he is honest enough to acknowledge that if one has the opportunity to secure twenty or thirty thousand acres of land, subject to a lease of 40 years, he can construct a coyote-proof fence around his pasture, wherein one man would be able to attend to 20,000 sheep. Conditions in our country are entirely different, as is well known.

Then we should bear in mind the amount of the taxes on 52,000,000 sheep. In this country the annual tax is $2,000,000,

while in Australia it is $1,000,000, or perhaps a little in excess of that sum. Then there is a very considerable difference in the relative cost of getting the wool into the domestic market as between the two countries, the western American producer paying just three times as much as the foreigner to lay his wool down in the markets of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York, for instance, and this item of transportation alone consumes the duty, so far as the western woolgrower is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, my time has about expired. As long as I have the honor to be a Member of the American Congress, I shall raise my voice in the interests of the American farmer and stock raiser and for what I conceive to be his adequate recognition, and if I have been successful in affording any enlightenment as to his requirements in the hour that has been so generously accorded me, I shall not have spoken in vain. Since the wool industry, as well as many other of his products, is assaulted on the theory that raw material shall be duty free, and that in order to gradually reduce the tariff one industry may be made the dumping ground, I cite briefly some of the declarations of our national platforms and leaders of our party, showing that such legislation is emphatically repudiated. And these references show that it is you, my Democratic friends, who are departing from the faith of the fathers, not I.

President Jackson, in his first inaugural address, March 4, 1829, puts the question in these words:

With regard to a proper selection of the subjects of impost with a view to revenue, it would seem to me that the spirit of equity, caution, and compromise in which the Constitution was formed requires that the great interests of agriculture and manufactures should be equally favored. (Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 11, p. 437.)

The first distinct effort to adopt the doctrine of raw materials of manufacturers was made in the Whig act of 1842, which act was condemned by leading Democrats at the time it was passed and resulted in the overthrow of the Whig Party and the passage of the act of 1846, variously called the Polk tariff and the Walker Act.

In speaking of the act of 1842, Mr. Calhoun said:

An examination of this bill will show that there is not an article manufactured in the country, nor one which might come into competition with one that is, which is not subject to high protective duties.

* * * * * * *

To this may be added that there is not a raw material scarcely on which manufacturers operate or any material which is necessary to the process of manufacturing which is not admitted free or subject to a very light one.

* * * * * * *

The bill, in short, is framed throughout with the greatest art and skill to exempt as far as possible one branch of industry from all burdens and shackles and to subject the other exclusively to them; and well may our political opponents raise their heads amidst their many defeats and exult at beholding a favorite measure—one above all others indispensable to their entire system of policy—about to be consummated.

The first Democratic national platform that was adopted by the national convention was in 1840, at Baltimore, Md., on May 5, and I quote verbatim from the platform:

4. *Resolved*, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges. * * *

5. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government.

And I emphasize the fact that the identical language verbatim et literatim was repeated in the Democratic platforms of 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856.

The Whig platform adopted in Baltimore in May, 1844, favored "A tariff for revenue to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, and *discriminating* with special reference to the protection of the domestic labor of the country."

Upon this issue the Democrats elected James K. Polk as President in 1844. The first President elected after the first Democratic platform ever was made. Polk brought to the Presidency the widest experience on the tariff that any Democratic President has had before or since the war. He was 14 years a Member of this House, was 4 years Speaker of this House, was on the Ways and Means Committee, and he wrote more as President on the tariff than any other President has written, and I shall quote from his messages at considerable length for these reasons and the additional reason that he construed the first Democratic national platform that ever was made.

In his inaugural address March 4, 1845, among other things, he said:

The incidental protection afforded to our home interests by discriminations within the revenue range, it is believed, will be ample. In making discriminations all our home interests should as far as practicable be equally protected. *The largest portion of our people are agriculturists. Others are employed in manufactures, commerce, navigation, and the mechanic arts. They are all engaged in their respective pursuits, and their joint labors constitute the national or home industry. To tax one branch of this home industry for the benefit of another would be unjust. No one of these interests can rightfully claim an advantage over the others or to be enriched by impoverishing the others. All are equally entitled to the fostering care and protection of the Government.*

Let us pause a moment and ask ourselves what was meant by President James K. Polk when he said:

The term "protection to domestic industry" is of popular import, but it should apply under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter who toils yearly in his fields is engaged in domestic industry, and he is as much entitled to have his labor protected as others.

Again, what did Andrew Jackson mean when he said:

The agricultural interest of our country is so essentially connected with every other, and is so superior in importance to them all, that it is scarcely necessary to invite to it your attention. * * * The general rule to apply in graduating duties upon articles of foreign growth or manufacture is that it will place our own in fair competition with those of other countries. * * *

And what did the Democratic platform of 1888 mean when it said:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations.

And that of 1896, which was equally impressive in its enunciation:

The duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not distinguish between class or section.

And then in 1904, when it declared that such duties should be—

so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section, to the end that the burden of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

Now, my Democratic friends, let me ask you in all earnestness, in view of these plain, positive, and unequivocal utterances of the great minds of our party, what possible defense can you urge to the people of this country for your undisguised purpose to strike down at a single blow one of our greatest industries, in which over a million people are directly interested? As I have before indicated, it is not seriously claimed that under this present bill the American sheep grower will be afforded fair competition with the foreign grower; and I affirm that by no possible process of analysis is such a demonstration possible.

I am sorry I was not searched more thoroughly during this debate for further information to impart to you concerning this important industry, and especially with reference to the pecuniary situation of the woolgrowers of this country, and, at the expense of repeating what I said on this floor at the last session of Congress, I conclude by saying:

The wool feature of this bill is incomplete, inadequate, inequitable, and iniquitous. I reaffirm that it is unfair in its provisions and seemingly recklessly inconsiderate of the interests of that foundation of our national fabric—the American farmer.

If one can view with equanimity the situation of this forlorn flock master, I believe he could have witnessed without emotion the pressing of the crown of thorns upon the head of the Nazarene, the stretching of His body on the cross, the driving of each nail through His limbs, the dipping of the soldier's sponge into a tankard of vinegar mingled with gall, and the putting of it to His parched and quivering lips, and, following His last cry of agony, see deliberately scrawled above His head the words, "This is Jesus, the king of the Jews."

I yield, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] five minutes of my time.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generosity, but I have been informed that at 5 o'clock I shall be recognized for half an hour.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. The gentleman asked me for time and I was willing to yield it to him. I desire to reserve my five minutes, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, one proposing to discuss the questions presented by the two wool bills before the House at this time is confronted with some embarrassment, an embarrassment of riches. There is so much that might be properly said, the subject of the growth and manufacture of wool is so large, the matter presents itself in so many different ways, the industries affected are so vast and so diversified, the record of the Democratic Party on the subject is so extraordinary, that one scarcely knows how to approach the discussion having only a limited time to command.

One very pertinent inquiry at this time is, Does the Democratic Party really want to revise the wool schedule or are they simply using the schedule as an asset for the coming presidential campaign? The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle will, of course, plead not guilty, and yet all the circumstances of the case convict them.

A little less than a year ago they introduced and, under caucus dictation, passed through the House a facsimile of the bill

they now present. That bill was amended in the Senate by a general increase in rates, and then came from conference a hybrid, which the President very properly vetoed. In his veto message the President made it plain that he would sign no wool bill that did not carry rates which would afford adequate protection to American woolgrowing and woolen-manufacturing industries.

The unanimous report of the Tariff Board on woolgrowing and woolen manufacture is now before us. It is thorough and complete. No one except the apologists of the Democratic bill has ventured to question the finding of the board as to facts, and the report clearly shows that the bill presented by the Democratic majority will not adequately protect our industries. In fact, it shows plainly that their bill will give such an advantage to the foreign competitors of our people as to destroy our industries. As the President will not sign such a bill, it is clear that the measure is not presented with the expectation that it will be enacted into law, and therefore the only purpose it can serve is to keep alive the agitation over Schedule K.

In striking contrast to the Democratic position is that of the Republicans of the House and those engaged in the industries affected. At no time has our party desired, or the industries affected expected, tariff rates higher than are necessary to enable American producers and manufacturers while paying American rates of wages to maintain their industries against foreign competition.

Three years of constant tariff agitation has been vastly harmful to the wool producers and woolen manufacturers alike. The wool producer has found his markets uncertain and his prices unsatisfactory. The manufacturer, buying his wool from hand to mouth, has been facing a curtailed and timid market, and both have suffered severe loss without any corresponding gain to the users of woolen goods.

In this condition both the wool raiser and those who use his product are anxious to have the matter settled, and, rather than have the present condition continue, are willing to accept a tariff rate which holds any reasonable promise of allowing them to continue in business.

Our party has, in its national platform, laid down a fair and reasonable measure of protection, and now that we have the facts from a fair and unbiased and unprejudiced source, we stand ready to apply the rule "that protection shall measure the difference in cost of production at home and abroad"; and on that measure of protection we are prepared to go to the country, confident that the American people do not desire and will not sanction the transfer of our woolgrowing and woolen-manufacturing industries to foreign shores.

The Democrats present a bill which, by placing an ad valorem rate of only 20 per cent of the foreign value on imported wool, will reduce the value of every pound of wool grown on American farms and prohibit the growing of all wools of the finer grades, a bill which carries such low rates on manufactures of wool as to close American mills and thus deprive the few growers of coarse wools who might survive of a market for their product.

The Republicans present a bill based on a report of the Tariff Board, but with rates placed at the very lowest protective point; so low indeed as to leave the growers of fine merino wools and the makers of fine woolens dangerously near the line of destructive foreign competition; and yet a bill under which it is hoped our wool and woolen industries can survive and, in the absence of tariff agitation, prosper. As between these two measures—the one brutally destructive, the other but barely protective—no one but those who are willing to raise the black flag of piracy against American farmers, ranchmen, and manufacturers can hesitate.

My first duty on this floor is to those who sent me here, the tens of thousands of men and women whose accumulations of a lifetime of toil and struggle are invested in the sheep and wool industry, and the other thousands who are largely dependent, directly and indirectly, on the prosperity of those industries; but they would not expect me to ask for them or on their behalf any opportunities the pursuit of which would not be useful, helpful, and beneficial to the country at large. They believe and know that in the long run the destruction of the industry in which they and many others throughout the land are engaged would be nothing short of a national calamity, and so believing, they do not expect to appeal in vain for such protection as will enable the industry to exist and prosper.

DIFFERENCES IN COST.

I shall support the Republican bill not because I think all its rates are safely protective, but because I believe it is the best measure of protection obtainable. I do not question the approximate accuracy of the rate fixed on wool—18 cents per pound on the scoured content of imported fleeces or 19 cents per pound on wool imported scoured, and amounting to about 36 per cent ad valorem on present foreign cost—as measuring the average difference in cost of producing wool at home and abroad, as shown by the Tariff Board, but it must be borne in mind that any rate based on averages may leave a considerable portion of the product without adequate protection; and the portion of our national wool clip thus left somewhat in jeopardy is the portion which comes largely from the region which I represent. Furthermore, the Tariff Board did not take into consideration at all certain factors of cost which are of vital importance. Most important in these are the differences in interest charges and in the cost of transporting wool to market. To reasonably cover the differences in these items of cost in the case of the so-called territorial wools, it would be necessary, in my opinion, to increase the rate on class 1 wool at least 2 cents above the rate contained in this bill.

Furthermore, the board does not take into consideration investments in lands, and we know that in the region from which our sharpest competition comes—Australia—the woolgrowers have practically no investments in land, whereas all American woolgrowers, those who produce the coarse mutton sheep and those who produce the territorial wools, have a large and, in the case of the latter, a constantly increasing investment in lands; and if this difference in investment were taken into consideration it would, in my opinion, necessitate a higher rate than the bill carries. And yet, as I said, I think the rate in the bill fairly measures the difference as set out by the Tariff Board.

Let us consider for a moment some of the items of difference in the cost of wool production at home and in some of the competing regions. I have some data compiled by the secretary of the National Woolgrowers' Association from the report of the Tariff Board. The following is given as the comparative labor cost to raise and handle a sheep:

Average labor cost per sheep.

United States	$0.82
South America	.23
Australia	.07

This labor cost per sheep does not include the cost of shearing, and the board finds that the labor cost of shearing is as follows:

Labor cost shearing, per sheep.

United States	$0.09½
Australia	.07
South America	.06
Africa	.02

In order that the relative importance of this item of labor in the expense of sheep husbandry may be fully appreciated, we submit a table showing the total labor cost, including shearing, of handling 52,000,000 sheep, or the full number in the United States.

Total labor cost, including shearing, of handling 52,000,000 sheep.

United States	$47,580,000
South America	15,080,000
Australia	7,280,000

In the matter of feed it should be remembered that the Tariff Board fixes the value of feed at the cost of production and not at its market price, and therefore there is no profit whatever in the feed that the sheep consume.

Cost to feed 52,000,000 sheep one year.

United States	$23,400,000
South America	18,200,000
Australia	4,160,000

Then we come to taxes. The wools with which our fine wools compete are, most of them, produced in a sparsely settled region having a cheap government and therefore low rates of taxation. All our Territorial wools are grown now in regions where, though there are very considerable areas that are very thinly settled, they are surrounded by and interspersed with thickly settled communities, communities that maintain schools and all of the agencies of government, and where the burden of taxation, by reason of the small amount of real estate that is taxable, is comparatively high. The rate of taxation per sheep is given as follows:

Taxes per sheep.

United States	$0.05
South America	.04
Australia	.025

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the average rate of interest in your State?

Mr. MONDELL. The average rate of interest?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] I think stated it quite accurately a few moments ago. It depends at this time very much upon a man's indorser. A fair or low rate of interest in our region is 8 per cent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. A low rate?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. In good times some of our sheepmen secure funds for less than 8 per cent. The average sheepman, I think—the small sheepman—pays more frequently about 10 per cent, and in times like this he is very glad indeed to get money at almost any rate. The gentleman from Ohio understands that just now we are passing through perhaps the most trying climatic experience that the territorial wool industry has ever known. We can not cure that with a tariff. It is not the fault of the tariff. Tariff agitation, which has reduced prices, has, however, intensified the hard conditions, and the passage of the Republican bill would help and hearten our people. It may be the fault of the Democratic House. I would not be at all surprised if it were a dispensation of Providence on that account. But we have had two exceedingly dry years. Winter before last was very severe. The winter a year ago was mild, but the past winter, which has lingered long, but is now happily passing away, has been, perhaps, the worst in the history of the Rocky Mountain country.

The Tariff Board has fixed the loss per annum of American sheep at 3 per cent. It seems to me that is quite low under any circumstances. The average loss to the flocks in my State in the past year has been, in my opinion, not much less than 20 per cent. I think that is a conservative statement. I hope it is less, but there are many who make it more. We can not provide by tariffs for losses of that kind. We do not expect any such provision. But I simply mention that to show the difficulties under which we labor in the production of our territorial wools. We meet a winter climate of a severity unknown in Australia or New Zealand; that is, our winters are much more severe, and then occasionally we suffer very nearly as badly as Australia does from severe droughts, although we have never had as severe a drought over so large an area as Australia has had once or twice in her history.

In addition to that, we suffer in the Rocky Mountain and plains country from losses by predatory wild animals, a cause from which the loss in Australia and New Zealand is very small indeed. These can not be measured in the differences of cost in a report of a Tariff Board, but yet they are all handicaps, making difficult the carrying on of the industry in that country.

The table I presented gives the taxes per head of sheep in the United States as 5 cents, 4 cents per head in South America, and 2½ cents in Australia. The 5 cents per head, given for the entire United States, is less than the average rate of taxes in my State for the last two or three years, based upon the investment carried with each sheep.

On this basis the taxes in the United States on 52,000,000 sheep would be $2,600,000, in South America $2,080,000, in Australia $1,300,000.

And so this increased cost runs all the way through, not only on items included in the report of the Tariff Board, but in others not taken into consideration by the Tariff Board at all, such as freight. The table which I have is as follows, and I hope I may have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who, I know, is familiar with this, and I think it is correct:

Freight on 1 pound of scoured wool from the grower's railroad station to Boston.

Western United States	$0.06
Australia	.03
South America	.0105
London, dock	.0025

The 11 Western States reviewed by the board produced, in 1911, 56,875,000 pounds of scoured wool, that cost in freight alone to market 6 cents per pound. For comparison we show in the following table what it cost the growers of these States to market their wool and what it would have cost the foreign growers in freight to market a similar quantity of scoured wool in Boston:

Freight cost to market 56,875,000 pounds of scoured wool.

11 Western States	$3,412,500.00
Australia	1,706,250.00
South America	597,187.00
England	142,187.50

These tables show that, in addition to the differences in cost indicated by the report of the Tariff Board, there are a number which are not taken into consideration and which, if taken into consideration, would considerably increase the rates that would be necessary in order to be fully protective as to the average territorial fleece of the country at least. And as high a rate at least would be necessary for the full protection of the fine merino fleeces of Ohio and Michigan.

The Republican bill is carefully and wisely drawn. It is perhaps the first wool tariff ever presented, all of the rates in which are clear and definite, with no ambiguity, no concealed rates. There are many most excellent things about the Republican bill. The form of the wool duty is the correct one. In my speech last year I said that, in my opinion, our wool duties should be levied on the scoured content of the wool. It is the only fair and equitable method of adjusting duties on wool; and while, in my opinion, the rate carried in this bill, as I have just stated, does not fully cover the difference in average cost of production between our foreign competitors and at least our western American woolgrowers, still it is in such a form that we will get the benefit of the full amount of the duty. Of course, if we had the actual protection which in theory we have under the present law it would be very much higher than this bill, but we never have had a protection of 33 cents on the scoured pound, which on the shrinkage of western wools is the theory of the present law. Why we have not had it is entirely familiar to all those who are acquainted with the wool business, and it is unnecessary for me to go into it in detail. But with the duty assessed on the scoured content the woolgrower in the United States will receive the full benefit of the duty in increased price and, in my opinion, the rate carried in this bill, at least if we can have an end of tariff agitation, will, in the running of the years, bring the American woolgrower a fairer and more adequate protection than he has had in the last 10 years.

Mr. STEENERSON. How much has he been getting in the last 10 years?

Mr. MONDELL. There is a great diversity of opinion with regard to just how much protection we have been getting. There have been limited periods of time when, in my opinion, we did not receive more than 2 or 3 cents for some clips of our Territorial wool above the price of a like Australian wool, with the duty added.

The wool business is the most peculiar in the world. It is a business with regard to which it is possible, in times of tariff agitation and uncertainty, to press the price of the domestic clip down almost to a free-trade basis, and I have known of clips—not many, but some—being sold in my country that did not, in my opinion, bring more than 2 or 3 cents above a free-trade basis.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is not one of the reasons the fact that the rate of interest is so high that very often the sheep raiser can not afford to hold his clip for a favorable market, but must sell it?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman understands the situation thoroughly. The rate of interest is high. The sheep business is oftentimes carried on to a considerable extent on credit. The buyer refuses to buy in times of agitation, but stands ready to pick up a clip that must be sold at a sacrifice, and under those conditions are able to secure them at times at but little above a free-trade basis.

Unfortunately that low rate is never reflected in the price which the ultimate consumer pays. If it was the people as a whole would benefit by our losses; but I doubt if the American people as a whole have benefited by the failure of the western woolgrower, the merino woolgrower, to receive the full amount he was expected to receive from the rate carried in our tariff laws.

I do not mean to say that our protection has always or generally been that low. In my opinion, we had been receiving on an average, and when there was not too much agitation, an actual protection of between 7 and 8 cents on the grease pound. Perhaps that is a rather high estimate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The price is quite low now, is it not?

Mr. MONDELL. The price is quite low; not as low as it is sometimes and not as high as it ought to be in order to give us anything like the benefit of the present tariff. Our flock masters are offered, I am told, between 16 and 17 cents for the average fleece at this time. Anyone who knows about foreign prices knows that is not high enough to cover the foreign cost of the same wool, adding the full amount of our duty.

There is one feature of the Republican bill that I want to refer to briefly in passing, not in the way of criticism, but because, as it is true that no piece of legislation is ever absolutely perfect when first presented, I want to offer a suggestion of possible slight amendment. While I admit I may be mistaken, I am rather inclined to think that the rate carried in the bill on noils and waste is rather too low, rather dangerously low. I think the rate on tops is a little low. On the basis of the wool rate in the bill, I would increase the rate on tops 1 or 2 cents and the rate on noils possibly more. I think the rate on roving waste and ring waste is pretty low. On carbonized and uncarbonized noils it is rather dangerously low. We are quite as much interested in the rate on tops and noils as we are in the rate on wool, because if these rates are by comparison lower than the wool rates tops and noils will be largely imported and our actual protection lowered.

AN AMAZING DOCUMENT.

Now, having said some things about our bill, I want for a few moments to pay some attention to the amazing document

which the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee present with their bill. I am very glad, indeed, to have learned from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that the document was not prepared by the members of the committee, but by some one from New York known as "The Professor." I am only too happy to have the gentlemen relieved from all responsibility for it, even though they signed it, for I have no personal grudge against them. In some respects it is the most amazing document I think I ever read. As a combination of fiction, garbled figures, lame logic, and misstatement of fact, it is a gem.

I can not believe that the 14 majority members of the Ways and Means Committee ever read it, for I can not conceive how it is possible that any intelligent man could ever read that precious document and put his name to it. I will guarantee that any intelligent American citizen—I do not care what he calls himself, Democrat, Republican, Socialist, or what not—that reads that report will say that the man who wrote it did not know what he was writing about, and that the men that signed it ought to be ashamed of themselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I wish I had the time in the few moments at my disposal to go over this extraordinary document and point out some of its peculiarities. I hope that everybody will read it. It ought to be widely read to illustrate the kind of document that the Democratic majority will put forth in support of its measure. A party that hopes to win anywhere or any time by such a garbled mass of misstatements certainly misjudges the intelligence of the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

However, that report is not very much more remarkable than the speech made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in support of this bill. The only reason why practically every statement that he made will not appear in the RECORD as challenged is entirely due to the fact that the gentleman declined to allow anybody to interrupt him. Had they been given an opportunity gentlemen on this side would have successfully challenged practically every important statement made by him in the course of his speech.

How about this document? In 70 dreary pages it lays down and argues several propositions, as follows: First, as stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yesterday, that "to ascertain the difference in cost of production at home and abroad is impossible."

Second. That if the comparative cost of production were possible of reasonably accurate ascertainment it would not furnish a guide to the proper amount of duty needed for protective purposes.

Third. That assuming it were possible to approximate the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, and that such approximation were a proper guide in determining the amount of duty needed to insure reasonable protection, that the researches of the board have not been such as to secure the facts, and that the report is fragmentary, inaccurate, illogical, and based on assumption or erroneous figures.

The 14 majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, no one of whom can qualify as an expert on or as even being familiar with the production, handling, or manufacture of wool, having thus demolished the work of the experts of the Tariff Board, proceed in an involved and labored effort to prove, by the very report they have attempted to discredit, that the rates fixed in their bill afford ample protection to the industries affected.

Evidently the incongruity of the position thus assumed never occurred to the gentlemen who signed the report. The most charitable view we can take of the matter is that they never read the report and therefore do not know the position they have assumed, for in the only part of the report which bears any evidence of having been considered, the first two pages, it is stated that the rates in the former bill, of which this is an exact copy, "were fixed without any reference whatever to protection." What an amazing circumstance it is that rates fixed a year ago without any reference to protection should now prove, according to the framers of those rates, to afford just the amount of protection needed, according to a report which the same gentlemen declared to be "inaccurate, erroneous, and fragmentary" and "based on false premises."

What does this all mean? It means that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have not the courage of their convictions. They are free traders masquerading under the misnomer of a tariff for revenue, and yet in defense of the very bill that was framed "without regard to its effect on industries," they attempt to screen themselves behind the claim that this bill will not be totally destructive of industries. They begin to hear the rumbling of the storm which will sweep their free-trade camp in November.

But to return to that charming report signed by the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. I commend it to all lovers of pure fiction. It contains more misinformation, doubling and crossing itself at more angles, than any work of an untrammeled imagination I have ever had the pleasure of reading.

After boldly misquoting the report of the Tariff Board in an effort to prove that much of the wool product of our country needs no protection and the bulk of it no more than the amount carried in their bill, they then proceed, on pages 43 and 44 of their report, to juggle the figures in an attempt to prove that the Ohio and Michigan fine merinos need so much more than they can hope to secure that there is no help for them.

These paragraphs on the wools of the Ohio region are obscure, involved, and full of errors and inaccuracies, and yet out of it all are involved conclusions which flatly contradict the arguments and conclusions which precede them, to wit, that the fine merino wool of the Ohio region must have a tariff rate of 28 or 29 cents per scoured pound, or at least 55 per cent ad valorem, in order to be adequately protected. Let us see how this works out.

The cost charge against the Ohio fleece, according to the Tariff Board, which our friends seem to accept when it serves their purpose to do so, is 19 cents. The cost charge against the Territorial fine wool, according to the Tariff Board, which they also seem to accept, is 12 cents. The Territorial cost is therefore approximately 60 per cent of the Ohio cost. If the Ohio wools need a rate of 28 or 29 cents on the scoured pound or 55 per cent ad valorem, as our Democratic friends say they do, then the Teritorial wools, in order to be protected, must have 60 per cent of those rates, or about 17½ cents on the scoured pound, or 33 per cent on an ad valorem basis—very nearly the rates carried in the Republican bill.

Thus we find that the Democratic report which at one point, in an effort to justify the Democratic bill, claims that a duty of 20 per cent will be amply protective for the Territorial wools; at another point, in an effort to discourage the Ohio and Michigan raisers of wool, claims that a rate of nearly twice the amount carried in their bill, and almost the rate carried in the Republican bill, is necessary to protect the Territorial fleeces.

HOW IT HAPPENED.

The fact is that the Democratic majority started out last year on this wool-tariff revision with the free traders in full control and insistent on free wool; but the clamor of wool-producing Texas and some districts in the Ohio Valley they hoped to control caused them to halt. They excused their departure from free trade in wool by the mendacious fiction of a depleted Treasury. In the hope of putting the President "in a hole," as they expressed it, they accepted rates in conference which, according to their declarations, were unjustifiable. Their hybrid, conceived, as they admitted, in absolute disregard of its effects on industries, and completed, so far as they were concerned, for no other purpose than to secure political advantage, met the fate it deserved in a presidential veto.

Then came the report of the Tariff Board flatly contradicting every argument they had made in support of their bill, showing that the American wool industry must have a very considerable protection in order to survive and that while some of the rates on woolen goods were unnecessarily high an intense competition among American manufacturers kept the prices down to a point which, in the majority of instances, marked almost exactly the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

In this condition of affairs, if we are correctly informed, consternation reigned in the Democratic camp. The free traders had had their way with regard to the sugar schedule, even to the certain destruction of a great industry. No doubt they insisted that there was ever more reason why they should have their way in the matter of the wool tariff, for are not woolen garments even more essential than sugar? On the other hand, the gentlemen on the other side who represented wool districts insisted that the report of the Tariff Board made it so clear that the industry must be protected in order to survive that they could not excuse themselves in voting for free wool, and so a compromise was struck on the old, discredited bill of last year.

Of course, they realized how desperate was the situation which confronted them. They must discredit the report of the Tariff Board in order to defend their bill from any standpoint. They must accept and exaggerate the report of the Tariff Board touching certain coarse wools in the vain hope of calming the fears of growers of coarse wool in the southern and eastern portions of the country.

They must accept certain figures of the Tariff Board and discredit others in a vain attempt to prove that the Territorial wools do not require any more protection than the 20 per cent carried in their bill, and they must juggle and confuse and misquote the report of the Tariff Board in an effort to prove to the growers of fine wools in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Virginia, and elsewhere that, so far as they are concerned, the jig is up

anyway; they can not hope or expect, even under the Republican bill, an adequate protection; and all the time that the Democratic band is playing these conflicting and discordant notes the free-trade bass drum is pounding away on the dominant note in this Democratic House, as voiced by the gentleman from Alabama in his speech on the sugar bill, that no protective tariff is justifiable from a Democratic standpoint, emphasized by the notice served on the producers of fine wool in Ohio and elsewhere that if they can not do business under free trade they had better go into some other line of industry.

That is the best that the American farmer engaged in the raising of sugar cane and the raising of sugar beets, millions of them on the farms of the United States engaged in the raising of sheep—that is the best they can get from a Democratic Congress. They virtually say to them, "If you can not prosper in the business you are now in under free trade, go into some other business."

MERINO VERSUS COARSE-WOOL SHEEP.

And this brings me to the consideration of a feature of the wool question in regard to which the Democratic majority, with its astounding lack of knowledge on the subject, is hopelessly in error, and touching which some others even better informed seem to have entertained curious notions. On page 10 of its letter of submittal the Tariff Board states among its findings:

That in the States east of the Missouri River wool production is incidental to general farming. Here producers, with the exception of certain-named districts, lay more stress upon the output of the mutton than of wool, and in such cases the receipts from the sale of sheep and lambs ordinarily cover the flock expense, leaving the wool for profit.

The Democratic majority assume from this statement that the woolgrowers referred to need no tariff protection, and, as a matter of fact, in figuring the average requirement of protection, this has to a certain extent been assumed to be the case; but such is not the case by any manner of means, and nothing in the report of the Tariff Board justifies such a conclusion. It is true that in the districts named, good markets for mutton being easily accessible and therefore the net receipts per pound relatively high, the board finds that these receipts for mutton ordinarily cover the flock expense, leaving the wool as a profit and the only profit.

What is going to happen to this profit if you reduce the receipts from that wool to a free-trade basis? The price received for wool under reasonable protection is sufficient to make it profitable to remain in the business; but reduce that profit, which is the only profit, by a third or a half and the grower of coarse-wool sheep can no more afford to remain in business, except in certain particularly favored localities, than can the grower of fine-wool sheep in the West. The investment continues the same; the cost of caring for and feeding the sheep is not reduced, and yet it is assumed that you may reduce by half or a third what is at present only a fair return on the investment at best and still have those people continue in the business of growing sheep. There is only one way in which it could possibly be accomplished, and that would be through an increase in the price of mutton. If anybody can figure out how the public at large would be benefited by shifting the profit from wool to mutton they are entitled to a membership on the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee. [Applause on the Republican side.]

A still more profound and dangerous fallacy is contained in the assumption that all the Ohio and Michigan and Territorial growers of fine wool need to do to make their business profitable under a lower tariff rate, or no rate at all, is to change from merino to cross-bred or coarse-wool sheep. So far as the Territorial wools are concerned, the change is largely an impossible one, as I will point out later. If it were possible it would not necessarily decrease to a very considerable extent the cost of wool production, for the apparent higher cost of wool production in those regions is not largely due to the type of sheep or class of wool.

All of the regions in which the Tariff Board reports a high charge against the fleece are regions where a large number of sheep are produced. Where there are but few sheep to the farm the actual cost, or apparent cost, of producing the wool may be negligible. Where sheep are produced in large numbers and become an item of importance on the farm or ranch, the actual cost of care and maintenance is a matter of sufficient importance to demand and receive attention, and the flocks, not being a mere incident to the general business, requiring little attention, consuming little but waste material, as in cases where there are but few on a farm, do require and receive attention, the cost of which is appreciated, do consume feed, the value of which is known and understood. And so in the Ohio Valley where the flocks are of considerable size and the industry of large importance the animals, whatever the breed may be, must have the care and attention of men paid good wages, must have feed which would otherwise be marketed, and while a change to crossbred sheep or to the straight, coarse-wool breeds would bring a larger return per animal in mutton the return in wool would not be increased, the amount of feed consumed per animal would be increased, and the situation would not be far different from what it is now.

THE TERRITORIAL WOOLS.

On the Great Plains and in the Rocky Mountains, from Canada to Mexico, the region which produces the so-called Territorial wools, a shifting from the Merino type to the coarse-wool sheep is in the main impossible. In that region the great majority of the flocks are not under fence, but are herded on the open range, utilizing the mountains and high lands in the summer and the plains and the valleys in the winter. The merino is the only type of sheep that can be successfully herded in large bands; the coarse-wool sheep scatter hither and yon, break up into small bands or stray singly, thus escaping from the herders to wander through the hills and become the prey of predatory animals. Crossbreeding with the coarser-wool sheep is common, but there must be frequent reversions to the merino type to secure an animal that can be successfully herded.

Furthermore, the merino type is by far the best adapted to the dry summers, cold winters, and rough mountain pastures of that region. In favored localities the coarse-wool sheep can be successfully grown, and crosses are and will continue to be common, but in the main the merino type must prevail, for we can not change the climate or the topography of the country, and unless we radically change our land policy we can not have the enormous fenced pastures in the forest reserves, in the hills, and on the plains, such as they have in Australia and largely in South America.

The ridiculous character of the Democratic suggestion, that in search of a wool more cheaply produced we abandoned the merino type, is shown when we consider that of the approximately 52,000,000 of sheep in the United States in 1910, 69 per cent were half-blood merinos as above, 52 per cent being nearly full bloods. Even in what the board calls the fleece country—all the region east of the Mississippi, and Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri—the percentage of sheep of half merino blood and above is 31. The wool of all such sheep is of the merino type. The fact is that pure-bred coarse-wool sheep, except in breeding flocks, are rare in any part of our country.

THE MERINO SHEEP.

Even if we could change from the merino type in the Ohio Valley and in the West and grow only the coarse-wool sheep in this country, the change would be a national calamity and one everlastingly discreditable to the good sense and judgment of the American people. Not only does the merino type of sheep produce the only wool in the world that can be used in the manufacture of woolens, but it is essential for the finer grades of worsted. American wool of merino blood grown in the Ohio Valley, as well as some grown in the Territorial regions, is the strongest fine wool in the world. Our Army and Navy Departments do not insist upon the use of American merino wool in the manufacture of cloth for Army and Navy uniforms for purely patriotic reasons, but because there is no wool in the world that will make the cloths they need of such strength and wearing quality as the American merino wools. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE QUESTION CONFRONTING US.

The question presented at this time is after all not one of rates, but of policy. How long and to what extent will the country support a party that by its representatives in the popular branch of Congress declares war on American industries? At the very moment that they cry that no American industry need fear their legislation they are proposing legislation that they must know and do know will cripple and destroy industries. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL] warns his party against the poison of protection. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] refers to those engaged in the wool industry as "mendicants," and jokes about the meager returns they have been receiving, as shown by the report of the Tariff Board. The gentleman from Alabama says that no industry in this country has any claim to tariff protection. Surely such utterances as these and the legislation which is proposed makes it clear that no man whose industry needs protection, no man who believes in the policy of protection, even in its mildest form, has anything to hope for from the Democratic Party.

One after another they present their tariff bills. Each one proposes deadly breaches in our tariff walls. Each proposes to transfer to foreign shores a portion of our industries. Each would, if enacted into law, deprive large numbers of our people of employment. Taken together, they would take us back to

the condition we experienced under the Wilson bill, when no industry but the soup house flourished. No one had profitable and steady employment but the sheriff and the auctioneer. Will the American people stand for it? I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, by some sort of incantation of wizardry or magic a large number of the people of the United States were led for many years to believe that a protective tariff gave an increased price to the manufacturer who sold the goods and at the same time a low price to the consumer who bought them. This paradoxical tariff problem was enough to give any man a brain paralysis, and the people, in contemplating that problem, made more complex by the intricacies of the Payne-Aldrich tariff, engaged in the revolt which has brought about the great change in this House. Specious arguments fell at length before the awakened consciousness of the American people—that they were paying dearly for the benefit of the favored few.

I want to say to my friends on the other side that, coming from Rhode Island, which is a veritable hive of industry, I believe in protection [applause on the Republican side]; but, lest my friends on the Democratic side should for a moment think I am getting off the reservation, let me assure them that I believe in protection to the American consumer. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the manufacturers have had more protection than they needed and that it is now ample time for Congress to pay attention to the needs of the millions of consumers instead of the century-fattened interests.

We have been told repeatedly that we were absolutely ignorant if we challenged the statement that the tariff tax was not paid by the consumer, and if we denied that it came from high heaven itself—this protection theory—we were charged with dereliction in patriotic duty. The people now know that the need for this Tariff Board, of which we have heard so much, was not discovered by the Republican Party until the expressed verdict at the polls by the people showed that they wanted the tariff to be revised downward in their favor. Then we were treated to the suggestion of a Tariff Board cunningly calculated to act as a stay of execution of the popular mandate and the popular judgment. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We owe the present tariff largely to the Senator from my State—now the ex-Senator—to Senator Aldrich and "his languid disciples of the Finance Committee," who, in framing their tariff bill, listened to the claims and to the entreaties of the manufacturers of this country and paid but little heed to the needs and the necessities and the demands of the people. What shall we say in condemnation of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill if, contemplating what was said of the Dingley bill by a Philadelphia manufacturer, "We have paid for it, and it is ours," we consider its even more indefensible character? If they paid for the Dingley bill, they must have doubly paid for the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill.

The Republican Party is facing a situation which was prophesied by a man for whose memory I have the highest respect—one of those insurgent Republicans whose conception of duty to the public interest was as high as heaven itself—Senator Dolliver; and he warned the Republican Party of the coming storm when he said:

> If you want a tariff agitation to begin the moment this bill is made a law you have pursued a wise and proper course.

He further said on August 5, 1909:

> I have but a few more years in this world. I sometimes have been willing to deceive myself for the sake of the comfort which comes from the society and the good will of others; but I do not propose now to become a party to a petty swindle of the American people without telling them the truth and without appealing to their good will and their confidence in the integrity of my motives.

And when the Dingley rates were raised, another Republican Senator, also of the insurgent stripe, said:

> They are endeavoring to make billionaires of millionaires.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now we have the spectacle of the Republican Party making a bold attempt to hoodwink the people by the report of a spineless and powerless Tariff Board. Speaking of this woolen Schedule K, I can only say that they drew the wool over the eyes of the people, but when the people listened to the enlightened reasoning and the appealing force of the Democratic Party, the wool was quickly lifted, and that lifting resulted in the great change in this House, now dominated by the Democratic Party earnestly endeavoring to do delayed justice to the consumer, and not forgetful of the legitimate needs of our manufacturers.

What need was there for a Tariff Board to inform Congress that the tariff rate of 91 per cent on cheap cotton stockings, 100 per cent on cotton underwear, 78 per cent on sugar, 136 per cent on woolen blankets, 154 per cent on women's dress goods, 121 per cent on flannels, 96 per cent on shawls, and rates in like proportion on other necessaries were too high and should be reduced at once? The Republican plan has compelled the masses of the American people to go through another winter, awaiting the pleasure of this board, before even getting a promise of reduction of these unconscionable rates.

And the percentage which labor receives upon the gross product in the textile industry is 19.5 per cent!

The financial loss to the people has been $50,000,000 by reason of Republican delay through its Tariff Board. The President had his opportunity to give the people relief; they cried out for cheaper clothing and food; he gave them veto messages and subtle disquisitions on tariff commissions.

Speaking of the profit made for the manufacturer through the instrumentality of this Payne-Aldrich tariff, and especially of this infamous Schedule K, characterized by the President as indefensible, if it were the profits of the woolen manufacturers that alone were at stake, the American people could take care of these at a much smaller cost than the present tariff imposes on them. If the woolen duties were removed altogether, the American people could afford to pay the American woolen manufacturers every year a sum equal to their annual profits, and then would save tens of millions of dollars as compared with what the woolen tariff is now costing them. The schedule is based on a lie. Here is Senator LA FOLLETTE's proof of this statement, taken from his speech in the Senate on July 26, 1911:

> Now, Mr. President, when the manufacturer and the grower came together in agreement, and when Schedule K was first constructed—right at the very outset they agreed upon a false standard by which to measure compensatory duties.
>
> The manufacturers persuaded the Congress that adopted that scheme of legislation that it took 2½ pounds of wool in the grease to make a pound of yarn worth not to exceed 30 cents per pound. That is false. That is not true. We know to-day, if we have cared to look into it, that on the average it does not take to exceed a pound and a half of wool in the grease to make a pound of yarn worth not to exceed 30 cents per pound. They had that false basis incorporated in the law; it was made a part of the statute, that yarn worth 30 cents a pound or less should take a compensatory duty equal to the duty on 2½ pounds of first-class wool. That means it will take a duty, when computed on the 11-cent-a-pound basis, of 27½ cents. They persuaded the Ways and Means Committee to believe that it took 2½ pounds of that kind of grease wool, which paid a duty of 11 cents a pound, to make a pound of yarn of the 30-cent-per-pound grade. It does not. That falsehood, Mr. President, was written into the law, and we have been paying duties on that false basis ever since.
>
> Now, what does it take? Decisions of the Treasury Department on drawback propositions show that on the average it takes a pound and a half of wool in the grease of the first class to make a pound of yarn worth 30 cents per pound.
>
> This "compensatory" duty, therefore, of 27½ cents per pound gives an excess compensatory duty of 11 cents on every single pound of yarn valued at 30 cents—in other words, that duty of 27½ cents levied on all yarn worth 30 cents or less per pound, on the theory that it takes 2½ pounds of wool in the grease to make it, gives an advantage to the wool manufacturer of this country of 11 cents on every pound of that grade of yarn, which, figured on an ad valorem basis, shows the duty to be 40 per cent in excess of what actually measures the difference in the cost of raw material. Then, in addition to that, they secured the protective duty that they contended was necessary to measure the difference in the cost of production in this and competing foreign countries.

Coming from Rhode Island, I am pleased to speak upon this subject, because down there we have an organization known as the Tariff Publicity League, which sprang up into very active being in our last gubernatorial campaign. Every dead wall and every fence in the State of Rhode Island, and the morning and evening editions of the newspapers, were plastered with its advertisements, hurling anathemas upon OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, and of course consigning me to perdition because I was one of his humble followers. They were very bold in their advertisements, but they were cowardly enough never to disclose their names or their identities. They covered the State with these advertisements, working on the fears of the people employed in the mills, and saying that such and such a mill would close if the Underwood bill should pass; that such and such a mill was tottering to its very foundations, simply because Mr. UNDERWOOD had introduced the bill.

Now, I had occasion to go down into one of the mill towns in Rhode Island, and I asked the people in that town, "What about this mill whose owner says it has closed by virtue of the agitation started by the Underwood bill?" The information was handed back to me that that very mill had been closed for two long years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They advertised the fact that some Central Falls mill closed for tariff reasons, and I discovered the fact that it was never closed for tariff reasons, but that it was closed on account of worn-out machinery. I do not believe any tariff tax should be substituted for worn-out machinery in order to make a mill run and in order to make it pay. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is profitable at this time to consider that out of the 90,000,000 people in the United States at the time of the passage

of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill there were only 5 per cent directly interested financially in maintaining the exorbitant tariff on woolen goods, and of those 5 per cent perhaps less than 1 per cent got 95 per cent of the spoils. And yet every citizen must have woolen garments and blankets. Thus it is that the vast majority of the people pay tribute to the syndicate of greed, and this iniquitous trust which forces shoddy upon the workers of our land instead of good woolen cloth has caused to be added to the silent occupants of our cemeteries thousands of victims.

In Rhode Island we have an abundance of child labor, and if a man will study the Rhode Island statistics he will learn some interesting things. These statistics are gotten up by Republicans, and no Democrat has had, or perhaps ever will have, a chance to participate in the making of them, owing to the archaic constitution of Rhode Island and its rotten borough system which denies representative government to the people.

When these statistics are studied, we find an absence of the vaunted prosperity of which we hear so much. Would that we had an abundance of prosperity. I would like to see Rhode Island overflowing with milk and honey by reason of this protective tariff, but it is not. I want to call your attention to these facts: In the industrial statistics of Rhode Island for 1908, compiled entirely by Republican hands, and therefore the more to be quoted by Democrats, we note the wages paid in the textile industries to be $8 to $9 a week for men in cotton goods; $9 to $10 a week in cotton small wares; $8 to $9 a week in dyeing and finishing textiles; $11 to $12 a week in hosiery and knit goods; $9 to $10 a week in silk and silk goods; and $10 to $11 a week in worsted and woolen goods.

In those same statistics are more significant columns which tell the story of how the people of Rhode Island, working in the mills, are able to keep body and soul together. It is a sordid story. It is a story that appeals to human sympathy. It is a story that makes us feel that there ought to be some remedy, and some way by which the American workingman, seeking to keep his family in comfort, seeking to provide for them the ordinary necessities of life, should not be compelled to drive his wife into the mill and to drive his child into the mill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But those statistics tell the story. They tell it more eloquently than any man could tell it. They tell the story of how the women receive $6 to $7 a week and the little children $3 to $4 a week in the mill. In a further investigation, conducted in November and December, 1910, by Republican officials, it was found that the wages paid were absolutely unsuited to proper family support unless other members of the family assisted the chief breadwinner. It was shown that a large number of families containing more than three persons are living on less than $10 a week, and that the much-vaunted prosperity of New England mill operatives is made up, not by decent wages paid to any one individual, but by the combined earning capacity of practically the entire household who have come to the age where they are able to work. I believe that the average wage is about $409 a year, and some one in Rhode Island challenged me one night and said, "Is not that a decent wage for an American workingman? What would you have him receive? See what he does with his money and how he builds homes." And when I figured out that $409 a year was $7.80 a week, I concluded that if they had built homes they must have been made a present of the lumber.

I will here incorporate in my remarks the tables sustaining what I have said. These tables are taken from the Twenty-second Annual Report of the Commissioner of Industrial Statistics, pages 376 and 377, made to the Rhode Island General Assembly at its January session in 1909:

Number of wage earners and average weekly earnings of men, women, and children.

	All wage earners.			Men.		
	Number in specified week.	Per cent of all wage earners.	Average weekly earnings.	Number in specified week.	Per cent of all men wage earners.	Average weekly earnings.
Textiles.			*Dollars.*			*Dollars.*
Cotton goods	25,698	20.4	7 to 8	12,010	15.0	8 to 9
Cotton small wares	3,146	2.5	7 to 8	986	1.2	9 to 10
Dyeing and finishing textiles	11,048	8.8	7 to 8	7,221	9.0	8 to 9
Hosiery and knit goods	2,031	1.6	7 to 8	486	.6	11 to 12
Silk and silk goods	1,550	1.2	7 to 8	666	.8	9 to 10
Woolen and worsted goods	25,757	20.5	8 to 9	13,181	16.5	10 to 11

Number of wage earners and average weekly earnings of men, women, and children—Continued.

	Women.			Children.		
	Number in specified week.	Per cent of all women wage earners.	Average weekly earnings.	Number in specified week.	Per cent of all children wage earners.	Average weekly earnings.
			Dollars.			*Dollars.*
Cotton goods	11,655	29.3	6 to 7	2,033	34.0	3 to 4
Cotton small wares	1,962	4.9	7 to 8	198	3.3	4 to 5
Dyeing and finishing textiles	3,257	8.2	6 to 7	570	9.5	4 to 5
Hosiery and knit goods	1,439	3.6	6 to 7	106	1.8	4 to 5
Silk and silk goods	829	2.1	7 to 8	55	.9	4 to 5
Woolen and worsted goods	10,666	26.9	7 to 8	1,910	31.9	3 to 4

Considering tariff commissions, it is well to consider the Tariff Commission of 1883 and its work. This Tariff Commission of 1883 traveled 7,000 miles, visited 29 cities, examined more than 600 witnesses, took 2,625 pages of testimony, and then recommended a reduction of tariff duties of from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. Of course, their recommendations were disregarded, and in the tariff bill that was subsequently framed there was a substitution of specific for ad valorem rates, and the revision was so cunningly performed that in the end higher duties were enacted than had been in the old tariff bill. After the labors of the commission and the work of the Finance Committee in considering the bill based on their recommendations, the cotton manufacturers appeared before the committee and told them what they wanted, and their orders were obeyed. That brings me to the consideration of the present Tariff Commission, whose existence hangs by a very slender thread. A few lines in the Payne-Aldrich tariff law are responsible for its existence. The commissioners are personally appointed by the President, and answer to him and not to Congress.

Now, I want to call your attention to what the chairman of this board said at a banquet in New York on the 8th of December, 1910. This information I get from the Worcester Evening Post of September 1, 1911. I think it is well worth listening to. On this occasion Chairman Emery said:

> There are certain things that are very difficult to get, and one thing that according to the platform of the Republican Party—and incidentally that does not mean anything to me except that I have been given the job according to that platform—is to try to get the cost of production. I thank you all, gentlemen, that you did not laugh. [Laughter.] I frankly say right here that this idea of settling things on cost alone by any mathematical or algebraical or geometric ratio or problem or theory is all nonsense. You must not think I am joking about this thing, but there is a joke about it, and the joke is this: I have no power whatsoever. The Tariff Board has no power. There is really no such thing as a Tariff Board. The law says that for certain purposes the President may employ such persons as he sees fit. I am one of such persons. That is all.

This is the Tariff Board that had no right, no power, no authority to go into the factories and get the information in the way that it ought to be obtained. What credence is to be placed in the statement of a manufacturer who, listening to the humble petition of the Tariff Board commissioner, gives him some off-hand information? That manufacturer ought to be put under oath, and every book in the establishment ought to be open to the careful examination of the tariff commissioners, and under this law no such thing was done. And a real tariff commission would inquire about wages, and the capital stock, and the dividends paid, and the water in the stock, the dividends on which were being ground out of the souls and bodies of underpaid men, anemic women, and starving children.

I want to introduce at this time a succinct history of Schedule K. Here it is:

[Revised and reprinted from Worcester Evening Post, Sept. 1, 1911.]

A HISTORY OF SCHEDULE K.

April, 1866: The woolgrowers and wool manufacturers meet at Washington, D. C., and recommend to Congress a tariff on wool and wool goods.

March 2, 1867: A Republican Congress passes a woolen tariff law substantially the same as that recommended the year before by the woolgrowers and manufacturers.

January, 1880: Agitation for a revision of the tariff. The National Woolgrowers' Association opposes any change in Schedule K, but favors a tariff commission.

February, 1880: The president and secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers interview the President of the United States and obtain assurances as to the personnel of the new tariff commission.

March, 1880: The National Association of Wool Manufacturers recommends the passage of the tariff-commission bill without amendment.

July, 1880: The National Association of Wool Manufacturers circulates among manufacturers a petition which says:

"That the manufacturer should have a protective duty sufficient to offset the high cost of labor, interest, and taxes; that the present tariff (Schedule K) should continue until special and minute information from experts shall indicate the changes that can safely be made; that the best method of obtaining the required information is through the Eaton Tariff Commission."

May 15, 1882: A tariff commission authorized by act of Congress.

May, 1882: John L. Hayes, secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, appointed president of the Tariff Commission. Later he is made chairman of the subcommittee to prepare the woolen and worsted schedules.

1882: John L. Hayes, secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and president of the United States Tariff Commission, addresses, as secretary, the tariff commission of which he is president, and recommends a schedule of duties on woolens.

December, 1882: Report of the tariff commission sent to Congress.

March 3, 1883: Tariff bill passed increasing some rates in Schedule K and making reductions that did not help the consumer.

October 1, 1890: The McKinley bill is passed by a Republican Congress increasing duties on wool goods. The duty on worsted tops manufactured by William Whitman, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, is made equal to the duty on finished cloths.

August 27, 1894: The Wilson bill, passed by a Democratic Congress, becomes a law, revising Schedule K, with free wool and ad valorem duties on goods.

March, 1897: S. N. D. North, secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, is admitted to the secret sessions of the Senate Finance Committee during the framing of the Dingley bill. On April 4, 1897, Secretary North writes to William Whitman:

"I am the only person whom the committee allows in its meetings."

June 2, 1897: William Whitman writes to Secretary North, who is attending the tariff sessions of the Finance Committee:

"We all depend upon you to watch closely our interests."

July 10, 1897: William Whitman writes to Secretary North, who is attending the tariff sessions of the Finance Committee:

"I depend on you, dress goods, yarns, and tops."

July 25, 1897: The Dingley bill, with Schedule K practically unchanged, becomes a law.

1898: The National Association of Wool Manufacturers presents $5,000 to S. N. D. North, its secretary, for services in connection with the revision of the tariff.

June, 1908: Agitation for a revision of the tariff. The Republican national convention at Chicago pledges the party to revise the tariff to equal the difference between the foreign and domestic cost of production plus a profit. This is practically the same as the proposition laid down by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in July, 1880, for the revision of the tariff.

September 26, 1908: William H. Taft, Republican candidate for President, makes the following pledge in a speech at St. Paul:

"I am here to plight the faith of the Republican Party, in accordance with its platform, that the revision will be honest and exact, according to the measure stated in the platform."

October 15, 1908: Seven men from the National Wool Growers' Association, and five men headed by William Whitman, from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, meet at the Palmer House in Chicago, and adopt a resolution that—

"In the coming revision of the tariff the present duties, both on wool and woolen goods, be maintained without reduction."

May 4, 1909: Senator Dolliver in the Senate begins the insurgent attack on Schedule K.

August 5, 1909: A Republican Congress passes and President Taft signs the Payne-Aldrich bill, which leaves Schedule K practically unchanged.

September 17, 1909: President Taft, at Winona, Minn., makes the following confession that it was impossible to revise Schedule K, because of the combine of woolgrowers and wool manufacturers:

"Mr. PAYNE, in the House, and Mr. Aldrich, in the Senate, 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, were 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. * * * Allowing the woolen schedule to remain where it is is not a compliance with the terms of the platform as I interpret it."

April 8, 1910: William Whitman, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, before the Massachusetts Cost of Living Commission, says:

"I do not know any reason why President Taft should know any more about the wool tariff than does the gentleman who recently refused to receive Mr. Roosevelt."

August 20, 1910: President Taft, in a letter to Congressman WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, states that—

"The precise difference in the cost of production sought for is not capable of definite ascertainment" and "all that even the most scientific person can do is to exercise his best judgment in reaching a conclusion."

October 17, 1910: William Whitman, president of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, spends four hours with the Tariff Board at Washington and then issues the following statement:

"I opposed the Tariff Commission very strongly, but the Tariff Board is a very different thing. I want to do what I can to show my appreciation of President Taft. I believe he means well and is doing well, and I am ready to meet him half way."

February 1, 1911: Banquet of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at Washington, attended by 35 stand-pat Senators and Representatives, and two members of the Tariff Board, Chairman Emery and J. B. Reynolds. William M. Wood, president of the American Woolen Co., said on this occasion:

"If all the schedules of the tariff were as well balanced as Schedule K it would be the most remarkable document, next to the Constitution of the United States, that the human mind has ever produced."

August 15, 1911: Passage of the Underwood-La Follette bill to revise Schedule K, and providing for duties of 29 per cent on wool and 49 per cent on wool goods.

August 16, 1911: President Taft vetoes the Underwood-La Follette bill to revise Schedule K on the ground that the Tariff Board has not yet reported.

This history of Schedule K, which we have now brought down to date, suggests the question: How long are the people to be burdened by legislation for the special interests of woolgrowers and worsted manufacturers? Is the woolen tariff of 1867, made more indefensible by each Republican revision, now to have a new lease of life? Particular attention is invited to the similarity of the conditions now and in 1882, nearly 30 years ago.

Then, as now, the people were clamoring for relief from a burdensome tariff.

Then, as now, the proposition was advanced by the standpatters to revise the tariff on a basis of the difference between the foreign and domestic cost of production.

Then, as now, the standpatters urged that the only right way was to refer the question to a commission.

Then, as now, a tariff commission or board was formed.

Then the Tariff Commission fell under the influence of the special interests.

Has that occurred now?

Then the result was a revision of the tariff which gave the consumer no relief.

Is that what is in store for us now? The people must decide.

Speaking of wages, I have an important table here which I think will interest you. We have been told that under a low tariff business would go to the dogs in Rhode Island, that workingmen would be thrown out of employment, that mills would shut down. Well, we can only judge the future and the present by the past. In 1846 we had the Walker tariff, which lasted 15 years, and which was commended by some of our good Republican brothers in later days, and their comments I will read to you. That Walker tariff of 1846 was 25 per cent, and it gave such a revenue that all parties combined to reduce the tariff, and so they brought it down to 20 per cent in the tariff law of 1857. In the decade covered from 1850 to 1860, operating under these two tariffs, cotton manufactures in Rhode Island increased 176.1 and woolens 87.1, and in 1857, when one of the Rhode Island Members of this House, Benjamin B. Thurston, and all the Members from Massachusetts voted to reduce the tariff from 25 per cent to 20 per cent, the Representatives of the Western States denounced their action as being one in favor of the manufacturers. Standing here to-day I want to say that I am proud to follow in the footsteps of that Rhode Island Representative, and I will vote to reduce the tariff to a basis that will consider the consumer as well as the manufacturer. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I will now quote from some Republicans who looked with favor upon the low tariffs of 1846 and 1857. The Republican Senator—afterwards Vice President—Henry Wilson, in a speech in the Senate in 1857, said:

I wish to say to the Senate and the country that the Commonwealth I represent has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economic administration of the Government; for a free list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industries; and for such an adjustment of the duties on the products of other nations that come in direct competition with the products of American capital, labor, and skill as shall impose the least burden upon that capital, labor, and skill.

In the same speech he said:

We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manila, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactures can be admitted duty free or at a mere nominal duty without injuring to any extent any considerable productive interest of the country.

The Republican Senator Allison, in this House, March 24, 1870, said:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect as any that we have ever had.

James A. Garfield, afterwards President, said in this House in 1878, in answer to the charge that the year of 1860 had not been one of prosperity:

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was one of peace and general prosperity. Yet to suit a theory of finance we are told that 1860 was a year of great distress and depression of business equaled only by the distress of the present year. I hold that the facts I have recited establish, in so far as anything can be established by statistics, that the year 1860 was a year not only of general peace, but of very general prosperity, in the United States.

James G. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, said:

The tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue, and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition.

Those who wail and lament and cry over proposed tariff reform had their prototypes in England prior to 1842; they tore their hair over the prospect of the protection system of centuries being abandoned, and prophesied disaster to industry. Parliament was flooded with petitions of protest. What was the result?

Forty years after tariff reform came in England the net earnings of the people increased by $86.50 a year; where there

had been three paupers before there were only two; estates rose on an average $1,700; before tariff reform there were 106,000 taxable incomes in Great Britain; after 40 years these had increased to 320,000. The wages of carpenters, bricklayers, masons, miners, cotton and woolen workers advanced.

Here is a table prepared for me by the Bureau of the Census, Division of Manufactures:

The following table shows the percentages of increase in wages in the cotton goods and in the woolen and worsted goods industries for each decade from 1850 to 1909:

Rhode Island.

	Cotton goods.	Woolen and worsted goods.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
1850-1860	40.2	163.1
1860-1870	84.0	167.7
1870-1880	7.3	29.4
1880-1890	39.0	68.2
1890-1900	2.8	6.6
1899-1909	46.9	73.7

The tremendous advance in the wages of textile operatives in Rhode Island made under the low tariffs of 1846 and 1857 in force during the period from 1850 to 1860 should silence those who attempt to play upon the fears of their employees. What say my Republican brethren to this? Will they explain why the 25 per cent tariff of 1846 and the 20 per cent tariff of 1857 caused an increase of 163.1 per cent from 1850 to 1860 in the wages of woolen operatives? Will they explain why the high Dingley tariff of 1897, in operation until 1909, did not exercise as good an effect on wages? If low tariffs destroy industry, why did the cotton-goods industry increase 176.1 per cent and the woolen industry increase 87.1 per cent under low tariffs?

New England need never fear low tariffs if her industries are honestly capitalized, efficiently managed, and the machinery kept up to standard. No tariff crutch can help a decayed mill. Let us congratulate ourselves that the Tariff Board has seen one light; it reports:

Wages are much higher in the United States, but wages are in themselves no necessary indication of relative cost of production. Frequently it is found that high wages and low labor cost go together.

I must not close without a specific instance of the outrageous robbery of Schedule K. I will here incorporate an editorial from the Providence Tribune, under date of June 18, 1911:

THE TARIFF ON A SUIT OF CLOTHES.

A reduction of 5 cents a pound in the duties on woolens doesn't seem to amount to much on a suit of clothes weighing 4 or 5 pounds. But those who think that is all there is in the talk of ameliorating the hardships inflicted by Schedule K should take note of the suit of clothes analyzed by Chairman UNDERWOOD in his highly entertaining report from the Committee on Ways and Means submitting the bill to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures thereof.

The material for this suit is a comparatively cheap cloth for the making of ordinary suits of men's clothing worn by the great masses of the people. It is known in the woolen trade as "an all-worsted fancy fabric from half-blood wool," weighing 9½ ounces to the yard and 56 to 58 inches wide. In England it costs at wholesale 77 cents a yard, and the freight to New York is 1 cent a yard. On this fabric the Payne tariff levies a specific compensatory duty of 44 cents a pound, or 23 cents a yard. In addition, there is an ad valorem duty of 50 per cent, or 38 cents a yard, making the total duty 61 cents a yard, equal to 78 per cent of the import price. As it takes about 3½ yards of this cloth to make a suit of clothes, this makes the tariff tax on such a suit $2.14; and, of course, the price of the corresponding or competing American fabric is increased by the amount of that duty.

Now, the contention is, as everybody knows, that tariff duties are levied, not for the enrichment of manufacturers, but for the protection of the laborer. And yet the labor cost in the cloth here described is only about 25 per cent of the total production cost, so that the protective duty of 78 per cent is more than three times the entire labor cost. Observe the farce of it.

Chairman UNDERWOOD estimates that the total annual consumption of this cloth in this country is not less than 171,200,000 yards. "The tariff tax of 61 cents per yard means, therefore, to say nothing of any increase of tax as it passes down through the hands of the manufacturer, jobber, and retailer, not less than $104,400,000, or, say, $100,000,000 per year paid by the people." Of this great sum the Treasury receives only $15,500,000. The remaining $85,000,000 is taken from the people by the Government in the performance of the Republican pledge guaranteeing "reasonable profits to the American manufacturer."

No wonder that even the Republicans are taking back all the pretty things they said about the Payne-Aldrich tariff and Schedule K; it is no longer the "best tariff ever"; they now see flaws in it. The Democratic Party saw flaws in it from the beginning; the people with shoddy on their backs realized its petty larceny characteristics and sent a Democratic majority to this House to enact proper legislation correcting the evils complained of. We have corrected it once, only to be turned down in our efforts by the President. We present our bill again, confident that it is right, that it is what the people want. Let the President veto it if he will. If he does he invites the veto of the people at the polls next November.

The Democratic Party believes that it is absolute robbery to impose upon ninety millions of people a tariff that enriches the few, gives but a scanty wage to labor, and adds to the consumer's burden. We must never forget that Garfield said that the "Republic was opportunity." Where shall the opportunity be if millions are to be multiplied in the hands of the few by virtue of tariff legislation? Where shall our young men turn for advantage and opportunity if they see every industry controlled by corporate greed, and what incentive shall be furnished to patriotic impulse if they see the degrading spectacle of Congress listening not to the people but obeying the mandates of the favored classes? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MAGUIRE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, three years ago the Congress of the United States spent much time and energy in writing a new tariff law. When the work was finished the country was asked to accept it from its authors as a wise piece of legislation, and it was insisted that the result as enacted into law was in compliance with promises previously made. But the people refused to approve the work, because upon investigation it became apparent that the same old structure, the Dingley tariff law, remained in the new Payne-Aldrich law, with very slight alteration. Disappointed in their public servants, the people called again for a real revision downward, and this time the power to revise the tariff was given into other hands to carry out. This is therefore part of the work in which this House is now engaged, and I feel sure that when this Congress shall have completed the work of rebuilding our revenue system upon a broad and stable basis the people to whom we are responsible will find no difficulty in recognizing a genuine revision of the tariff downward, and they will cheerfully commend their servants in this House. The men who are responsible for the legislation passed here and who have the courage to remain true to their trust will merit and, I believe, will receive the continued confidence of the public.

The tariff question, Mr. Chairman, has always been one of the great questions in our national politics in this country. It doubtless will always remain so, at least until some other and more satisfactory method of raising a much larger part of the needed revenue for the maintenance of the Government is adopted. The tariff is, of course, primarily a question of taxation. Our people have always watched with distrust and jealousy the power that levied and the hand that collected their taxes for whatever purpose they might have been necessary. It is not strange, then, that the people of this country are studying more closely than ever the problems of taxation.

The enormous sums collected through the customshouses to-day and which must ultimately be paid as taxes by the consumers of the country almost stagger the imagination. In 1846 only $27,000,000 were collected from customs duties, in 1890 we collected $229,000,000, in 1900 we collected $233,000,000, and in 1910 the amount collected was something like $333,000,000. In addition to the customs we also collected about $290,000,000 from internal-revenue sources.

Taxation is always and everywhere a burden whether it be direct or indirect. We have used at different times both methods, but for the most part the indirect taxation. In the earlier years of the Republic the work of devising revenue policies was largely left to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such men as Hamilton and Gallatin formulated the fiscal policy of the Government in their times and led the way for Congress. Later the great report of Robert J. Walker, as Secretary of the Treasury, formed the basis of the famous Walker tariff bill of 1846. The history of our revenue system shows it to have been one of considerable uncertainty and instability. The amount of revenue needed annually and collected has been increasing rapidly in recent years, and the appalling expenditures must necessarily impress the thoughtful men of our times with the fact that there is a great field here for practical and efficient economy in the administration of Government. There have been times when it seemed necessary to levy special war taxes, and again at other times the problem was how to get rid of the accumulating surplus of public revenues, and at still other times our Nation was confronted with deficits.

Internal and customs receipts and expense of collecting by per cents for the years following.

[From Report of Secretary of Treasury, 1911.]

Year ended June 30—	Internal revenue.		Customs.	
	Receipts.	Cost of collecting.	Receipts.	Cost of collecting.
	Dollars.	*Per cent.*	*Dollars.*	*Per cent.*
1865	209,461,215.25	.18	84,928,260.00	6.39
1870	184,899,756.49	3.92	194,538,374.44	3.20
1875	110,007,493.58	3.89	157,167,722.35	4.47
1880	124,009,373.92	2.95	186,522,064.60	3.23
1885	112,498,725.54	3.42	181,471,989.34	3.58
1890	142,606,705.81	2.65	229,668,584.57	2.98
1895	143,421,672.02	2.62	152,158,617.45	4.43
1900	295,327,926.76	1.51	233,164,871.16	3.20
1905	234,095,740.85	1.85	261,798,856.91	3.48
1910	289,833,519.45	1.73	333,683,445.03	3.20
1911	322,529,200.79	1.55	314,497,071.24	3.50

At present the chief sources of revenue are, first, from customs which, up to June 30, 1910, as estimated, amounted to $333,683,445.03, and from internal revenue sources for the same time $289,933,519.45, which also includes the corporation tax. Of the total amount collected from these two sources 53½ per cent was collected from customs duties laid upon articles imported into this country. The subjects of taxation under our present system includes every possible and conceivable article of consumption, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, except a very few imports now admitted free of duty. Up to this time there has been little dispute among men as to the wisdom of raising a portion of our public revenues by means of a tax on imports. They do not agree, however, upon what proportion of the total necessary revenue should be levied as import duty. The great tariff issue to-day is whether the Congress shall or ought to use the taxing power to levy tariff duties solely for revenue, or shall that power be used to continue a policy called the protective system, under which raising revenue becomes incidental and the industrial welfare of the manufacturing interests of the country, as understood by its advocates, becomes primarily important. The one theory of the tariff insists that duties should be levied for necessary revenue only, and so levied with respect to rates and articles affected as to bring about an equitable distribution of the burden that must be borne by the people to maintain the Government. This theory is based upon the assumption that if no revenue were needed by the Government then no duties should be levied for any ulterior purpose.

England once left the tax on tea used by the Colonists, not so much because she wanted the revenue as because she wanted to maintain the principle as it seemed to her which was involved.

If no revenue were needed, would the advocates of the protective theory justify the levying of duties on imports for the sole purpose of prohibiting the importation of goods? In other words, if we could remove the necessity for revenue, which has operated to obscure the workings of the protective system, would that system then be able to maintain itself? To do so it would have to ask and secure the unrestricted privilege of exercising the taxing power of the Government for its own benefit and for private purposes alone. I will venture to say that such a use of the taxing power, even if it were constitutional, would never be tolerated by the people of this country.

The theory of protection insists that taxes in the form of import duties should be levied for the advantage of the manufacturers, and so levied with respect to rates and articles that the system will effectually protect the few for whose benefit it is designed. Revenue is secondary and incidental in a protective tariff. An example of the extremity to which such a system goes is found in the McKinley law of 1890, in which a bounty was given of 2 cents a pound on sugar. This was the boldest step taken up to that time, and yet it represents the inevitable result of the policy of special privilege.

The beneficiaries, the Sugar Trust, at that time were not willing, as other beneficiaries of protection were, to be content with collecting the tribute themselves from the consumers. They were powerful enough to ask and secure the disgraceful concession from the Government that this tribute should first be collected by the agents of the Government itself and at public expense, paid into the public Treasury, and then, in good hard cash paid out of the Treasury directly into the coffers of the trust. This example, however, illustrates the practical difference between the bounty system and the protective tariff system. In the one case the beneficiaries are permitted to collect the tax themselves from the consumer of the protected articles, and in the other case the Government first collects the tax from all the people and pays it into the pockets of the beneficiaries.

High protection can not produce revenue because it is not its purpose to do so. When a rate drops to the revenue point it ceases to be primarily protective. Protection as a system is effective only when it so completely restricts importation of the protected articles that there is very little or no competition from such imported goods. A tariff is a tax always, and the consumer pays it whether it be a revenue tariff or a protective tariff. The essential difference lies in who gets the tax money finally. The revenue tariff goes largely and at once to the Treasury of the United States, and the consumer has the consolation, at least, of knowing that he has contributed his portion to the expenses of the Government; while the protective tariff goes largely and indirectly to the protected manufacturers. The process by which this is done is very simple.

The manufacturer insists that he needs a certain amount of protection. The necessary tariff wall is raised by legislation to comply with his wishes. Then, finding themselves secure against competition from without, the manufacturers proceed to organize their line of industry into a noncompetitive combination. Then orders are given to limit the production and the output of the mills and factories, and finally they fix their own prices to the American consumers. With competition shut out no revenue, therefore, can come to the Government, and the combination, sheltered behind the protective wall, advance their prices in amount equal to the duty levied, and then they collect for themselves the duty which was levied by Congress, not for revenue, but for protection. This is why the manufacturer enjoys the system of protection. This, then, is the "modus operandi" of that benevolent protective system which was fastened upon the country years ago and which is to-day making a last desperate struggle for existence. Nominally and originally protection meant simply to keep out foreign-made goods, and home competition in our own markets was relied upon to protect the consumers from excessive prices. But in practice and for many years protection has meant quite another thing. Now protection is construed to mean that all foreign competitive goods are to be shut out, so that the American manufacturer may proceed to exploit the American market by means of trusts and combinations and monopolies. Protection in operation, therefore, is a two-pronged weapon. It denies to the consumer the advantages of foreign competition and at the same time compels him to buy in the markets of monopoly. No one would deny prosperity to American manufacturers if they can secure it upon the basis of merit and without the special aid of the Government, but they should not ask nor be given by law the right to collect for their own private ends the tax which the Congress levies for public purposes.

Let us examine into the platforms of the two great political parties and some of the utterances of the representative men of these parties for the past 20 years and see what they reveal on the tariff system. In 1888 the platform upon which Mr. Harrison was elected said:

> We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection—the protective system must be maintained.

In compliance with that platform the party passed the McKinley tariff law of 1890, which levied a tariff of 91.78 per cent on the average on the woolen schedule, and even went as high as 138 per cent in some instances. This was a heavy increase over the then existing tariff law—the Mills law of 1888—which levied a rate of 40 per cent ad valorem. The next tariff law passed was the Wilson law of 1894, which levied an average ad valorem of 47.84 per cent on woolen manufactures and put raw wool on the free list. Two years after the Wilson law was passed the Republican platform of 1896 contained the following plank:

> We renew and emphasize our allegiance to the policy of protection—true American policy—we are not pledged to any particular schedules. The ruling and uncompromising principle is the protection and development of labor and industry. The country demands a right settlement, and then it wants a rest.

Mr. McKinley was elected with that plank as a part of the platform, and the Dingley tariff bill of 1897 was enacted into law as a fulfillment of the policy. In this law the woolen schedule was put back practically as it was fixed in the McKinley law of 1890, and the law as a whole was an extremely protective measure. The majority report of the Ways and Means Committee which brought in the Dingley bill says:

> The manufactured lumber which was put on the free list by the tariff of 1894 (Wilson law) has been transferred to the dutiable list as an act of justice to this large industry.

Also:

> Such articles as wool, lumber, burlaps, bags, and salt have been restored to the dutiable list, from which they should never have been removed.

The protective system has always showed great solicitude for the great industries, such as the Lumber Trust and the Woolen Trust, and others. Not even salt, they say, should be free. Again, in the platform of 1900, the Republican Party renewed its faith in the policy of protection. In 1904 their platform says that protection is a "cardinal policy of the Republican Party," and here, for the first time, we find a specific meaning of protection. The platform says:

The measure of protection should always at least equal the difference in cost of production at home and abroad.

It will be noted that this attempt to measure the amount of protection has been repeated in a more definite and pronounced way in the platform of the Republican Party adopted at Chicago in 1908. After promising to revise the tariff by a special session of Congress, it says:

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

Mr. Taft was elected upon this platform, and later the Payne-Aldrich tariff law was enacted in 1909 as the latest authentic legislative expression and interpretation of that extremely novel theory of protection. Understanding the "reasonable profit" theory as it was doubtless intended to be understood, the framers of the present tariff law left the woolen schedule unmolested just where it had been for 20 years. And this in spite of the notorious and unfair discriminations in Schedule K, and in spite of the demands of the consumers of the whole country. To those who framed that bill it doubtless seemed necessary to leave the woolen schedule remain with an average ad valorem of 90.10 per cent in order to insure a "reasonable profit" to the manufacturers—or the Woolen Trust.

In no instance, perhaps, is the injustice of the indirect system of taxation so well illustrated as in the present woolen schedule. From the standpoint of the tax collector it is more desirable to levy taxes indirectly, because the taxes are then mingled with the goods purchased by the consumers and the tax element of the cost is paid in disguise. Taxation always diffuses itself along the line of least resistance. The poor people have the least power to resist, and so the burden of indirect taxation bears more heavily on them; while the rich have more power to resist and they bear the least burden. Again, indirect taxes are more expensive to collect and thus less of the total colleted ever reaches the Treasury. Furthermore, in this country this system has brought about the concentration of business in a few hands and has promoted monopoly by granting special favors and privileges. A tax on consumption is in effect a per capita tax, and as such the families of the poor, if they get all they should have to eat and wear, pay actually more than those of the rich. How unjust a $10 per capita tax would be in this country. The poor man with eight children might pay a hundred dollars and the rich man might not pay more than ten. Yet this is the effect of a tax on articles of consumption. Such a tax that operates through consumption affects directly human life, human comforts, and happiness. John Stuart Mill says that indirect taxation violates two of the cannons of taxation. One is that it takes from the taxpayer more than it puts into the Public Treasury, and the second is that it violates the principle of equality, because it fails to take in proportion to the ability to pay. Mr. W. F. Dutton in the American Journal of Politics estimates that the cost of living is increased 25 per cent by indirect taxes. Benjamin Harrison realized the inequality of the present system of taxation when he said:

We must establish, and at once, a system that shall equalize the tax burdens. The men of wealth in our great communities should lead the movement.

A distinguished Representative of California, when speaking in Congress on the Wilson bill in behalf of the income tax, said:

I am in favor of the income tax as proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means because it is better than the system of taxation now prevailing; because the burdens which are laid by the income tax, wherever they may ultimately fall, are all for public uses, while under the tariff system three parts of the burden are laid for the enrichment of private individuals to every one part that is collected for public use.

If the taxes now collected from customs of over three hundred millions a year were laid as direct taxation and demanded in the same unfair proportion as they are now paid the system would not be tolerated by the taxpayers, no matter upon what theory it was advocated. The hand of the taxgatherer could then be plainly seen and resisted. But by the system of indirect taxation the phantom hand of the taxgatherer is concealed. We may well ask why it is now tolerated. If a man buys a dollar's worth of sugar he pays from 38 to 40 cents tariff, or about $1.90 a sack. On a pair of shoes he pays about 50 cents tariff. On a knife valued at 10 cents he will pay 9 cents tariff, one one valued at 30 cents he will pay a tariff of 32 cents; on a $4 blanket he will pay over $2 duty. And in all these cases it must be remembered that the large part of the amount paid because of the tariff goes not to the Government, but to the protected industries to make up their "reasonable profit."

Realizing that we can not entirely dispense with the policy of raising a part at least of the needed revenue for the support of the Government by a tax upon articles of common consumption, my investigations have lead me to the conclusion that a just system of taxation ought not place so large a part of the burden as is now imposed upon such articles as all the people need to feed, clothe, and shelter them. We can not, of course, carry on the extensive functions of this great Government without raising in some way a large amount of revenue. I would be the last person to favor curtailing the necessary and legitimate functions of the Federal Government. I would not favor retrenchmen at the sacrifice of efficiency.

I am, indeed, anxious that ours shall be the best and most efficient Government on earth. But while I would not hamper any department of the Government in giving the best possible service to the people of this Republic, still I would not have one cent of taxation levied unnecessarily, even for public purposes, and certainly not for special privileges or for private enterprises. Before beginning to lay any burdens upon the taxpayers of this country for any purpose, I should insist upon a systematic and wise economy in the administration of the Government. In my judgment, it is a reckless and ruinous policy that raises a great surplus of revenue. Such a policy is a public menace, because it offers a temptation that leads to extravagance on the part of those in charge of the Government, and they might easily be persuaded to devise unnecessary and unjustifiable ways to spend the surplus. I hope and trust that the time is not far away when this Government will be able, under a constitutional amendment, if necessary, to enact an income-tax law by which the larger portion of the necessary revenue may be collected.

There is already an amendment proposed which, when ratified by three-fourths of the States, will give Congress the power to levy and collect an income tax as an indirect tax and without apportionment. I believe it will not be long until the requisite number of States, which is 36, will have ratified this amendment. Thirty of the States have already done so. Pending the ultimate ratification of such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, Congress is not without power to lay and collect indirect taxes as it may seem wise to do.

To this end the Ways and Means Committee submitted a bill which this House passed about a week ago whereby large incomes will be compelled to bear their just share of the burdens of taxation. The Supreme Court held the corporation tax law constitutional, and the excise tax bill which is now in the Senate simply extends the provisions of the law to include individuals, firms, and copartnerships.

This bill proposes to levy a tax of 1 per cent upon all incomes in excess of $5,000 derived from the carrying on of any business or occupation. It is thought by those who have given the matter careful study that this bill as drawn, in view of the opinion of the Supreme Court on the corporation tax law, will not be subject to the constitutional objection to an income tax such as was pointed out by the court in the decision of the Pollock case. If this bill is approved, as I believe it will be, it is estimated that it will bring in about $60,000,000 the first year of its operation. This will offset approximately the loss of revenue suffered by the proposed free-sugar bill and thereby benefit the great consuming public and also shift the burdens of taxation to those whose salaries or incomes can well afford to bear a more equitable share of the public taxation. Such a tax, in my judgment, is the fairest and the most equitable of all taxes, because it compels every man to contribute in proportion to what he has. It will place the burden upon those who are most able to bear it and will lift the weight of taxation from those least able to stand it. Such a tax will take from all according to their ability to spend rather than in proportion to their ability to consume. It will tax what men have accumulated above what they need rather than what men are striving to accumulate for their physical needs and comforts.

After raising a large part of the revenues by an income tax, I would collect such part of the public revenues as seems wise by internal-revenue taxation, as we do to-day, upon the articles which are not classed as necessaries. For the balance of the taxes I would levy import duties, but purely for revenue necessary to make up the total revenue required to defray the

expenses of the Government economically administered. In levying such import duties I would deny protection, as such, to any article of production or class of articles. I would so fix the rates that were found to be necessary to produce the sufficient amount of revenue as to make the burden lightest on articles of general use and heaviest on articles of luxury. Food, clothing, and shelter should be taxed as lightly as possible. Luxuries should bear the maximum revenue rates, but no rate in any case should be prohibitive. It must yield revenue to be justified. Montesquieu, a noted French political philosopher, makes a classification that commends itself to the standards of justice. He says that necessities ought not to be taxed; that articles classed as useful should be taxed a little and superfluous articles should be taxed heavily.

A vital principle which the protective theory has always ignored is that taxes on imports should be so laid that when they are actually paid they shall be paid into the Public Treasury and not to private interests by way of enhanced values. The argument that the foreigner pays the tariff is no longer seriously advanced in support of this particular method of collecting revenue. It therefore must not be overlooked that the consumer of the articles taxed will ultimately pay the tariff to some one. Whether the consumers will pay much or little will depend, therefore, upon whether they pay it as a protective or a revenue tariff. If they pay it as a revenue tariff, then the needs of the Government will determine the amount they are called upon to contribute; but if as a protective tariff, then the consumers are at the mercy of those who control the output and fix the price of the protected article. To draw up a tariff bill such as will be purely a revenue measure and which will do exact justice as to classification of rates and items is, of course, impossible; but to get one that will approach these ends is the aim of every tariff-for-revenue advocate. There are many considerations to weigh in reaching the most equitable and satisfactory results. We must know how much revenue should be collected on imports, then what articles shall be subject to duty and at what rate, then what articles should be exempt from duty entirely. It also involves the question as to what is the maximum revenue point for each article and what is the competitive point in the scale of rates. As to rates, the Democratic theory is that ad valorem rates are the fairest and the simplest of application and the most likely to be in harmony with a tariff for revenue.

As to classification of articles and which shall be admitted dutiable and which free, the Democratic national platform of 1908 gives a general and simple guide. The tariff plank of that platform reads as follows:

> We favor immediate revision of the tariff by the reduction of import duties. Articles entering into competition with trust-controlled products should be placed upon the free list; material reductions should be made in the tariff upon the necessaries of life, especially upon articles competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home; and gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis.

In the application of general principles, however, many conditions are found to exist in detail not contemplated by the general rule. It is found necessary to inquire what articles are luxuries, what are necessaries, what are raw materials, what are trust-controlled products, what articles are imported that are not produced here, what articles do we produce in great quantities and what in small quantities; and, too, as to trust products, it is material to inquire whether the article is controlled by a world trust or monopoly. These and many other important considerations must enter into a careful and equitable adjustment of import duties in making up a tariff schedule.

Accepting the verdict rendered by the American people at the polls a year ago last fall as a complete repudation of the high-protective policy, as that policy is exemplified in the Payne-Aldrich law, the party now in control of this House has accepted the responsibility placed upon the Members by the people, and they have set about the task of reducing the enormous burdens of tariff taxation. Their work thus far has commanded the attention and merited the approval of all people who are sincerely in harmony with the struggling taxpayers in their efforts to rid themselves of the effects of that iniquitous system which has been robbing honest labor of the fruits of its toil for the purpose of enriching the few, in whose favor that system has been operated for years.

Thus far this House has accomplished a great good. It has set in motion a plan of economy in the administration of public affairs which is daily revealing the extravagant conditions that have existed in different branches of the Government.

Last summer we passed the free-list bill, which would have been one of the greatest relief measures ever enacted into law if given a trial. The following table shows a few of the gains it would have made over the present law:

Articles.	Present law.	Proposed law.
Farm machinery	15 per cent	Free.
Farm wagons	35 per cent	Do.
Leather boots and shoes	10 per cent	Do.
Harness and saddlery	35 per cent	Do.
Fence wire	¾ cent per pound	Do.
Woven wire	40 per cent	Do.
Lumber	$1.75 to $2.75	Do.
Shingles	50 cents per 1,000	Do.
Laths	20 cents per 1,000	Do.
Sewing machines	30 per cent	Do.
Salt	11 cents per pound	Do.

While the free-list bill, which passed the House by an overwhelming majority, involved a loss in revenues of only about eight millions, on the other hand it would have unburdened the farmers and others of this country to the extent of enormous sums which have been paid as a tariff tribute to the manufacturers and as a bonus, by reason of the present high and unconscionable rates on lumber, farm machinery, and other articles of common use. Farm machinery and other trust-controlled products, which the manufacturers have been shipping abroad and selling in foreign markets for less than here, are certainly able to compete with foreign-made machinery in our home markets without the aid of a tariff. Their own abuse of the protection which they have enjoyed is a condemnation of the whole tendency of a protective tariff. The Government statistics show that in 1890 we exported to foreign countries of farm machinery $3,859,184, and in 1910 our exports had increased to $28,124,033. Such a condition does not indicate that the manufacturers of farm machinery are threatened by foreign competition.

The next great service rendered by this House for the American people in the special session was to revise the schedule on wool and woolen manufactures, designated as Schedule K. The bill passed the Senate in a modified form, but was defeated by Executive veto, leaving the woolen schedule of the Payne-Aldrich law in operation. Still hoping for relief, the same woolen schedule that passed the House last summer has been reintroduced, bearing the same identical rates, and is now before us for consideration. This woolen schedule, though appearing under the names of the Payne-Aldrich law, the Dingley law, and the McKinley law, has remained practically without change, in substance, on the statute books for more than 20 years, and this, too, notwithstanding the fact that it embodies all of the grossest evils and the most cruel discriminations of the whole protective system. It is so bad that even the President admitted, after its passage, that it was "indefensible." The bill which is now before the House makes a reduction in this schedule from 90.10 per cent in the present law to 42.55 per cent. This sweeping reduction of over 50 per cent doubtless will not please the pampered manufacturers and beneficiaries, who have grown into opulence because of the tribute they have collected for two decades under this schedule. But this reduction will be welcomed all over the land by the great mass of men, women, and children who form the devoted, industrious citizenship of our Republic.

They never ask nor do they receive special favors at the hands of the Government. All they ask is to be permitted to live and enjoy the fruits of their own toil. Nor is the reduction of over 50 per cent the only thing accomplished by the proposed woolen schedule. It goes to the root of the evil and eliminates the specific duties and substitutes an ad valorem duty throughout, which is recognized by the leading economists as a fair and equitable duty on textile schedules. To show how unfairly the specific rates discriminate in favor of the rich and against the poor, it is only necessary to take a single example from the present woolen schedule. Woolen blankets valued at 44 cents a pound are subject to a duty of 44 cents specific and 50 per cent ad valorem, which makes a compound rate of 150 per cent; while if valued at 70 cents a pound the same rates prevail and makes a compound rate of only 112 per cent; and if valued at 88 cents a pound the rates are 44 cents and 55 per cent, which make an equivalent ad valorem of 105 per cent. Thus the cheaper blanket pays a rate of 150 per cent and the better one pays only 105 per cent. Again, as to women's and children's dress goods made wholly or in part of wool, if valued at 7 cents per yard the duty is 7 cents and 50 per cent, which makes a combined rate of 150 per cent, but if valued at 24 cents per yard the duty is 8 cents and 50 per cent, or a combined rate of only 83⅓ per cent.

These compensatory and specific rates which have concealed by far the worst vices of the present woolen schedule are abolished in the bill which is being considered by this House. The proposed schedule levies a simple and honest ad valorem rate for revenue of 42.55 per cent on manufactures of wool instead of the Payne-Aldrich rate of over 90 per cent.

Following the passage of the woolen bill last summer the House took up and revised the schedule including cotton manufactured goods. While it was generally believed that this schedule was subject to the same needed revision as the woolen schedule, still its examination confirmed the belief that it, too, was subject to the same unseen methods of eliminating competition and charging over the compensatory rates to the ultimate consumer. This schedule was revised downward with practically the same cut in rates as the woolen manufactures, and had it reached the statute books would have given needed relief to the great body of American consumers.

Although the conscientious efforts of this House last session to reduce the tariff were met at every step with Executive vetoes, still we have not despaired of securing for the people some relief from the injustice of the present system of taxation. The first great tariff work of the present session was the passage by this House of the steel and iron schedule. The American people have been the victims for years of the gigantic Steel Trust, which has been fostered by high protective tariff, and it was left for this House to bring out a bill which has greatly reduced the former unjust and discriminating rates of the steel schedule. No sooner was this schedule passed than the chemical schedule was taken up and revised in rates and classification. Then came the sugar schedule, and here, again, the House repudiated protection and even sacrificed a great revenue-producing item in the interest of cheaper food for the struggling masses. The Sugar Trust has levied tribute upon hungry children for a score of years. They have successfully resisted heretofore all efforts to take from them this special tariff privilege. Not satisfied with shaping legislation, they have even gone to the extent of corrupting customhouse officials.

Now they threaten that this bill will destroy the sugar-beet industry, but no substantial evidence of this effect has been produced. To place sugar on the free list, as this bill has done, may and should operate to cut down the enormous profits of the Sugar Trust, but I refuse to credit the statement that the high tariff is necessary to maintain agricultural industries in the United States. Our farmers receive no share of the large dividends distributed among the stockholders of the Sugar Trust. What the farmer needs is the opportunity to buy in a fair market what his family needs and also the machinery which he must use upon his farm. Then he can produce and afford to sell his products in a fair and open market without contributing the profits which belong to him to those who control and fix the prices of his products and also what he consumes under the present system.

I venture to say that the period of usefulness for the protective system has gone and high protection in this country is doomed. It is undemocratic and un-American. Having imposed itself in the early days as a foster mother to infant industry it has retained its selfish existence by craft, cunning, and intimidation. It had its inception in national optimism, and at one time was a factor in the growing nationality, but it has long since degraded into a juggernaut of organized selfishness for the purpose of exploiting the unsuspecting and patient public. The good faith of the American people has been betrayed by its sophistry and greed. Under the philanthropic inspiration of protecting home industries its triumph has been that of a special few over the struggling and impoverished masses. Its advocates have shifted from one fallacy to another in their persistent course of deception. It is interesting to observe that when one fallacy failed to work longer to justify the system of protection another was taken up and advanced in popular arguments. At first the argument in justification for a high tariff was that the foreigner paid the tax. When no one would believe this any longer we were told that the object of the system was to encourage domestic infant industries.

That slogan worked splendidly until the industries grew out of their swaddling clothes and became gigantic trusts and combinations. Now, instead of Government aid to encourage their growth, it keeps the Government busy trying to keep them from controlling the Government itself. But the modern argument is that we need the high tariff to protect labor. That worked well for a few campaigns, until the laboring men began to inquire how a high tariff that shut out foreign goods, but let in foreign labor to compete with them, was much protection to American labor. Again, we hear much now about how the American market must be preserved for American manufactures. Experience has demonstrated that those most anxious to preserve the American markets are those who use special legislation to get these American markets under their control and then reap the benefits of unfettered monopoly. They insist on a highly protected market in which to sell their manufactured products, but at the same time they tell the American producer that he must dispose of his products in the free markets of the world. That is the absurd position of those who want to preserve the American markets for American manufactures. There has recently, however, come into the field of political science a new and heretofore unheard-of modification of the old theory of protection to American industries. It asks not only protection that shall equal the difference in the cost of production here and abroad, but, in addition to that, "a reasonable profit" to the manufacturers. Confident in their system of industrial control and in their success at deceiving the people, they have at last sprung the trap. A "reasonable profit" to the manufacturer. And what is a "reasonable profit" is to be left to be determined, as formerly, by the manufacturers and beneficiaries themselves. No wonder the manufacturers believe in protection. No wonder they have successfully resisted all attempts to revise the tariff, and especially Schedule K.

With the permission of the House I desire to insert as a part of my remarks at this time a few extracts from an address of Dr. Charles W. Elliott, as printed in the Wall Street Journal of September 22, 1908. There are few authorities in this country whose opinions carry greater weight on public questions than those of Prof. Elliott. In speaking on the tariff, Dr. Elliott says:

In the first place, it [high tariff] has postponed and obstructed the effective entrance of American products into the markets of the world. Many American industries, including the fundamental industry of agriculture, produce much more salable material than can possibly be sold in the United States; and all these industries must sell their surplus products outside the United States at a great disadvantage, because the products have paid high duties on the raw or partially manufactured materials which enter into them, on the implements or machinery which were used in producing them, and on the structures which sheltered and distributed them. As a country which produces in normal years much more grain, meat, and cotton and many more manufactured goods than it can consume, it is the interest of the United States to develop for itself world markets under the most favorable conditions possible. The tariff prevents or obstructs the attainment of those favorable conditions. A nation which prohibits the importation of the natural exports of other nations or, what amounts to much the same thing, charges higher duties than other manufacturing nations charge on foreign raw or unfinished products, can not maintain a profitable carrying trade with other nations.

* * * * * *

Despotic and aristocratic Governments have long practiced the creation by law of privileged or favored men or classes. The American democracy has abolished or had nothing to do with the ancient privileges of nobles, court favorites, sinecure holders, and commercial adventurers by royal monopoly charter, but has been more than ready to create privilege manufactures by tariff legislation, in spite of the fact that equality before the law has been theoretically the very foundation of American government and society.

The enrichment of a few individuals of a small class at the expense of the community and with no benefit to the State is, however, not the worst result of the protective policy. The worst result is the legal violation by the Republic itself of the fundamental equity, and this result is aggravated by the falsely altruistic argument used in support of the tariff. The man who acts unjustly for reasons which seem to him benevolent or humanitarian is more dangerously poisoned than the man who is unjust for straight selfish reasons and admits to himself just what he is doing and why. The fallacies of protection are all the worse because they are covered with the nauseous slime of a pretended altruism. In short, the chief objection to protective legislation is a moral one, namely, that it diminishes the enterprise, self-reliance, and sense of justice of the population as a whole. That legislation is a serious mental and moral evil which has been for 50 years working injustice at home and contracting American exchanges abroad, because two generations of voters have been hoodwinked with a word—"protection." No revision of schedules can dig up this evil by the roots. It will only be cured when the National Legislature makes the tariff nothing but one means among many of raising needed revenue.

That the tariff is not necessary to the maintenance of American wages or American standards of living appears clearly from the common practice of selling American goods in foreign countries at much lower prices than they are sold in the United States and yet at a profit.

* * * * * *

The tariff establishes a tax paid by the great body of consumers, not to the Government for its support, but to the capitalists who have invested their money in those plants which produce protected articles.

I would not deny to the laborers of our great country any protection or any of the comforts of life to which they are justly entitled. I care not whether they labor in the mills or in the mines, in the factories or on the farms; the American workmen deserve to share in the prosperity and the progress of our Nation. But I am opposed to an industrial system which seeks special privileges in legislation in order to protect, not legitimate industries while in their infancy, but to shield great industrial and financial combinations which have long outgrown their swaddling clothes and have piled up such wealth and accumulated such power that they threaten our national welfare. I am oposed to a protective tariff which is a protection to the few against the many in this country, a tariff which has become so high in many instances that great corporate wealth and combinations have been permitted to levy tribute upon the masses of consumers and have grown rich while they have

operated under the guise of protecting labor. These protected interests have been so long the favored beneficiaries of special legislation that they have come to believe they have a vested right in the protective system, and they even grow alarmed at any attempt which seeks to deprive them of the special favors which they have enjoyed so long. They complain that such attempts will cripple industry and destroy property and prosperity. They threaten dire calamity if they are not permitted to continue to receive their regular allowance from the public bounty.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO].

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I would not from choice select the tariff as a subject in which to interest this House, but I am not willing to let a measure be considered in which at least one-third of the entire population of my home county is directly interested, and in which every resident of the county is, directly or indirectly, interested without raising my voice in their behalf.

For the last half century no other public question has received so much attention from Congress as has the question of the tariff. For years the two great political parties have divided on the question of whether we should have a protective tariff or no tariff other than one for revenue. Every national election fought with these two propositions clearly defined has resulted in such an overwhelming victory for protective tariff that in our State of Pennsylvania it had become the fashion for anyone running for office on the Democratic ticket to proclaim himself a good protectionist.

The last presidential campaign was somewhat different from the others, and many people believing, honestly mistaken though they were, that the high cost of living was the result of protected industries, and forgetting the lesson of a few years ago, demanded of the Republican Party a gradual reduction of the tariff along certain lines. The discussion of the question at this time led men to see that there must be some better way of adjusting such intricate questions than leaving them to the whims of politicians, so the idea that a permanent Tariff Board, removed from partisanship, composed of men who have made a study of economic questions, just as the judges of our courts have made a study of legal questions, should be able to more intelligently present to Congress the facts regarding the workings of the tariff met popular approval.

With a report from such a board at hand it should easily be determined whether any tariff schedule gives the necessary protection or whether it is merely a revenue schedule or an out-and-out free-trade measure.

This idea, seized on by the then minority party, received rather coldly by the dominant party, has been partially put into law, and to-day we have before us the findings of that board accepted by the party now in the minority in this House, but rejected by the party now in power.

To-day the issue of free trade and protection is more clearly drawn between the great parties than for a generation, and, thanks to the frankness of the gentlemanly leader of the minority, the country now knows exactly where each party stands on the tariff—the Republican Party standing for a tariff which as nearly as possible makes up the difference between the cost of production in this and competing countries, while the Democratic Party stands for a free-trade policy, except where it is necessary to have some duty levied in order to raise revenue. With this line-up we are content, and confidently appeal to the good judgment of the people, with an abiding faith that they will see and do the right.

The wool industry has been an important factor in our development as a nation; it has also played its part in the making of other nations. With us for several generations it has been the football of political battles, and while the men who by their labor have produced it have toiled and worked to make for themselves and families an honest living, statesmen have argued pro and con the right and necessity of its protection. It shall not be my purpose at this time to take up the matter of a tariff on manufactured wool or woolens, at the same time our people realize that unless the home manufacturer of woolens is protected against the foreign manufacturer they have no market, and no matter how high the duty on raw wool may be, they receive no benefit from it. I leave this, however, for men who have made it a study and are familiar with its details. What little I shall say will be in behalf of the men who raise the sheep to produce the wool; the men of southwestern Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and eastern Ohio, who have, by years of toil and study, brought this industry to its present high standard; who have succeeded in producing the finest wool of its kind grown anywhere in the entire world, and who to-day are willing to meet you in any reasonable reduction of duty and adjust themselves to the new rates, provided they can continue in the business and make a reasonable profit. I have talked with many of these men, and they believe that if the findings of the Tariff Board on Schedule K are accepted and enacted into law they can continue at a small profit, but if you reduce the duty below that line you have simply made a present of that much to the woolgrowers of Australia, and at the same time our people will pay the same prices for clothing made of wool grown in foreign countries, the product of foreign labor and foreign capital, while the domestic industry will be gradually destroyed. This is no theory, but a demonstrated fact.

Prior to the passage of the so-called Wilson bill the rich hills and fertile valleys of that section, so well adapted to this industry, were dotted everywhere with sheep. The sheep raisers were prosperous, and as a result the communities were also prosperous. And then came the change, and in 1896 the flocks had disappeared from our hills. The sheep were sold for 50 cents and $1 per head, "for mutton only" was an accomplished fact.

With the return of the Republican Party to power and the passage of the Dingley law these same men, anxious to again engage in this business, sent to other parts of the country for sheep, but it was 10 years at least before the industry was again firmly established, and millions of dollars had been lost to that section of the country. Do you wonder, then, that our people look with disfavor on this attempt to repeat the conditions of 1896?

In 1909, for my own county of Greene, the Census Bureau gives the following data:

Farms on which sheep are raised	1,615
Fleeces of wool marketed	135,791
Number of wool-bearing sheep	141,373
Number of pounds of wool produced	842,495
Value (practically 30 cents per pound)	$291,447

This county has a population of but 30,000 people. Assuming that on each farm there will be an average of six persons, and you have almost one-third of the entire population engaged partly in the raising of sheep. The reduction of the duties, as proposed by the Underwood bill, will mean a loss, as I figure it, of more than $50,000 annually to the people of this county alone—will take away all the profit from the industry and in a few years destroy it entirely.

In 1890 Fayette County is reported as producing 173,904 pounds of wool and Somerset County 79,557 pounds. In 1909, Fayette County produced but 37,865 pounds and Somerset County 42,954 pounds. This decrease in production in these two counties can in part be accounted for by the fact that during this period the mineral resources of these counties have been developed to a great extent, and this has made the raising of sheep unprofitable, but it also goes to show that but one of these three counties has in any way recovered from the almost complete destruction of the industry from 1893 to 1896.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill we are face to face with the question of whether the tariff on wool shall be such as will protect our citizens who raise sheep on land worth from $60 to $100 per acre, where they must feed the sheep grain many months of the year, where they employ men who receive living wages and who enjoy the benefits of our high standard of living; who pay taxes to keep up the best of schools, build good roads, and make for themselves and families a community life of culture and refinement, or whether that tariff shall be one for revenue only, too small to give any adequate protection to our own people, who have their money invested and have given the best years of their lives to the study of this industry, and which will compel our people to compete with the countries where land is worth but a few dollars per acre, where the sheep graze 12 months of the year, where men live like uncivilized beings on the unkept, boundless domains of a country where modern living and culture are unknown.

Our Government spends millions of dollars annually in sending out reports and valuable information to the people who live from the product of the soil, and I take pride in the fact that it does all this, but Congress sits up nights devising laws which make the work of the farmer unprofitable and thus drive the younger men into other fields of activity.

Back in feudal times the demands of war frequently suspended the operation of industries for long periods and thus delayed the industrial progress of the world. To-day we are seeing the demands of partisan politics accomplish the same purpose, and what in former centuries was a game of conquest is now a conflict of those forces which would by industry and labor work out the common weal, as against that baser side of human nature which seeks to make of prejudice and indolence a condition whereby our citizens are turned from the useful arts, and are made to believe the Government owes them a living, instead of teaching them that they owe our Government

their loyal support, in order that it may the better protect them in their labors and secure them and those who come after them in their right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The greatest function of Government is to give people opportunity, opportunity to work and receive the proper reward for their labor; opportunity to grow and develop the powers with which they are endowed by nature.

This our people ask and demand—nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, so long as I shall serve in this great legislative body I want to be counted on the human side of every problem, and I believe the uncertainty of legislation affecting industries is the greatest menace to industrial prosperity, and, as a result, a menace to human progress. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at this late hour of the evening I have an announcement to make that I think will be rather popular, and that is that I do not expect to occupy nearly all of the time that has been assigned to me. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] for the applause which everybody feels like giving, but which he was good enough not to give. However, Mr. Chairman, representing as I do one of the great woolgrowing districts of this country, I should feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say something about this bill, which, as I understand it, is extremely inimical to the interests of a large number of the people whom I represent and not beneficial to anyone, and which, if enacted into law, would mean practically the destruction of the sheep industry, particularly in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—that section known in the report of the Tariff Board as the Ohio region. I think I can show before I close that this is undoubtedly the case, and that the majority in their report practically say that if this bill becomes a law the industry in what is known as the Ohio region must either very materially change its form or absolutely cease to exist. If this concourse with its sad assemblage of mourners is to be regarded as a sort of funereal occasion, if the wool industry is to be consigned to destruction, it seems to me that what little the friends of that great industry have to say about it would better be said before the industry is dead. I am reminded of that little stanza of poetry which my friend from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], with his poetic instincts, will appreciate, and which runs like this:

A rose to the living is more than sumptuous wreaths to the dead;
In filling Love's infinite store, a rose to the living is more,
If graciously given before the hungering spirit has fled.
A rose to the living is more than sumptuous wreaths to the dead.

So, in harmony with the spirit of that stanza of poetry, I want to place a few little flowers at the feet of the wool industry of this country rather than to place sumptuous wreaths upon its coffin, for that is what I should have to do if I spoke after this bill became a law.

This debate, which has been prolonged rather extensively, is useful in a good many ways. To my mind one of the things coming out of it that is the most valuable is the fact that in connection with the debates had on this bill last summer, it has made the position of the gentlemen across the aisle with reference to the wool industry and the other industries of this country absolutely clear. As was said just now by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO], some of us in certain sections of the Union have known of gentlemen running on the Democratic ticket and asserting that they were good protectionists. This debate has torn the mask off that proposition, because we have heard it asserted here by the leader across the aisle, we have had official pronouncement to the effect that the Democratic Party does not stand for any such thing as protection to any industry. For example, here in debate the other day on the sugar bill the distinguished, able, and courteous leader of the Democracy, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], said in response to an inquiry by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] that he did not know what effect that bill would have upon the sugar industry of Louisiana—proposing legislation not knowing whether it would strike down or destroy an industry; and that was followed up a little later in that same debate by an admission of another distinguished leader on that side of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, in which he said substantially that he was willing to go further than the gentleman from Alabama. He said that in his opinion it would absolutely destroy the industry in that State; and then upon the question of the wool industry it has been said upon this floor several times in the course of this debate, admitted in the reports of the committee, both upon this bill at this time and upon a similar bill last summer, absolutely officially admitted, that it is going very seriously to cripple the industry, if not absolutely to destroy it, and a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PETERS], said here in the debate, when questioned by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], in response to the inquiry of Mr. LONGWORTH, that it did not make any difference, in his judgment, if he knew that the rate proposed in this bill, namely, 20 per cent, would absolutely wipe out the industry, that that would not be considered at all, that the only thing our friends, the Democrats, were considering was the raising of revenue.

It has been stated here that in time to come when the revenue would not be needed, then that the duty should be absolutely and unqualifiedly abolished. In other words, it is now known to the farmers of this country and the sheepmen of this country that it is proposed absolutely to put wool upon the free list just as soon as it can be done. Why, it is said here in the committee report that was made last summer, and I read from it; you will find it on page 26 of the report of the Ways and Means Committee:

It is maintained by a very large number of our best economists and statesmen—

I suppose he refers to Democratic economists and statesmen—

It is maintained by a very large number of our best economists and statesmen that the economic situation involved in our rapid progress as a Nation requires that our ports should be thrown open to the importation of wool free of duty; and this view, based on the most profound consideration of the public welfare, has found expression in Democratic legislation. It is the constant intent of the Democratic Party to make the burden of tariff taxes as light as possible for the people, and to levy tariff taxes on a revenue basis as promptly as possible, for the party recognizes no justification whatever for tariff taxes except the necessity of revenue.

Later on in the same report it is said:

The bill, H. R. 11019, is not to be construed as an abandonment of any Democratic policy, but in view of the Democratic platform for a gradual reduction of the tariff—

And, by the way, as we go along, if that is the attitude of the Democratic Party, when you brought in the sugar bill the other day this platform declaration ought to have been considered in regard to a "gradual" reduction of the tariff.

and of the depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury—

Is not that awful? Of course everybody knew at the time that that statement was a fiction, and the logic of events has absolutely proved it to be so, because the "depleted Treasury" turned out to have a surplus of something over $40,000,000.

And of the depleted and depleting condition of the Public Treasury, a result of Republican extravagance, a tariff of 20 per cent ad valorem on raw wool is now proposed as a revenue necessity.

In other words, it is perfectly clear that there is no intention to maintain any protective duty whatever on wool. I think I am perfectly fair in making that statement and am not misrepresenting anybody. So the woolgrowers of the country ought to understand that they are face to face with the proposition of free wool. We have torn the mask aside, and we know where our good friends the enemy are located on this proposition. Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that, so far as I am concerned personally, I am not altogether satisfied with some provisions in the present tariff on raw wool. All woolgrowers are well acquainted with the fact that because of the peculiar classification and provisions in the existing law washed wool of class 2 comes in at the same rate as unwashed wool. Every woolgrower knows the importer takes advantage of that and brings in large quantities of washed wool; in fact, there is practically no unwashed wool of the second class brought in. This practice reduces the shrinkage of imported wools and thereby crowds out our own wool. Then, in the second place, through the operation of the skirting clause, which will be found very carefully referred to in the report of the Tariff Board, pages 287 to 293, volume 1, advantage is again taken of the farmer:

These provisions are contained in paragraph 368 of the act of 1909, which is as follows: "The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the camel, angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, of class 1 and class 2, which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, or which has been sorted or increased in value by the rejection of any part of the original fleece, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject: *Provided*, That skirted wools as imported in 1890 and prior thereto are hereby excepted.

As has been explained here by two or three gentlemen who have spoken, in Australia they will take a fleece and lay it on a table or the floor and cut off the dirtier portion, the less valuable portion, and keep in the fleece only the best and cleanest wool. Then, under the "skirting clause," this skirted fleece is brought into our country, and, of course, everybody understands it must have a very low rate of shrinkage, as low as 40 per cent, and, in many fleeces, much lower than that. Now, the Tariff Board refers to that in a very interesting way, and I want to trespass on the good nature of the committee long enough to call attention to their statement, because some of my friends on the other side of the aisle have not read the report of the Tariff Board. I know some of them have not, else they would not make the

statements they have made. Why, it has been stated here that there is not anything new in this report of the Tariff Board. It was said that the information acquired might just as well have been acquired by correspondence. The gentleman who makes that kind of statement surely does not have the materials of the report of this Tariff Board well in mind.

I think in regard to the details of the wool industry in the United States and elsewhere that this is the greatest work that has ever been undertaken by any nation. There never has been any such collection of materials at first hand. They did not simply write to somebody. Why, it has been said their men were sent abroad. Certainly they were sent abroad. They went into the sheep-raising districts of Australia and South America and made careful personal investigation; that was the only way in which they could get at the facts and report to this Tariff Board.

It is a very voluminous report, and they show some interesting facts at page 382, volume 2, on the subject I have just discussed. I want to read part of their statement, because I think it is very valuable information:

The complaint of the grower of domestic wools that he is not now and has not during all these years been receiving the amount of protection nominally extended by the 11-cent duty on the grease pound is based upon the heavy shrinkage of the domestic fleece as against the light-conditioned skirted wools selected for importation primarily for their large net yield. An examination of the existing duties will show that the schedule is constructed upon the theory that wool shrinks 66⅔ per cent in the scouring. Since, however, it is certain that the wools actually imported shrink something less than 40 per cent, it is obvious that instead of paying $11 duty for every 33⅓ pounds of actual wool brought in, the importer is really securing some 60 pounds at a rate of not to exceed 18 cents per scoured pound.

In order that this matter may be more clearly understood, the board has prepared a tabular statement in which the full effect of shrinkages upon the actual operation of the existing wool duties is shown:

Present grease-pound rates with computed scoured-pound equivalents.

Shrinkage.	Actual duty on scoured content.	
	Class I wools.—Duty per pound, 11 cents.	Class II wools.—Duty per pound, 12 cents.
75 per cent	$0.44	$0.48
70 per cent	.36⅔	.40
65 per cent	.31⅔	.34⅔
60 per cent	.27½	.30
55 per cent	.24⅔	.26⅔
50 per cent	.22	.24
45 per cent	.20	.21 9/11
40 per cent	.18⅓	.20
35 per cent	.16½	.18 6/13
30 per cent	.15⅔	.17⅙
25 per cent	.14⅔	.16
20 per cent	.13¾	.15

Gentlemen can readily figure that out for themselves. Of course, everybody knows that is true. But let us see how it works out. Suppose that the law operated as it was intended that it should operate. In that case if you bought 100 pounds of wool in the foreign market and it was brought in here and would shrink 66⅔ per cent, you would have left 33⅓ pounds of wool. That would make the rate what the law intended it should be—that is, 33 cents on the scoured pound. As a matter of fact how does it work out? Under this skirting clause, of which I have spoken, the importer goes into the foreign market and buys wool that shrinks not 66⅔ per cent, but wool that shrinks 40 per cent or less. Then out of his 100 pounds of wool, instead of having 33⅓ pounds, he will have 60 pounds, and if he divides the amount of duty which he has to pay—$11 on the 100 pounds—by 60 instead of 33⅓, under the supposed arrangement, it will be seen that the farmer has not been getting anything like 33 cents protection on the scoured pound. He is really getting only about 18 cents protection on the scoured pound. Here is the thing I am objecting to. Under the present law the farmer has been charged with receiving a protection of 11 cents a pound on grease wool or 33 cents a pound on scoured wool. The fact is he has not received it. He has received only a little over one-half of what he was really entitled to under the law.

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

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

Mr. WILLIS. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. RAKER. I want to say to the gentleman that that has been understood by the sheepmen of California for many years, and they have been trying to get recognition and have it remedied, but they have not got it. How, may I ask, will the gentleman remedy that?

Mr. WILLIS. Speaking frankly, but not seriously, I think the reason why that has not been remedied heretofore is because the gentleman from California and myself have not been in Congress heretofore. That is the occasion for it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert in the RECORD certain tables——

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from California are in Congress now, will that be remedied? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I have no doubt of it. In the next Congress I hope to be here, and I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] will also be here, for if the people of his district are going to have a Democrat here I should prefer that they should send him, and I will say the same also of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY]. For what would this Congress be without his loving and serene smile? [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the result of this skirting clause——

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to call for a vote on the proposition of the gentleman from South Carolina? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. I object to that, because I do not wish to have my friend humiliated by a vote on that proposition. [Laughter.]

Now, as to the result of this skirting clause to which I have referred the Tariff Board says, on page 382 of volume 2, that in wools with a shrinkage of 40 per cent the actual rate on the scoured wool nets per pound 18⅓ cents instead of 33⅓, as the supporters of the law supposed. In wools with a shrinkage of 35 per cent the rate on the scoured pound is only 16 cents. That shows the reason for the dissatisfaction on the part of the woolgrowers with the present law, and consequently I am very glad to have the opportunity to comment upon certain things in that section. In this connection I desire to add an extract from an address recently delivered before the Ohio woolgrowers by Gov. Gooding, of Idaho:

To the woolgrowers it is a well-known fact that some parts of the fleece are very much lighter than other parts. It is by selecting the lightest fleeces that can be found in the world and then taking the lightest part of these fleeces that the importers beat Schedule K when shipping wool into America. Now let me show you how the importer beats Schedule K and you will understand why we want that schedule revised and the duty on wool assessed on the clean contents of a pound of wool. He looks the whole world over for light shrinking wool to ship to America; in fact, the whole wool world has been pitted against Schedule K. In Australia they go so far as to "willow" the fleeces. "Willowing" them means shaking them over a wire screen so as to remove all the dirt possible. The lightest fleeces of the flock are taken; the dirty wool around the neck, legs, and belly are taken out. This is called "skirting." In this way it is plain to be seen how all the lightest fleeces and the lightest parts of the fleece are shipped into America. The same is done in South America, and a phrase has grown up in the wool markets to-day, in speaking of a light fleece of wool, as being "fit for the American trade." Not that America needs any different kind of wool than any other country on earth, but being light in shrinkage, more clean wool can be brought in for 11 cents per pound. For instance, we will buy 100 pounds of wool in the London market, ship it to America, and pay the duty of $11. We will scour it and we find that we have washed away 66⅔ pounds of dirt and grease and have 33⅓ pounds of clean wool left. This is just what the law presumes will happen with wool that is shipped into this country. But Mr. Importer never buys that class of wool. He takes the lightest he can find, and the average wool that he ships in here will not shrink more than 40 per cent. Now we will buy the second hundred pounds of wool, ship it to America, and pay the $11 duty. We will scour it and we find that we have washed away 40 pounds of dirt and grease and have 60 pounds of clean wool left. So we find that we have imported into this country, under Schedule K, 60 pounds of scoured wool for $11 instead of 33⅓ pounds, as the law presumes is being done. So this is the way Mr. Importer has beaten Schedule K and has nearly cut our protection in two.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

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

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; I shall be very glad to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. SHARP. Is not this true, that another element that enters largely into the dissatisfaction of the woolgrowers is the fact that whereas there is not now and never has been such a relation as that which we call a "trust" or "trust system" among the woolgrowers, there has been, and is to-day, recognized quite generally more or less, a sort of combination between the buyers of the product, so that there is really no active competition among the bidders for the product of the woolgrowers? I ask that question because I find that state of affairs to exist in my own district, and I have been informed to that effect elsewhere by a reputable woolgrower.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, the observation of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] is correct. There is no combination among the farmers. They shear their sheep and have their little clip of wool, and they have no opportunity for combination. On the other hand, there is opportunity for combination on the other side, and that combination has undoubtedly existed among the great buyers in the eastern markets.

I might say another thing, and that is this: Every rumor of a proposed change in the tariff law is laid hold of by the wholesale buyers of wool to beat down the price paid to the local buyer, the farmer, and the woolgrower. I dare say that as a result of the agitation of the wool question in the last two or three years in some parts of the country wool has been practically sold on a free-trade basis and the woolgrowers have lost millions of dollars without the price of clothing being reduced one penny. I honestly believe that is true. I doubt whether the protection has exceeded in some instances 2 or 3 cents per grease pound. That is not true generally, but it applies in certain places.

Now, if we change this tariff, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to exercise a good deal of discretion and care in determining the kind of tariff that we shall adopt. We should decide intelligently whether it shall be an ad valorem duty or a specific duty. I am strongly in favor of a specific duty, based on the scoured content of the wool imported.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

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

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. I want to state to the gentleman that in southern Oregon and in California, where my home is, last year wool was selling at from 9 to 12 cents a pound, and the owner, shipping that wool from 50 to 200 miles, pays the freight on it himself. Now, where does he get any consideration?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly that is one of the cases that I was just referring to. It is quite evident that in the case to which the gentleman from California adverts the wool is sold practically on a free-trade basis.

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that the matter which the gentleman from California referred to absolutely disposes of the Democratic contention that the amount of the tariff is added to the price of the article. I thank the gentleman from California for that suggestion. It disposes of that argument effectively.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will pardon a suggestion, I want to say that the eastern buyers tell the farmer that they can not get anything for the wool. Then they fool around for two or three months, and finally they get the sheep raiser or the farmer to sell his wool for practically nothing. The combination and the men concerned in the wool monopoly in the East are the fellows that have been reaping the reward that the farmers and the woolgrowers should have had.

Mr. WILLIS. That is precisely the point that my friend from Ohio [Mr. SHARP] referred to. Now, the woolgrowers of the country are interested in having at least two changes made in the existing law. Of course I do not need to say that they expect and hope that an adequate protection to equalize the difference in costs of production here and abroad will still be afforded to their industry. I think I do not misstate the matter when I say that every time that farmers and woolgrowers have met together anywhere in this country within the last two or three years and have discussed the subject they have unanimously adopted resolutions saying, "We want, first, not an ad valorem duty, but a specific duty; and we desire, second, that that duty shall be levied on the basis of the scoured content." That, of course, would do away with the inequalities of the skirting clause.

Upon that point, it seems to me, there is another reason why we should have a specific duty. If we have an ad valorem duty at the time when the world price of wool is low, and when, therefore, our woolgrowers need protection the most, and when by the same token the manufacturers need cheap wool the least, under this ad valorem duty that is the time when wool comes in most freely. In other words, under the operation of the ad valorem scheme, it makes it easier to import wool at the time when you need it the least. On the other hand, suppose the world price of wool is high and you have an ad valorem duty. When the world price is high and the producers in this country therefore will not need the protection so much, and when the manufacturers of woolen goods need the opportunity to get wool with which to carry on their business, then, under the operation of your ad valorem system, you mark up the duties. Do you not see that it makes it still more difficult? In other words, the system of ad valorem duties on the importation of wool works exactly the reverse of what it ought to. It makes it easier to bring wool into the country when the country does not need it, and makes it more difficult to bring it into the country when the country does need it.

On the other hand, a specific duty will work just the reverse of an ad valorem duty, because when the world price of wool is low—and when the producers, therefore, need protection the most—if you have a specific duty then, relatively, it will be high. On the other hand, when the world price of wool is high, and when, therefore, it is desirable that there should be importations, the specific duty will be relatively lower, and importations can be had. In other words, the system of specific duties works automatically—just as we want it to work—and the system of ad valorem duties works automatically—just as we do not want it to work; it is just the reverse of what we want. This system of ad valorem duties is like a rain-making machine that will work only in wet weather. It is like a stove that will burn only in July. It accentuates the very thing you do not want, and when you do want it you can not get relief under it. For that reason the woolgrowers of this country want a specific duty, and for the reasons I have already given they want that specific duty levied on the basis of the scoured content.

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

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. SHARP. I ask the question purely for information, because I am greatly interested in the gentleman's splendid exposition of this subject. Has the gentleman, in his study of this question of the relative merits of a specific duty and an ad valorem duty, run up against any difficulties in putting into practice the specific duty? I assume it to be true that you will find different values of scoured wool. Certain kinds of scoured wool will be worth very much more, perhaps, than other kinds. I would like to ask, for information, the manner in which the gentleman would meet that situation so that there would be no inequality or liability to fraud in grading these different kinds of scoured wool.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, that is a very proper and pertinent question, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP], with his usual frankness and clearness, has stated it as well as it could be stated.

That is one of the difficulties that you always are bound to run against in a system of specific duties. I do not know of any way by which you can avoid a little inequality; but I will say to my friend that it seems to me the inequalities that will proceed from the difference in values of the differing varieties of wool will be so slight compared with the inequalities that grow out of the ad valorem system that they are practically negligible. I am frank to state that there is that objection, but I do not know how you could draft a law that would entirely meet it.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is exactly right, but the difficulty will be greatly relieved by the better ascertainment of the value of the wool when it is scoured and tested, and the price in the market will regulate the value of the wool.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank my friend for his suggestion. I think this will very largely obviate the difficulty.

Mr. RAKER. Will my distinguished colleague from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Would there be any difficulty in enforcing the ad valorem duty in importing wool?

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad of that suggestion. There undoubtedly would be great invitation to fraud under a system of ad valorem duties. It would be a matter very difficult to guard against.

Mr. RAKER. Just how? I should like to have the gentleman give an illustration.

Mr. WILLIS. A number of consignments of wool will come in on the same steamer, and they may have been purchased at different prices. There is no standard of prices. The prices may vary in the same market, as is shown in volume 2 of the report. When you undertake to levy ad valorem duties you will have difficulty in ascertaining the actual value of the wool, and there will be a premium all the time upon fraud; whereas if you levy a specific duty on the basis of the scoured content there is no trouble about that, because, as was explained by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL], whether it is fleece wool or a woolen suit, there is no difficulty at all in telling almost immediately and with practically no expense what the actual amount of scoured wool is in the garment or in the fleece. This is done by the carbonizing test through the use of sulphuric acid.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. With pleasure.

Mr. RAKER. There is not much wool imported in the scoured form, is there?

Mr. WILLIS. Not under the present system.

Mr. RAKER. Now, if you put 19 cents on the scoured content, would not there be just as much opportunity for fraud as there is in the duty on the greased wool?

Mr. WILLIS. No; there is no difficulty at all in determining the scoured content in any given quantity of wool.

Mr. RAKER. Is there not a great chance for fraud on the question of how much the shrinkage would be?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I do not think there is much opportunity for fraud there. I think in the markets of the world there is no difficulty about it. Anyone skilled in the wool business can take a sample from a sack of wool, no matter what the condition is, and they can tell you approximately what the scoured content will be. I think the chance of fraud is very much less than under the ad valorem system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without taking the time of the committee to read it fully, I want to refer to a statement in volume 2, page 394, of the report, which is as follows:

The economic objection to an ad valorem duty on wool arises from the fact that the amount of duty paid, since it fluctuates with the foreign value of the commodity, would not be adjusted to the needs of the Government, of the consumer, nor of the American woolgrower. A speculative change in the market which increased the price of wool would automatically lead to an increase in the amount of duty at the very time that the manufacturer is most hampered by the existing high price, when the consumer most needs relief, and the woolgrower is most prosperous. On the other hand, a fall in price brings a reduction of duty at a time when the woolgrower is at greatest disadvantage and when manufacturers can best afford to pay the tax.

The tendency of sheep breeding all over the world is toward crossbreds, and the advocates of ad valorem wool duties have complained that under the present system of specific duties crossbreds can be imported more favorably than merinos, and that when the market for crossbreds declines the advantage in favor of the crossbreds is still further increased. During the season 1906–7, which was a normal one, the specific duty on South American crossbreds, taking into account the prices then prevailing in the foreign markets, was equivalent to an ad valorem rate of about 43–45 per cent. In the following season, 1907–8, including the time of the financial panic, prices abroad declined steadily, so that in May, 1908, the specific duty on the same grade of crossbred wool was equivalent to an ad valorem rate of 75 per cent. By thus increasing the ad valorem equivalent when foreign prices are low and decreasing it when foreign prices are high the specific duty automatically protects American woolgrowers against declines in the wool markets abroad and at the same time favors the American buyer when the foreign wools increase in value. In the case of drought or other calamity in the American woolgrowing industry and overproduction abroad, or vice versa, the specific duties would have a corrective tendency. Ad valorem duties would act in an entirely contrary manner—decreasing with the decline of values abroad and increasing with the rise of foreign markets, thus tending to throw open the American market to foreign wools in times of depression, when they could least withstand such pressure, and, on the other hand, when there was a scarcity of wool at home and prices soared, it would be impossible to find relief abroad.

America occupies a unique position among the nations with regard to her woolgrowing and wool manufacturing, having practically no outlet for either in foreign markets. The American woolgrower is entirely dependent upon the home market. If the basic idea of the duty on wools is to give the domestic grower permanent protection, it should remain as uniformly effective as possible under all changes of foreign conditions (shortage, overproduction, etc.). Ad valorem duties would not accomplish this, being ineffective in times of overproduction and low prices abroad and giving an unnecessarily high protection in times of scarcity and high prices in foreign countries.

It seems to me that this succinct statement shows that it is very desirable that we should have a specific duty on wool, and that this duty should be based on the scoured pound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a few matters to which I wish to refer. Some of them have been covered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in his remarks, and I shall pass over them hastily but insert the tables in the RECORD. These tables were prepared, as the gentleman from Wyoming stated, by S. W. McClure, secretary of the National Woolgrowers' Association, but I have taken the pains to verify them in every instance. I think I have cited the volume and page from the Tariff Board's report, and can certify that the computations are absolutely correct. A great many of them I made myself, so that I know they are right; others I have carefully checked over.

The first thing to which I wish to call attention is the question of wages. It is said that we can compete with the producers of wool anywhere in the world. I deny that proposition, and say that in the first place the reason why we can not successfully compete is because of the larger labor cost per sheep. By these tables it is shown that in the United States the average labor cost per sheep is 80 cents, in South America 23 cents, and in Australia 7 cents. That is for the labor outside of the cost of shearing the sheep. The labor cost of shearing in the United States is 9 cents, in Australia 7 cents, in South America 6 cents, and in Africa 2 cents per sheep. So measuring from any standpoint the labor cost is a great deal larger in this country than in any of its competitors.

Now, if we figure it on the number of sheep in the country it would amount in this country to $47,000,000, in South America $15,000,000, and in Australia $7,000,000. So that you see that the foreign countries referred to, particularly Australia and South America, have a great advantage in respect to the labor cost.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman any figures or any statistics on the question as to the kind of labor employed in this country, as to whether it is American or foreign labor in the West?

Mr. WILLIS. As I recollect it, the Tariff Board does not give any definite statement as to that. I do not know that they tried to make any special investigation of that phase of the question. But it is brought out in the report that the labor is of a much higher grade in this country than in South America, where they rely largely on native labor, or in South Africa, where native labor is surprisingly cheap. The average monthly wages in the Transvaal are $10, in Natal $4.87, in Orange Free State $3.75, and in Rhodesia as low as $1.21.

Now, another point to which I wish to invite the attention of the committee is the cost of feed. I am not criticizing the Tariff Board in this respect; I am not criticizing them because they did not include interest; I am not criticizing them because they did not include the investment in land. Probably it would not have been feasible to make a computation otherwise than as they did, but we want to bear these things in mind in estimating costs. Upon that point—the feed of a sheep—some surprising facts are brought out. You will find them in volume 2, page 341, or thereabouts. Here, in a word, is what appears.

In the United States it costs the owner annually 45 cents per head, in South America 35 cents a head, in Africa 35 cents a head, but in Australia the total average cost per sheep is only 8 cents. That is to say, the Tariff Board finds by personal investigation that the feed of a sheep in Australia a year costs 8 cents. Any gentleman knows the climate there is such that it is not necessary to house the sheep; it is not necessary to make any provision for feed for winter time, because there is no winter time. The sheep run out of doors all the year round. The farmers do not need to feed them and do not feed them an ounce of grain. The wethers that go to the slaughter pens to furnish the great supply of frozen mutton that is sold all along the shores of the Pacific and in Europe are fattened simply upon the native grass, so that the men who raise wool and sheep in Australia have an amazing advantage from the standpoint of feed. Gentlemen will say, Why is that? I will tell you why it is. The Government of Australia is doing more to protect its sheep industry than any other government in the world. I am frank to say that it is doing more than I think a government ought to do. It is allowing the sheepmen to pasture their sheep upon Government lands almost without cost, as can be seen from that statement. When you can pasture a sheep for a year, getting all the food that the sheep needs, for 8 cents, it means that the Government is practically giving the sheepmen of Australia the food for their sheep. That I have worked out here considerably in detail, but I shall not stop to state it fully at this time. I will put it in the form of a general statement here. Take the number of sheep that we have in this country, approximately 52,000,000. To feed them here one year would cost $23,000,000; in South America it would cost $18,000,000; and in Australia, $4,000,000. In other words, between one-fifth and one-sixth of what it costs in the United States.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] referred to the question of taxation in the United States. It is 5 cents a head here in the United States, in South America it is 4 cents a head, and in Australia 2½ cents a head. So that it can be seen that the Australian producer has an advantage there. The same fact is brought out if we estimate it on the total number of sheep.

Another thing I wish I had time to go into, although I shall not take the time, is the question of transportation. A feature of the report of the Tariff Board that is important from a legislative standpoint is the relative charge for transporting wool to Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, the central markets to which all American wool goes, the markets to which imported wools are brought. The board finds the average charge for transporting 1 pound of grease wool from the western railroad station to the eastern market is 2 cents. From the Australian grower's port to the port of Boston per pound it is 2¼ cents. Passing from that, which I have gone into very carefully, I have reduced the whole thing to the basis of the scoured pound, because that is the only way in which you can make a fair estimate, and we reach the following conclusions that are borne out absolutely by this report of the Tariff Board. Here is what we find. We find that the freight on 1 pound of scoured wool from the grower's railroad station to Boston in the case of the western United States is about 6 cents a pound. In the case of Australia it is 3 cents a pound, and in the case of South America it is 1 cent a pound. From London it is one-quarter of a cent a pound. In other words, here is the actual fact: From the great pastures where the largest amount of wool is produced in this country the freight rates to the Boston market

are, to put it very conservatively, vastly greater than they are from the sheep pastures of our great competitors.

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

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly.

Mr. SHARP. In that connection has the gentleman given any thought or consideration to what possible influence the opening of the Panama Canal will have in enabling the western wool, which admittedly can be raised more cheaply there than in any other section of our country, to reach the Boston markets?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, that is a very happy suggestion and one of my hobbies. I, of course, have not gone into that question far enough to be able to say what the result will be, but it is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of every other patriotic American, that when we get the Panama Canal finished and keep it in our own control—not turn it over to the management of some great railroad corporation—and maintain it and own and maintain the Panama Railroad, we will be in a position to see to it that the great transcontinental railroad lines no longer can hold up the woolgrowers and other producers and shippers, and make them pay exorbitant prices, so exorbitant that they are almost shut out of the Boston markets. In my judgment that will be one of the greatest benefits flowing from the completion of the Panama Canal. [Applause.]

Making the same computation on the basis of the total production of wool, to bring that amount of wool from our 11 Western States, costs $3,400,000; from Australia, it costs $1,700,000; and from England, $142,000. In other words, our chief competitors have a great advantage in the matter of freight rates. Another thing to which I wish to call attention very briefly is the question of the total expense per sheep per year, not counting interest. We are leaving that out. The total expense in Ohio is $2.40; in western United States, $2.11; in South America, $1.15; in Australia, 93 cents; and in Africa, 93 cents, so that we are again at a disadvantage. I referred before to the fact that the board in its invesigations had omitted interest. The board is fair and conservative, and it is positively ridiculous for anybody to say that the Tariff Board is the representative of anybody's tariff views. It is perfectly absurd. The Tariff Board does not represent anybody's tariff views. They are not making a tariff. They are collecting facts. They are not the representatives of the President or of anybody else.

I want to call your attention to the reason they give why they leave out interest. (Vol. 2, pp. 314-356.) I find I have opened the volume at page 356:

> Sheep render a useful service by keeping a farm free from weeds, and the fertilizing value of the flock is so universally conceded that farmers generally agree that these two items offset the ordinary farm labor involved in caring for the sheep.

That brings up an interesting point concerning the Ohio region, showing how conservative the Tariff Board is in its report. There is not a penny allowed the farmer for the labor of caring for the sheep. It is estimated by the board that the value that comes from the fertilization of the soil and the destruction of weeds and briers pays the labor cost, and they made that offset. Surely the board has not been any too liberal with the woolgrower in this case.

Here is what they say in regard to interest:

> Interest is usually figured as a part of production cost in such operation, but as rates are not uniform it gives a fairer basis of compensation to omit any charge on that account, leaving that item for the consideration of each individual as bearing upon the question of his profit rather than his cost.

I think the board is fair, as they left out the item of interest everywhere. But so far as they go on the subject they say what the interest is, so we can understand what it would amount to if it were taken into consideration. I think the gentleman from Wyoming referred to that in his statement.

Page 314 gives further reasons, substantially the same as I have read, why they have omitted the statement of interest. I am going to state, by the way, what the rates of interest are; I do not know whether it was stated by the gentleman from Wyoming or not. On page 314, volume 2, of the report of the Tariff Board they say:

> In examining our various tabulations it should be remembered that no interest is allowed on capital invested or on capital borrowed. Our schedules contained statistics of the amount of capital borrowed and the rate of interest paid; but, notwithstanding the fact that it has been the practice, in discussing the sheep industry, to consider interest as an item of cost, it has been thought advisable in this investigation to consider it in connection with profits. Since some flock owners use much more borrowed capital than do others, this elimination of interest from costs makes the schedules more comparable.
>
> In the western United States the prevailing rate of interest varies from 8 per cent to 10 per cent, in Australia from 4 per cent to 6 per cent, and in South America from 5 per cent to 6 per cent.

So you see again, in a matter of interest, we are at a disadvantage. I have already referred to the average cost per sheep per year, not including interest. I shall not take up your time now to go into the question further than to say it shows when we take interest into consideration the American producer of wool and sheep is at a still greater disadvantage. Now, in order to determine the cost of producing wool the board determined the total expenses of the flock. How did the board figure out to determine the actual cost of producing a pound of wool? I have that information in volume 2, page 313. Here is what the board says about it:

> To this end we have considered wool as the chief product, and the receipts from mutton are offset against costs. When the receipts from mutton are less than the total flock expense, the difference is the "net charge against wool." When, on the other hand, the receipts from mutton are greater than the expense, the difference is the "net credit to wool." And this net charge or net credit to wool, divided by the number of pounds of wool, is the "net charge against or net credit to a pound of wool."

I submit that that method is fair.

Mr. SHARP. Does that refer to the net price of mutton or to the gross receipts?

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand, they will take the total receipts from items other than wool from the expenses of carrying on the flock, excluding interest and investment in land. They take the total expenses and offset against that what they receive from mutton and what they receive from sheep for breeding and other purposes. For example, say those items of income just offset the cost of keeping up the flock. Then the wool has cost nothing, so far as the price at which it can be sold is concerned.

Mr. SHARP. They consider the gross receipts.

Mr. WILLIS. Precisely. Now, in that connection, for the benefit of American woolgrowers—I see my time is almost gone—I want to call attention to another fact here set forth very clearly in volume 2, page 350, wherein it shows the kind of competition that our woolgrowers must meet. I think a portion of it was embodied by the gentleman from Connecticut in his speech, but I want to use some in connection with what I have to say here. This is on page 350, where they use the following language:

> There remains, therefore, only the simple operation of subtracting from the flock expenses the receipts from other sources than wool, to reveal the fact that as against a clearly demonstrated net charge against the western American wool of from 10 to 11 cents, there is probably not more than 4 to 5 cents per pound against the South American clip, and if the season is normal and the sheep market steady, little, if any, charge against the Australian. Indeed, well-managed stations in many parts of Australia are showing at the present time a profit before any wools are sold.
>
> This qualification is generally applicable to the stock trade in all of the larger sheep districts of Australia. Statements similar to the above are made by two other prominent owners with regard to returns from surplus stock in Queensland and Western Australia. But both say that in good years, and on well-managed runs, the sales of sheep yield enough to pay working expenses. One of these anticipates that, in view of the increasing exports of Australian mutton and lamb, the surplus station stock will in future years give an annual return considerably in excess of the amount of the working expenses—assuming that no large addition is made to the cost of labor in the meantime.
>
> In the light, therefore, of the best information to be obtained, the board believes that at the present time the entire Australian output of merino and crossbred wool (interest being left out of account, as in the case of the United States) is moving to market, under present receipts from sales of sheep, with a net average charge of but a few cents per pound; and this estimate apparently holds good of New Zealand and the African Cape as well.

That is Australia, gentlemen. Then reference is made to the South American clip. In Australia, if the season is normal and the sheep market is steady, there is little, if any, charge against the Australian wool. In all well-managed stations in many parts of Australia they are showing at the present time a profit before the wool is sold.

You see the income from mutton and other sources keeps up the running expense of the flock, so that the wool costs absolutely nothing. In other words, the prices are figured just as they are figured in the United States, and the farmers of Ohio and the farmers elsewhere throughout the United States are in competition with farmers who make a profit on their sheep, even without selling their wool.

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that I was very much interested in what the gentleman has said about the sheep-growing industry of Ohio, and I was reminded of what was said by Roswell G. Horr or "Sunset" Cox as to what would take place when a Democratic statesman would meet an Ohio sheep. I want to know if a Democratic statesman now can look an Ohio sheep in the face—a thing which it was said he could not do a generation ago? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am unable to answer that. I could not say whether they would be able to look an Ohio sheep in the face without being ashamed or not.

Now, in Australia this wool goes to market without a penny of cost charged against it. That is the kind of competition that the farmers of this country must meet.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. According to the gentleman's system of reasoning, if a man were raising cotton in the South and raised one bale of cotton, when the balance of the products that he raised on the place would pay the expenses of running the place, then the cotton would be all profit, and the result would be that the bale of cotton would cost him nothing, and if he got 5 cents a pound for it it would be all profit. By segregating the costs of the various activities on the farm, omitting one particular thing, you would be able to show a clear profit on that particular thing. In that way a farmer might be able to show a clear profit on the potatoes that he raises, just the same as on a bale of cotton. Suppose a man did not count his cotton as a money crop, but raised potatoes principally as the source of his income. Then the cotton would show a clear profit, and the same calculation could be made with respect to any other crop.

Mr. WILLIS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that that is not my philosophy or my logic. I am trying to set forth the findings of fact reported by the Tariff Board. But, so far as that is concerned, it seems to me that that is a fair method of procedure. Take the growing of cotton, for example. If it could be shown that the cotton seed alone sold for enough money to pay for the expense of raising the cotton crop, the cotton fiber itself would be clear profit. That would be an apt illustration of the woolgrowing situation in Australia.

Now, on page 514 of this same volume it is shown that in South Africa the same condition obtains. The statement is as follows:

Sale of surplus stock and mutton: In the Cape Province fat ewes are reported as selling for $4.50 per head and fat lambs 5 months old at $4. Old ewes are readily sold for local slaughter at from $2.50 to $3 per head, according to their flesh.

At the present time the demand for mutton is so strong that there is a good profit in breeding the woolless sheep for mutton alone. Where the sheep combine both wool and mutton the profits must naturally be much greater.

Cost of production: The average shearing per head is estimated at 6 pounds, with an average price received by the growers of 13½ cents per pound.

With an average valuation on breeding sheep of $2.50 per head and an investment, excluding lands in improvements and equipment per head of not over 40 cents per year, and taking into account the low cost of wages and provisions, the moderate leasing values of their grazing lands, the mild winters which do not demand other food for the animals than that found on the ranges, the strong demand for mutton of all classes, it is evident that the African woolgrower is able to meet all his expenses from the sale of his surplus stock and mutton, leaving the wool as a clear profit on his investment.

One flock owner in Rhodesia reports he can sell his wool at 12 cents per pound and make money.

They carry on the business there at a clear profit without counting in receipts from wool. That is the kind of wool with which our American farmers have to compete.

Now, I have a lot of figures here, but I shall not take any more of the time of the committee in discussing this phase of the question. The tables that I have here I shall insert in the RECORD. I want, in the concluding moments that I have, to refer to the effect that this bill will have on the woolgrowing industry in the Ohio region. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has already touched upon that, and upon its effect in the territorial region. It is shown by the report of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, pages 43 and 44. I am not giving the figures of the Tariff Board now, but the statements by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means:

Figuring this as a percentage upon the cost of the competitive Australian wool imported into the United States, which may be taken as 50.8 cents a scoured pound, on the average, it is found that 28.6 cents represents over 55 per cent ad valorem. This is very much more than the protection amounts to, accorded under the present specific basis. In the board's table of actual importations and scourings in a representative American mill (pp. 387–389) the equivalent ad valorems run from about 34 per cent to about 55 per cent. In a very few instances there are equivalent ad valorems as high as 55 per cent. It would seem, then, that the Ohio wool-producing region is not protected now on the assumption that the board's cost figures are correct and that, if it is to be protected at all, the tariff on wool would have to be very much raised above its present figures, so as to give a rate of 28 or 29 cents on the scoured pound and of at least 55 per cent ad valorem.

It should be frankly admitted that on the Tariff Board's estimate the Ohio region and a very few of the Western States would need a protection in excess of 20 per cent.

In other words, not taking time to read all that, it is shown by the majority report of the committee that according to their own figures the woolgrowers in the Ohio region are entitled to something like 28 or 29 cents on the scoured pound.

Now, I want my friends from that woolgrowing section, not only the Ohio Members, but all Members from that section, to ask themselves this question, In what position will we put ourselves with the woolgrowers by this bill? Here is an admission by the framers and defenders of the bill that the bill will absolutely put the Ohio woolgrowers out of business. That is stated absolutely in the majority report of the committee, that the sheep business can not live if this bill becomes a law. I am not expecting that we will get a rate of 28 cents a pound on the scoured content, but I am expecting and I am saying that the woolgrowers have the right to expect better treatment than is accorded to them in this bill, which accords to them only a pitiful 20 per cent ad valorem. That is no protection at all. I have talked with hundreds of farmers—not with the silk-hatted varieties of farmers, but with the real farmers who farm and raise wool—and they have said to me, "We would rather have absolutely free wool than this Democratic scheme on a 20 per cent ad valorem basis. Then we would know where we are."

Mr. BOWMAN. If the gentleman from Ohio will permit me, I would like to say that on the question of the price of wool paid to the farmers I was very much interested by the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] in regard to the uncertainty of the price paid to the farmer and the low prices received by him. Suppose the policy on the part of both the leading parties in this country was that protection to the limit of competition should be given on wool, and there was certainty about it. Would there not be a very much greater certainty and assurance on the part of the farmer as to the price he would get than there is now?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly; that is desirable. We want to get this thing settled in some way. I am willing to concede something. I am frank to say that as I study the report of the Tariff Board I do not believe that the rate of duty on raw wool in the bill reported by the minority is quite as high as it ought to be. I mean the rate on the scoured pound.

According to the report the cost to produce 1 pound of grease wool, without interest, is as follows:

Ohio	$0.19
Western United States	.11
Average, United States	.096
South America	.045
Australia	.00
Africa	.00

Since Australia is the greatest wool-producing country in the world, and is the country from which we import the bulk of our foreign wool, and since Australian wool competes directly with our own product in quality, it is essential that a tariff drawn with the idea of producing revenue or protecting the American woolgrower must be based upon the relative difference in cost between wool production in this country and Australia. When interest is included we find that it costs on an average 11.3 cents more to produce a pound of grease wool in the United States than it does in Australia, excluding the difference in cost of transportation. Now, if these wools were of equal shrinkage—that is, if they produced an equal amount of wool when scoured—a tariff levied upon the grease basis of 11.3 cents would be the difference in the cost of production, based on the findings of the Tariff Board. But since it is recognized by everyone who has studied the question of wool and its products that 1 pound of grease wool may be equal in scoured wool to 3 pounds of grease wool from another section, and since the value of wool depends upon the amount of scoured wool that the grease wool produces, it must be clear that a tariff to afford the difference in cost must be based on the difference in the cost of producing a pound of scoured wool in this country and its chief competitor.

Of course, it would be fair in determining the difference in the cost of producing scoured wool to base that difference upon the average shrinkage of imported wools, which is approximately 40 per cent or less; but, in order to present this matter without prejudice, we shall accept the shrinkage of foreign wools as given by the board on page 12 of volume 1 of the report:

Shrinkage of wools.

	Per cent.
Ohio	60
Western United States	62
Average, United States	60.4
England	25.1
Australia	48.54
South America	51.04
Africa	58.4

The following table shows the cost to produce 1 pound of scoured wool without interest:

Ohio	$0.475
Western United States	.289
Average, United States	.242
Australia	.00
Africa	.00
South America	.092

On the basis of the above table it is therefore clear that if interest is not to be included as a cost there is an actual difference in the cost of producing a pound of scoured wool between this country and Australasia of 24.2 cents per pound. This, however, does not take into consideration the difference in the cost of transportation.

But this is a question on which men's judgments will differ. I am willing to concede something. The gentleman from Con-

necticut [Mr. HILL] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] may be right about the rate. We want to get this thing settled on the basis of a specific duty and on the basis of the scoured content.

I have samples of wool which I have collected from among the woolgrowers of the eighth Ohio district. I wish we had time, so that every Member could see what I want you to see with reference to the character of this wool.

The wool grown in the Ohio region is the best grown anywhere in the world. Take this wool right here. Here is a prize Australian fleece. You can pull the fibers apart as you would pull cotton batting; the Australian fiber is lustrous and beautiful, but not strong. Take the same number of fibers of Ohio wool, and the moment you make the test you realize that when you put the same amount of force on it as I am now doing it does not break them at all. The Ohio wool is the strongest wool to be found anywhere in the world. There is no question about that. It is the best wool grown anywhere. On this point Gov. Gooding says in his address to the Ohio woolgrowers:

Do you know that here in Ohio and in some of your adjoining States you produce the best wool in the world; that the Army and Navy of the United States are dressed in cloth principally made from wool grown in Ohio? In the days of the Civil War this Government required that all cloth for the Army and Navy should be made out of American wool. It was a war measure, and put into effect to encourage wool production in this country, for wool is conceded by all to be a great necessity in times of war. The great Napoleon attributed his defeat in Russia more to the lack of woolen clothing for his men than to any other one cause. This Government, however, has since discovered that cloth made from *American* wool stood a very much stronger tearing test than wools produced in any other country. The wearing quality of wool depends solely upon the strength of the wool fiber from which it is made. In its contracts to-day for cloth this Government specifies that cloth weighing 13 ounces to the yard shall stand a tearing test of 65 pounds to the inch in the direction of the warp. A piece of cloth is placed between two clamps and thumb screws are applied and a tearing pressure of 65 pounds applied to the cloth. If one thread of wool breaks, the cloth is condemned. There is no wool grown in the world, with the exception of that grown in Ohio and some of your adjoining States—a little in Nevada; a little in my own State, Idaho; and some in Oregon—that will stand the high tearing test that this Government demands to-day for the cloth for the Army and Navy.

Here is another thing to be noticed. Gentlemen say, Let the woolgrowers in the Ohio region go into some other branch of the sheep industry. I tell you, gentlemen, that if you destroy the great merino flocks of Ohio, you will cripple the wool industry of the world, because it is only by crossing the breeds, by using the crossbreeds that they already have as a foundation, and improving the stock by importations from the Ohio flocks that you can keep up the standard. This is the origin of the "comeback," a term so familiar in foreign wool markets. Why, bless you, this wool right here that is raised in Australia has its fineness and its luster because of the imported blood from the flocks of Ohio. We must maintain these flocks in the Ohio region if our country is to remain one of the great wool-producing nations.

The committee have been very kind to me, and I shall not detain you longer, except that in the name of the woolgrowers of this country I say to the majority, it seems to me, gentlemen, that we are entitled to fairer treatment than we are about to receive at your hands. The sheep industry of this country has a right to live. If you pass this bill, you invite a repetition of the disaster of 1894. The farmers and woolgrowers of Ohio ask no special favors; they simply want a fair chance. In their behalf I ask for a specific duty on raw wool to be based on the scoured content at a rate sufficient to equalize the difference in cost of production here and in the chief competing foreign countries. Do not paralyze Ohio's industries and darken her homes by passing this free-trade bill!

The sun never shone on a country more fair than beautiful, peerless Ohio:
There's life in a kiss of her rarefied air—Ohio, prolific Ohio;
Her sons they are honest and valiant and bright,
Her beautiful daughters are just about right,
But her sheepmen and farmers would be in a sad plight
Under Democrat rule in Ohio.

[Laughter and applause.]

I desire to present here the tables previously referred to:

Average labor cost per sheep.

United States	$0.82
South America	.23
Australia	.07

Labor cost shearing per sheep.

United States	$0.09½
Australia	.07
South America	.06
Africa	.02

Total labor cost, including shearing, of handling 52,000,000 sheep.

United States	$47,580,000
South America	15,080,000
Australia	7,280,000

Cost to feed 52,000,000 sheep one year.

United States	$23,400,000
South America	18,200,000
Australia	4,160,000

Taxes per sheep.

United States	$0.05
South America	.04
Australia	.025

Taxes on 52,000,000 sheep.

United States	$2,600,000
South America	2,080,000
Australia	1,300,000

Freight on 1 pound scoured wool from the growers' railroad station to Boston.

Western United States	$0.06
Australia	.03
South America	.0105
London, dock	.0025

Freight cost to market 56,875,000 pounds of scoured wool.

Eleven Western States	$3,412,500.00
Australia	1,706,250.00
South America	597,187.50
England	142,187.50

Total expense per sheep without interest.

Ohio	$2.44
Western United States	2.11
South America	1.15
Australia	.93
Africa	.93

Average cost per sheep, including interest.

Ohio	$2.758
Western United States	2.587
Australia	1.23
South America	1.37
Africa	1.075

Cost to produce 1 pound of grease wool without interest.

Ohio	$0.19
Western United States	.11
Average United States	.096
South America	.045
Australia	.00
Africa	.00

Cost to produce pound of grease wool.

	Without interest.	With interest.
Ohio	$0.19	$0.233
Western United States	.11	.175
Crossbreds, United States	.00	.0435
Average, United States	.096	.154
Australia	.000	.041
South America	.045	.075
Africa	.00	.022

Shrinkage of wools.

Ohio	per cent	60.0
Western United States	do	62.0
Average United States	do	60.4
England	do	25.1
Australia	do	48.54
South America	do	51.04
Africa	do	58.4

Cost to produce 1 pound of scoured wool without interest.

Ohio	$0.475
Western United States	.289
Average United States	.242
Australia	.00
Africa	.00
South America	.092

Cost to produce 1 pound of scoured wool, with interest.

Ohio	$0.58
Western United States	.46
Average United States	.389
Australia	.079
South America	.153
Africa	.053

Wool production of competing countries.

United States	pounds	325,000,000
Australasia	do	941,900,000
South America	do	528,100,000
Africa	do	131,000,000

Cost to produce 109,966,195 pounds of scoured wool.

United States ($0.389 per pound)	$42,776,849.85
South America ($0.153 per pound)	16,829,417.83
Australia ($0.79 per pound)	8,687,329.40
Africa ($0.053 per pound)	5,828,208.35

Summary of aggregate costs.

	United States.	Australasia.	Difference against United States.
Labor cost handling 52,000,000 sheep	$47,580,000	$7,280,000	$40,300,000
Cost of feed, 52,000,000 sheep	23,400,000	4,160,000	19,240,000
Total taxes, 52,000,000 sheep	2,600,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Freight, 56,875,000 pounds on wool scoured	3,412,500	1,706,250	1,706,250
Total expense, without interest, 52,000,000 sheep	118,404,000	48,360,000	70,044,400
Total interest, 52,000,000 sheep	22,323,600	15,600,000	6,723,600
Total maintenance cost, 52,000,000 sheep	140,727,600	63,960,000	76,768,000
Cost to produce 109,966,195 pounds scoured wool, without interest	26,644,512	.....	26,644,512
Cost in interest to produce same	16,132,337	8,687,329	7,445,008
Total cost to produce same, with interest	42,776,889	8,687,329	34,089,520

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. FINLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 22195) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool, and had come to no resolution thereon.

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 joint resolutions:

H. J. Res. 263. Joint resolution to authorize allotments to Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., of lands valuable for coal; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the president of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, of California, in relation to the San Francisco Mint and the Panama Canal, my answer thereto, and a statement by myself.

Mr. WILLIS. Reserving the right to object, I do not wish to be discourteous to the gentleman, but it was understood that after the general debate closed there was to be no further business. I was so informed by gentlemen on this side of the aisle.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, this was understood some time before, that this particular matter would be permitted.

Mr. RAKER. I do not know anything about the arrangement, but I saw the leader on this side of the House, and he said he had no objection to my making the request.

Mr. WILLIS. Can not the gentleman just as well have it inserted in the RECORD on Monday?

Mr. RAKER. It is only a telegram from the grand president of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, who reports that 8,000 ladies are interested in the San Francisco Mint, a historic place in California, and I would like to have it go in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the Daughters of the Golden West and the Daughters of the Golden East, but I believe that this matter will keep until Monday, and I feel constrained to object.

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. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to furnish a copy of the daily and bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard; to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 1. An act granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and the War with Mexico, with Senate amendment; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. THAYER, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for five days, on account of attendance at court as a witness.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors was discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21590, a bill to authorize levee and drainage district No. 25, of Dunklin County, Mo., to construct and maintain a levee across a branch or cut-off of St. Francis River in Missouri, and the same was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, when the House meets at 11 o'clock, I be permitted to speak on this bill for 20 minutes; that general debate continue thereafter for two hours, one hour to be occupied by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the second hour by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], and that general debate close at 1.30 instead of at 1 o'clock, as heretofore agreed upon. I will say that this is in accordance with the consent of the parties who have heretofore been managing the matter, and that the extra time in compensation to the other side of the House has already been used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the agreement heretofore made in reference to closing debate on the bill be modified so that when the House meets on Monday next he shall have 30 minutes, the gentleman from New York one hour, and the gentleman from North Carolina one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this is an understanding that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has had with with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will state that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] agreed before me that that program should be carried out on Monday, and in conformity with that proposed agreement the Republican side of the House has already had 31 minutes more time than has the Democratic side.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection, if that is the understanding.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that under an arrangement between myself and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] that he will not object next Monday to my putting the telegram I have referred to in the RECORD, I will not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1912, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, submitting department views on H. R. 22048, a bill to further restrict the admission of aliens into the United States, in response to inquiry of Mr. BURNETT (H. Doc. No. 659), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 22593) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, by providing for physical valuation of the property of carriers subject thereto and securing information concerning their stocks and bonds and boards of directors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 477), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS: A bill (H. R. 22636) to provide for the erection of a public building at Yoakum, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22637) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FERGUSSON: A bill (H. R. 22638) to provide for the purchase of a site and construction of a Federal building in the town of Las Vegas, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22639) for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Las Cruces, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22640) to provide for the purchase of a site and erection of a Federal building at Raton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 22641) providing that storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers shall be allowed their actual expenses, not to exceed $1 a day, while on duty under an assignment away from their legal residences; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 22642) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Potomac River, the Anacostia River or Eastern Branch, and Rock Creek, and lands adjacent thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 22643) to amend subchapter 2, chapter 19 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia

by providing a penalty for willful omission to return library property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22644) to extend and make applicable the compulsory educational laws of the various States to Indians residing therein; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 22645) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22646) providing that the United States shall, in certain cases, make compensation for the use of highways for carrying free rural-delivery mail; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 22647) providing for the sale and entry of certain lands in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 22648) to authorize a change in the location of Fourteenth Street NE., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 22649) to amend section 5 of an act approved January 21, 1903, as amended May 27, 1908, entitled "An act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 22650) to replace sections 4214 and 4218 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 22651) to increase the Infantry garrison at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to a brigade, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 22652) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States to the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, for the sole purpose of improving the roads therein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 22653) to authorize the sale of burnt timber on the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 22654) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain lands to be used as a sanitarium by the Order of Owls; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 22655) to extend the rights and privileges of Government, or Federal, employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 22720) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the necessity for constructing bridges on the White Mountain or San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the State of Arizona, and on the Yuma Indian Reservation, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia (by request): A bill (H. R. 22721) to prescribe the rule of decision in the appellate courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 285) concerning contracts with Indian tribes or individual Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution (H. Res. 474) providing payment for the taking of testimony authorized under House resolution 358; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Memorial from the State of New York, favoring House bill 36, House bill 4428, and Senate bill 2367, affording protection to migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial from the State of New York, favoring House bill 36, House bill 4428, and Senate bill 2367, affording protection to migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REDFIELD: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, favoring legislation by Congress for the protection of migratory game birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 22656) granting a pension to Margaret A. Seeley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 22657) granting a pension to Helen Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22658) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22659) granting an increase of pension to James M. Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22660) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Transue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22661) granting an increase of pension to Columbus Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 22662) granting an increase of pension to Noah Switzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 22663) for the relief of John C. Brake; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 22664) granting a pension to Thomas D. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 22665) for the relief of the trustees of the Clarksville Female Seminary, of Clarksville, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22666) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 22667) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 22668) granting an increase of pension to James Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 22669) granting an increase of pension to John F. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22670) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 22671) for the relief of Patrick Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22672) granting a pension to Margaret Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22673) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Yetts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 22674) granting an increase of pension to George S. Boom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 22675) granting an increase of pension to George Baldey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 22676) for the relief of H. A. M. Steen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 22677) granting an increase of pension to James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 22678) for the relief of Joe Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22679) granting an increase of pension to James B. White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 22680) granting an increase of pension to Preston M. Emery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22681) granting an increase of pension to Byron A. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22682) granting an increase of pension to Mariner Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 22683) for the relief of John Pilcher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22684) granting an honorable discharge and a pension to William Conner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 22685) for the relief of Peter McKay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 22686) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McDonner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22687) for the relief of the Christian Church at Campbellsville, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 22688) granting a pension to Anna G. Freeman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 22689) for the relief of Frederick Grasser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 22690) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Rome, Ga.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 22691) granting an increase of pension to James O. Cleveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 22692) granting an increase of pension to Noah Ruhl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22693) granting an increase of pension to Sidney Shandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22694) to correct the military record of William H. McKown and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 22695) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22696) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew Jackson Hendrickson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 22697) granting a pension to George E. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 22698) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARRAN: A bill (H. R. 22699) granting a pension to Ella J. Belt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22700) granting an increase of pension to Philip Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 22701) granting an increase of pension to Johnathan Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22702) for the relief of Mary Moles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22703) granting a pension to H. E. Rives; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22704) granting an increase of pension to Jessee Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22705) granting an increase of pension to Susan Schofield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 22706) granting an increase of pension to Lucy A. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 22707) for the relief of the legal representatives of Rev. Thomas J. Neeley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22708) for the relief of the legal representatives of H. E. Aden, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 22709) granting an increase of pension to Elias H. Colburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 22710) granting a pension to William A. Moffitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22711) granting a pension to Rachel Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22712) granting a pension to Jennie C. Rathbun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22713) granting an increase of pension to Milford H. Donoho; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 22714) for the relief of Clement Lamoureaux; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22715) for the relief of David Snow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22716) for the relief of Owen Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 22717) granting an increase of pension to Nathan W. Yoder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: A bill (H. R. 22718) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22719) for the relief of the estate of Joseph S. Rogers, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 22722) granting a pension to Mary C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22723) granting a pension to Charley Cadle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22724) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Trough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22725) granting an increase of pension to John L. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 22726) granting an increase of pension to Theodore G. Cree; 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 (by request): Petitions of citizens of Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York, asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AINEY: Petitions of Central Grange, No. 194; East Lemon Grange, No. 400; Union Grange, No. 152; Gibson Grange, No. 798; Beech Flat Grange, No. 336; Ledgedale Grange, No. 1481; Shiloh Grange, No. 927; Columbia Grange, No. 83; Gibson Star Grange, No. 924; Unity Grange, No. 1249; Troy Grange, No. 182; Enterprise Grange, No. 1352; Highland Grange, No. 183; Jackson Grange, No. 342; Union Grange, No. 155; Armenia Grange, No. 883, all of the State of Pennsylvania, advocating the passage by Congress of House bill 19133, which provides for governmental system of postal express; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of F. G. Inderlied and other citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against any parcel-post legislation extending the service beyond its present limitations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: Memorial of the Hub Board of Trade of Columbus, Ohio, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions of Stephen A. Forbes, director Illinois State Laboratory of Natural History, and students of Newton Academy, of Newton, N. J., in favor of House bill 4428; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. Leuenberger, secretary, and other members of Highland Park Grange, Topeka, Kans., in support of House bill 21225, relating to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of T. C. Ramsey and 3 other merchants of Killbuck, Ohio, for regulation of express rates and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Martin Burns and 21 other citizens of Newark, Ohio, protesting against the passage of interstate commerce legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of M. Friedman, superintendent United States Indian School at Carlisle, Pa., in favor of Senate bill 3; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Group No. 190, Polish National Alliance, protesting against further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURNETT: Memorial of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Boaz, Ala., in favor of adoption of House joint resolution 163; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of Altamont, Kans., for enactment of the Haugen oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER: Petitions of L. B. Griffing, of Atoka, and Thomas Carnell, of Wapanucka, Okla., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing House bill 18493, pertaining to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Senior Loyal Temperance Legion of Milwaukee, Wis., for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Farmers' Institute of Wisconsin, for establishment of a parcel-post system, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Lodge No. 128, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Milwaukee, Wis., for enactment of House bill 20487, providing for compensation of employees engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., for construction of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Grubbs Bagley Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of Local Union No. 77, N. B. O. P., of Mannington, W. Va., praying for a clause in the naval appropriation bill providing for the building of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Marion County, W. Va., praying for a speedy report on House bill 16214; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., for creation of a commission on industrial relations; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church South of Reader, W. Va., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., for enactment of House bills 19405, 19406, and 19407; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, protesting against the Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bills for the relief of Marcus F. Nesmith (H. R. 21439) and James Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Group No. 1224, of the Polish National Alliance of the U. A. of N. A., of Rockford, Ill., protesting against passage of immigration bills, providing for the educational test, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of G. E. Wiltse & Son, of Waterman, Ill., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Robert Daring, R. F. D. No. 2, and Truman L. and L. N. Cleveland, R. F. D. No. 5, all of Rockford, Ill., favoring the establishment of a parcel-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of citizens of Corpus Christi and Fort Worth, Tex., for enactment of the Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Union Church Mass Meeting, of Scottdale, Pa., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of Nicholas Gahr, of Haynes, N. Dak., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of North Dakota Sunday School Association, for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Edmore, N. Dak., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Elbowoods, N. Dak., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: Petitions of Mart, Waco, and West, Tex., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Bridgeport, Tex., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of J. R. Beckett and 100 other citizens of Faulkner County, Ark., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KOPP: Petition of citizens of Reedsburg, Wis., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of heirs of Charles G. Knight (H. R. 22411); to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Douglas County, Minn., for enactment of the Haugen oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Homer City, and Glade Run Presbyterian Church, of Dayton, Pa., for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Memorial of the Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, urging agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCOY: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Irvington and Newark, N. J., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of Grampian, Pa., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Granges Nos. 96, 223, 290, and 1284, Patrons of Husbandry, for a governmental system of postal express; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of citizens of the State of New York, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Dundee, N. Y., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Alton, N. Y., and the Ministers' Association of Newark, N. J., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: Petition of citizens of Denison, Tex., in favor of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REDFIELD: Memorial of the Seamen's Church Institute of New York, for enactment of Senate bill 2117; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for enactment of House bill 20487, the Federal compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Camp No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, of Meriden, Conn., for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Grange No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, of Kent, Conn., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, for establishment of a naval base on Narragansett Bay, in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Holly, Mich., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of numerous citizens of the State of California, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Melville Jeffrey, of Los Angeles, Cal., for enactment of House bill 20595, amending the copyright act of 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Order of Railway Conductors, Order of Railway Telegraphers, and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, for enactment of House bill 20487, Federal accident compensation act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Camas (Mont.) Hot Springs Commercial Club, relative to irrigation of the Flathead Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Bankers' Association, for agricultural demonstration work throughout the country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of citizens of Creston, Iowa, for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNBULL: Petition of Thomas F. Goode and 45 other citizens of Mecklenburg County, Va., against the establishment of a parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Grange No. 426, Patrons of Husbandry, of Prattsburg, N. Y., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEDEMEYER: Petition of sundry citizens of Addison, Mich., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas: Petition of W. E. Jordan and others of Murchison, in favor of legislation prohibiting gambling in farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *April 1, 1912.*

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast been our refuge in all generations, we come before Thee with bowed heads and saddened hearts over the great loss we have suffered. We know indeed that the way of man is not in himself alone, and that it is not in us who walk to direct our steps. Therefore we submit our lives unto Thee, whose we are. Though Thou slay us, yet will we put our trust in Thee. Deepen in us, we pray Thee, the confidence that amid all earth's changes Thou changest not, and fulfill unto us the promise that Thine unfailing love shall be sufficient for our deepest sorrow.

And unto Thee, our Father, who hast loved us with an everlasting love and hast given us comfort and good hope through the gospel, be glory and praise now and for evermore. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the last legislative day, Thursday, March 28, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR ROBERT LOVE TAYLOR.

Mr. LEA. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the Senate the death of my colleague, Hon. ROBERT LOVE