stump; and the people did not think you were going to give them cast-iron pipe or barbed wire on their breakfast tables.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us have some order. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRONNA. Not just now; I will in a moment.

In answer to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say that the Treasury of the United States will lose more than $25,000,000 of revenue upon the articles I have enumerated. There is no question in my mind but that the farmer of the country will lose many times as much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GRONNA. Because the Canadian farmer and the farmer from other foreign countries will have access to the American market, which belongs to the American farmer. I thought the Senator from Mississippi and I could agree on at least one thing, and that is that the Treasury of the United States will lose more than $25,000,000 through the changes that have been made, or that are proposed in the present bill to be made, from the present law on those items.

Mr. President, I do not care to occupy the floor any longer. I have said all I am going to say. I asked a few minutes ago to have a table printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Permission was granted to the Senator from North Dakota.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Amount expended by farmers for labor in 1909.*

| | |
|---|---|
| United States | $651, 611, 287 |
| Maine | 5, 633, 106 |
| New Hampshire | 3, 374, 126 |
| Vermont | 4, 748, 003 |
| Massachusetts | 12, 101, 959 |
| Rhode Island | 1, 761, 594 |
| Connecticut | 6, 881, 619 |
| New York | 41, 312, 014 |
| New Jersey | 11, 097, 727 |
| Pennsylvania | 25, 611, 838 |
| Ohio | 25, 631, 185 |
| Indiana | 17, 682, 079 |
| Illinois | 36, 308, 376 |
| Michigan | 19, 063, 082 |
| Wisconsin | 19, 195, 473 |
| Minnesota | 22, 230, 149 |
| Iowa | 24, 781, 592 |
| Missouri | 18, 644, 695 |
| North Dakota | 21, 740, 149 |
| South Dakota | 12, 831, 944 |
| Nebraska | 15, 028, 468 |
| Kansas | 20, 567, 237 |
| Delaware | 1, 612, 471 |
| Maryland | 8, 802, 172 |
| District of Columbia | 238, 833 |
| Virginia | 13, 354, 194 |
| West Virginia | 4, 035, 764 |
| North Carolina | 9, 220, 564 |
| South Carolina | 10, 770, 758 |
| Georgia | 13, 218, 113 |
| Florida | 5, 354, 376 |
| Kentucky | 12, 243, 851 |
| Tennessee | 8, 448, 059 |
| Alabama | 7, 454, 748 |
| Mississippi | 7, 162, 225 |
| Arkansas | 7, 654, 571 |
| Louisiana | 16, 704, 125 |
| Oklahoma | 9, 837, 541 |
| Texas | 25, 784, 501 |
| Montana | 10, 930, 477 |
| Idaho | 6, 701, 604 |
| Wyoming | 6, 174, 164 |
| Colorado | 10, 818, 465 |
| New Mexico | 3, 645, 423 |
| Arizona | 2, 504, 984 |
| Utah | 3, 169, 917 |
| Nevada | 2, 993, 978 |
| Washington | 15, 370, 931 |
| Oregon | 11, 101, 864 |
| California | 49, 976, 199 |

*Revenues from duties on farm products in 1912, and estimated revenues from duties on farm products under tariff bill as reported to Senate.*

| Article. | Imports, 1912. | Revenue, 1912. | Proposed rate. | Estimated imports. | Estimated revenue. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Horses | $335,684 | $68,323 | 10 per cent | $475,000 | $47,500 |
| Mules | 53,053 | 34,590 | do | 137,500 | 13,750 |
| Cattle | 4,486,306 | 1,214,481 | Free | | |
| Swine | 10,832 | 1,497 | do | | |
| Sheep | 123,832 | 20,326 | do | | |
| Other animals | 79,497 | 15,880 | 10 per cent | 100,000 | 10,000 |
| Barley | 1,929,214 | 830,542 | 15 cents | 1,300,000 | 300,000 |
| Oats | 1,053,609 | 408,156 | 6 cents | 945,000 | 162,000 |
| Rice | 4,185,086 | 1,323,338 | Various | 3,970,000 | 853,000 |
| Corn | 47,858 | 8,008 | Free | | |
| Wheat | 998,014 | 352,245 | do | | |
| Rye | 111,323 | 13,395 | do | | |
| Broom corn | 157,969 | 4,024 | do | | |
| Buckwheat | 15,967 | 3,025 | do | | |

*Revenues from duties on farm products in 1912, etc.*—Continued.

| Article. | Imports, 1912. | Revenue, 1912. | Proposed rate. | Estimated imports. | Estimated revenue. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Butter and substitutes | $236,483 | $60,337 | 2½ cents per pound. | $325,000 | $32,500 |
| Cheese and substitutes | 8,683,947 | 2,760,900 | do | 11,000,000 | 375,000 |
| Beans | 1,456,656 | 371,252 | 25 cents per bushel. | 1,600,000 | 250,000 |
| Beets | 147,466 | 15,095 | 5 per cent | 153,000 | 7,500 |
| Hay | 6,472,376 | 2,796,855 | $2 per ton | 9,000,000 | 2,400,000 |
| Honey | 51,706 | 16,284 | 10 cents per gallon. | 60,000 | 11,000 |
| Hops | 2,223,895 | 477,313 | 16 cents per pound. | 1,575,000 | 560,000 |
| Onions | 1,233,907 | 572,819 | 20 cents per bushel. | 1,350,000 | 360,000 |
| Garlic | 283,259 | 93,332 | 1 cent per pound. | 275,000 | 90,000 |
| Peas | 1,897,707 | 299,709 | Various | 1,661,500 | 116,070 |
| Flaxseed | 13,048,513 | 1,718,065 | 15 cents per bushel. | 11,000,000 | 900,000 |
| Straw | 56,891 | 15,402 | 50 cents per ton. | 75,000 | 7,500 |
| Vegetables | 1,035,163 | 252,633 | 15 per cent | 1,505,000 | 225,750 |
| Poultry | 154,175 | 33,344 | Various | 156,000 | 18,000 |
| Eggs | 150,986 | 54,935 | Free | | |
| Flax straw | 6,990 | 853 | do | | |
| Milk, fresh | 6,283 | 936 | do | | |
| Cream | 923,787 | 56,012 | do | | |
| Potatoes | 7,175,376 | 3,434,535 | do | | |
| Wool | 33,141,408 | 14,454,234 | do | | |
| Hair of Angora goat, etc. | 632,330 | 243,591 | do | | |
| Total | | 32,026,266 | | | 6,739,570 |

Estimated revenue and estimated imports taken from tariff handbook prepared by Finance Committee. Fruits not included in above statement. Where the article is placed on the free list the handbook contains no estimate as to probable imports.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that finishes this schedule, I think, except for some paragraphs that have been passed over. I ask that the bill may be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BACON. If the bill is laid aside and there is no other matter of a pressing nature——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought probably the Senator from Georgia would make a motion to go into executive session.

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we may as well adjourn.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 18, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, *August 18, 1913.*

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

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Dillingham | McLean | Simmons |
| Bacon | Fall | Martin, Va. | Smith, Ga. |
| Bankhead | Fletcher | Martine, N. J. | Smoot |
| Borah | Gallinger | Norris | Sterling |
| Brady | Gronna | O'Gorman | Sutherland |
| Brandegee | Hollis | Page | Swanson |
| Bristow | Hughes | Perkins | Thomas |
| Bryan | James | Pittman | Thompson |
| Burton | Johnson | Pomerene | Thornton |
| Catron | Jones | Robinson | Tillman |
| Chamberlain | Kenyon | Saulsbury | Townsend |
| Chilton | Kern | Shafroth | Weeks |
| Clapp | La Follette | Sheppard | Williams |
| Clark, Wyo. | Lane | Shields | |
| Crawford | Lodge | Shively | |

Mr. JAMES. My colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from presence here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. MCCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of sickness in his family. He is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] are detained from the Senate by reason of illness. This notice will stand for the day.

Mr. SHIELDS. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

TARIFF DUTY ON SPICES.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the RECORD does not show that paragraph 240 was recommitted to the committee. It simply states that the paragraph was passed over. It was the intention to have it recommitted. I desire to have that change made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be recommitted to the committee.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Widen-Lord Tanning Co., of Danversport, Mass., remonstrating against the adoption of paragraph No. 503, relating to grease, fats, vegetable tallow, etc., in the pending tariff bill, as proposed to be amended by the Senate Finance Committee, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present sundry memorials signed by a large number of teachers and students at the summer session of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., remonstrating against the proposed tax of 15 per cent ad valorem on books of all kinds imported into the United States. I move that the memorials lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the local branch of the Socialist Party of America, of Hanna, Wyo., favoring an investigation into the imprisonment and treatment of certain labor representatives, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wyoming, Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, and Illinois, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of good roads and a central transcontinental highway, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE TARIFF—BOOKS AND PLUMAGE.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a letter from a constituent of mine with reference to the tariff bill. It has reference to Schedule M, relating to the proposed tariff on books printed in foreign languages. It is signed by the president of a society, the C. M. B. A., and is a brief letter. I also have a letter from W. Leon Dawson, of Santa Barbara, Cal., in reference to the tariff on plumage. I ask that the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARDTON, N. DAK., *August 11, 1913.*

To the Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
*Member United States Senate.*

DEAR SIR: As president of the C. M. B. A., numbering societies with 80 members, I beg to urge you to use your influence to defeat the proposed 15 per cent tariff on books printed in other languages than the English. This measure has been rightly characterized as a "tax on knowledge," and we consider it unduly detrimental to the entire field of science and education, as well as unfavorable to those religious denominations or congregations, Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew, whose services are conducted in whole or in part in German, French, Italian, Polish, or any other language than the English. Moreover, the source of revenue would be out of proportion to the additional burden laid on a portion—and that only a portion—of the American people.

* * * * * * *

Respectfully,

JOS. KILZER,
*President of the C. M. B. A.*

---

THE BIRDS OF CALIFORNIA PUBLISHING CO.,
*Santa Barbara, August 5, 1913.*

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: To the intense disappointment of the bird lovers of America the Democratic Senators in caucus have ratified amendments which would rob the provisions of Schedule N (sec. 357) of all power to protect the world from the operations of the nefarious "Feather Trust." The most casual eye may see how easily the glitter of gold in a Jew's purse has blinded some of our Democratic friends to all humanitarian considerations as well as to the claims of agriculture, which so fully recognizes its dependence upon the birds.

We who love the birds, therefore, look to you to point out the inconsistency and the prospective damage threatened by this change in Democratic front, as well as to seek to win to the side of righteousness such as are not too far gone in this inspired folly. The cause of bird protection is really of the most profound significance, and the situation is crucial.

We count upon your vote, of course; may we not also count upon your voice manfully uplifted?

Sincerely and respectfully, W. LEON DAWSON.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 2242) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 103) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 3001) to change the homestead and preemption laws in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BACON:

A bill (S. 3002) making appropriation for expenses incurred under the treaty of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3003) for the prevention of fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3004) to carry into effect findings of the Court of Claims in the cases of Charles A. Davidson and Charles M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3005) granting a pension to Eva E. White (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. DILLINGHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution, coming over from a preceding day.

Mr. LODGE. In the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I ask that those resolutions relating to Mexico may go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will go over, then—all three. The morning business is closed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

Mr. TILLMAN. I gave notice some days ago that I would address the Senate this morning.

Mr. SIMMONS. But let the bill be taken up first.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing that it shall be taken up first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes. The Chair hears no objection, and the bill is before the Senate.

DR. BLEDSOE AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, those Senators who served with me here before I was taken ill know that I never read speeches in the Senate, and I regret very much that my physical weakness compels me to do so now.

A few days ago I asked permission of the Senate to insert in the RECORD and to have printed as a public document an article entitled "The Mission of Woman," by Dr. Alfred Taylor Bledsoe. When the RECORD appeared the next morning it was found that the article in question contained what many Senators thought was an unkind and unjust reference to northern women. I had not read the entire article before submitting it to the Senate. I had read only the first part, and was struck by the force of the historical references quoted in it as to the cause of the decay and fall of Rome. I felt that the article was very opportune just at this time, and that was why I wanted it given circulation in the RECORD and printed as a public document. On discovering the attitude of my brother Senators toward it, which I can readily see was natural, if not justifiable, I promptly joined them in requesting that it be stricken from the RECORD. I wished to avoid even the appearance of harboring mean thoughts or uncharitable sentiments toward the women of the North. Some of the very finest women I have ever known were northern women; and good women, thank God, are not confined to any section of our great country. They are to be found everywhere in the United States, and they will be the greatest factors in saving our civilization and institutions from degeneracy and destruction.

The expunging of the article from the RECORD did not prevent its reaching every part of the United States, for the copies containing it had been mailed before the action of the Senate ordering it to be expunged and countermanding the order for it to be printed as a public document had been taken.

Comments more or less vitriolic, and some of them unjust and wholly unfair, have come to me through the mail. I have been astounded to see how much ignorance has been shown. Some of the most scholarly northern magazines and periodicals, like the Independent, whose editors ought to be ashamed of their ignorance, discuss "The Mission of Woman" as though it had just appeared, instead of having been published forty-odd years ago. I have received a number of requests for copies of "The Mission of Woman," and I am sorry that the Senate refused to have it printed as a public document, because the action of the Senate expunging it from the permanent RECORD only attracted attention to it the more and caused people to be curious to see what had stirred up all the row in Washington.

I have investigated the matter fully, and feel that in justice both to Dr. Bledsoe and to myself I ought to make a further statement. He was a profound scholar, a courteous gentleman, and a godly man; and I feel that it is due his memory to explain fully how the article came to be written and under what circumstances it was given publicity. Dr. Bledsoe died in 1877, so nothing that has been or will be said about "The Mission of Woman" here or elsewhere will affect him in the slightest. He has gone "somewhere past the sunset and the night," to a land where worldly praises can not please nor worldly censures wound or crush. But I want to clear his memory and his name from any suspicion of sectional narrowness of any kind, and above all of narrowness and bigotry toward the women of any part of our common country. A chief tenet of the school in which he was reared was chivalrous respect and reverence for women; and to him a good woman, wherever and under whatever circumstances she might live, was a superior being, a sort of divinity whose high and holy purpose on earth was to bear, to rear, and to mold man into the image of his Maker. In sadness, not in anger, he saw, or thought he saw, northern women surrendering their divinity and high privileges for mere human rights, and as an honest man, true to the training he had received from his own mother and to the ideals which that training had engendered, he kindly but firmly spoke his sentiments.

The article first appeared in print in 1871, in the October number of The Southern Review, one of the broadest and most scholarly periodicals of its day. It was the lineal descendant of the once famous DeBow's Review. From 1846 until the close of the Civil War, this latter magazine was a leading exponent of the hopes and aspirations of the South; and when it, mortally wounded, as it were, by the collapse and fall of the Southern Confederacy, suspended publication shortly after the end of the war, The Southern Review was founded to take its place. Dr. Bledsoe was chosen editor of the new periodical, and it was his review of the then newly published "History of Morals," by Lecky, which led him to write "The Mission of Woman." The last chapter of Lecky's history is a very brilliant and profound exposition of the condition, social rights, and political privileges of women in all ages. The criticism, as it appeared in The Southern Review, had been reprinted in pamphlet form under the title "The Mission of Woman" by some admirer of Dr. Bledsoe; and Senator Johnston of Alabama—now, alas! gone from us to his long resting place—had come into possession of a copy. He showed it to me and asked me to have it printed as a public document. I glanced through it hurriedly and was so forcibly impressed by the author's apt application of Lecky's facts to the question of woman suffrage, divorce, and materialism, now so apparent everywhere, that I asked to have it printed in the RECORD as well as a public document. I thought it could not be given too wide publicity, because the country needs educating along these lines more than any other just at this time.

But Lecky's history was only the occasion of "The Mission of Woman." The real reason for its being written was undoubtedly the deplorable condition of southern politics at that time. As Senators will remember, the reconstruction of the South was completed in 1868. Universal suffrage had been decreed by Congress, and men with Federal uniforms on their backs and rifles in their hands marshaled the newly freed negroes to the polls and directed how they should cast their ballots. Thus, under the leadership of Thad. Stevens and others, the northern fanatics sowed the seed, and by 1871 the harvest of evils and crimes began to ripen. The South, prostrate and bleeding at every pore, her past a hopeless memory of better times, her present a slough of despond, and her future a hideous nightmare—the South, I say, was literally wallowing in violence, corruption, dishonesty, and political debauchery. It was pitiful. The great South—

"Than which no fairer land hath fired a poet's lay"—

was become a loathsome region, full of hideous sights and sounds and things unholy. Negroes, very few of whom could read or write, and some of them not three generations removed from the jungles of Africa, controlled our legislatures, while white scoundrels and thieves from the North ruled the negroes and robbed our people through them. Many of the magistrates and judges were negroes. The State colleges and universities of the South, maintained by taxation, were controlled by trustees elected by the negro legislatures. Carpet-baggers, scalawags, and negroes were among these trustees, and Dr. Bledsoe and other southerners like him were ready to cry out:

Ichabod! thy glory has departed.

At the thought of women anywhere, especially of the South, entering this monstrous and filthy arena, Dr. Bledsoe's chivalrous, sensitive spirit recoiled with horror. He pointed to the women of the North, not for what they were but for what they might become and would become if they persisted in their determination to abandon the sphere in which God had placed them. He lifted the kindly finger of warning; he drew the knightly sword of protection; he did not level the brutal pike of censure and condemnation. His scholarly mind appreciated the cause of the decay and rottenness of imperial Rome, and believing that history repeats itself he trembled for his country. I know from experience how hard it is for old men to adopt new notions or to accept new ideals. Visions are for young men; old men can only "dream dreams" and cling to their traditions. They dislike to be rudely awakened and are ever holding back against innovations and changes. The world moves forward, ever forward, because the young men will seek to progress. It is the ideal civilization or condition in society when the two forces are equalized, and the young and progressive visionaries are counseled and directed and held back by the wisdom of their seniors. Old men see the world rushing along pell-mell, helter-skelter, "going to the devil," so to speak, and we mourn in spirit. "The old order changeth, yielding place to the new," and the transitions are so rapid and startling that they hurt us cruelly.

I am led to make a few remarks on woman suffrage, although it is a dangerous topic to handle just at this time. I flatter myself, however, that my well-known reverence for good women will shield me from being misunderstood. The idea is fast becoming a practical issue, and Senators will realize the importance of our obtaining as much accurate information in regard to it as the nature of the subject will permit. Much valuable data could be obtained in States where the experiment is now being tried. Vital statistics should by all means be gathered in those States where woman suffrage already obtains. We ought to have records made of the birth rate, death rate, divorces, and other things affecting the everyday social life of the people, which would in a hundred years, say, show us whether female suffrage has affected these things injuriously or not. Such a radical change as would be produced in the manners and customs of the people by woman suffrage would put in motion influences that would be bound to revolutionize society. It might be, and the woman suffragists claim it will be, beneficial in every way. But it is the duty of statesmen to see that no rash experiments are made; and we ought to watch carefully and study all the facts obtainable in order to reach just conclusions. We can only be enlightened in such matters by the study of history. It would take three or four generations of men and women under woman suffrage before any just conclusions could be reached as to what direction we were going, and then only guesses could be made as to ultimate results.

In Rome when the manners and customs with regard to women began to change, and they were given more privileges than they had ever enjoyed before, divorces were so largely increased that free love became the rule. The birth rate correspondingly decreased, as Lecky's history shows. Now it is a beautiful dream that female suffrage will purify politics, because our ideals of women are so high, and we regard them so absolutely as the sources of goodness and purity, that we can not conceive of their not elevating and helping anything they touch. But the really vital and important thing for us to consider is the effect on the women themselves. We had better endure the evils of corruption in politics and debauchery in our Government, rather than bring about a condition which will mar the beauty and dim the luster of the glorious womanhood with which we have been familiar, and to which we have been accustomed all of our lives. We can better afford to have degraded and corrupt politics than degraded and bad women. To have both in ever-increasing degree, as was the case in Rome, would make the world so unspeakably horrible, as well as so corrupt, that good men and women both would disappear from the face of the earth, and civilization be blotted out like it was in the Dark Ages after the fall of Rome. Indeed, I am so thoroughly a convert to the belief that "you can not touch pitch without being defiled," that I shudder to think of the consequences to the

womanhood of America should suffrage become universal, taking in both sexes and all races. Yet the experiment is going to be tried, I fear.

I know the demand for suffrage on the part of women is growing too fast for old fogies like me to stop it, except possibly in the South and New England, where conservatism is more strongly intrenched than anywhere else in this country. I believe religiously that whatever the women ask for the men will give them, even though it be to their ultimate injury; and the country will have to test and be tested along these lines in spite of all the theories and ideals which have governed us heretofore. Fortunately, the United States Supreme Court has declared that casting the ballot is a privilege—not a national right—and that the States alone can confer this right on their citizens.

Neither the suffragettes, nor the suffragettors—as Representative HEFLIN calls their masculine sympathizers—ever consider or seem to pay any regard to the effect of politics on women; but I sincerely believe that the usefulness and goodness of woman vary inversely as the extent of her participation in politics. I believe she will improve politics, but ultimately politics will destroy her as we know her and love her; and when good women are no longer to be found, and we have lost the breed, the doom of the Republic is near.

It may be contended that information such as I have described would be partial and fragmentary, and that any conclusions based on it would therefore contain a large factor of uncertainty. That may or may not be true. But there is at least one subject about which mathematically exact knowledge can be obtained. The number of divorces granted in a State with woman suffrage and the birth rate may be compared with the number in the same State before equal suffrage was adopted, and the relation between the two phenomena inferred.

I thank God that my lot was cast in a State where there is no such thing as divorce. To get married in South Carolina is the easiest thing imaginable. To get "unmarried" is impossible. "Once married, always married," is the rule. Literally and exactly we believe that "for better or for worse, in poverty and in wealth, in sickness and in health, till death do them part," the twain are one.

It is true that, if life together becomes unbearable, a man and wife may separate and live apart, but even then the bonds that bind them are only stretched, not legally broken. In South Carolina we tie a matrimonial knot that baffles alike the skill of legal logic, the dexterity of sophistry, the nimble fingers of a false expediency, and the brute strength of a statute. The knot we tie holds faster than the fabled "Gordian knot" of antiquity. Ingenuity can not unfasten nor force destroy it. The skeleton fingers of death alone can loose it.

We in South Carolina do not believe in the modern idea so prevalent in this day and time of permitting a man to marry a woman in her youth and beauty and then, when her neck begins to grow skinny and shrunken, her face sallow and splotched, and her eyes dim, to search out among his women acquaintances some young and buxom girl who suits his lustful eyes better and straightway set to work, systematically, to treat his old wife so that she in self-defense and to maintain her self-respect seeks a divorce to get rid of him. There have been glaring cases of this kind of world-wide notoriety wherever the divorce evil flourishes.

When we contrast this type of man and woman with the glorious picture drawn by Burns, those men who have souls are bound to recoil from the one type and bow down and worship the other. Lest you have forgotten the verses, I will recite them for you:

John Anderson my jo, John,
When we were first acquent,
Your locks were like the raven,
Your bonie brow was brent;
But now your brow is beld, John,
Your locks are like the snaw,
But blessings on your frosty pow,
John Anderson my jo!

John Anderson my jo, John,
We clamb the hill thegither,
And monie a cantie day, John,
We've had wi' ane anither;
Now we maun totter down, John,
And hand in hand we'll go,
And sleep thegither at the foot,
John Anderson my jo!

This song, one of Robert Burns's best, is the very apotheosis of married life among the virtuous and good people of the world.

In thinking about the widespread, progressive character of the divorce evil, like all thoughtful men, I have been led to consider the cause of it and the great demoralization which has followed it. The law of sexuality is the most powerful law in nature, and it is the wise provision of the good God who created us with it to compel reproduction, the perpetuation of the race. Wherever the marriage bond is regarded as a sacred one women are virtuous, and virtuous women nearly always make virtuous men, just as good mothers are more apt to raise up brave and noble sons than bad ones. As long as Rome had women of the type of Virginia and Lucretia the Romans conquered all their neighbors and all other nations in Europe. When the women grew to be loose in their virtue, and lost it altogether in many cases, and the women came to be of the type of Nero's mother, who committed incest with her own son, as the historians tell us, Rome rapidly decayed and ceased to be mistress of the world. Therefore, it can be safely claimed that civilization itself is dependent on good women, and by good women I do not mean only amiable women, I mean virtuous women.

The divorce evil does not directly affect South Carolina, but our State is the only one that does not permit divorce in some form. North Carolina and Georgia, States on our borders, both grant them, and on increasingly trivial grounds, if report be true.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator will permit me, in order that what I say may go out in connection with his speech, as he specially mentions my State, to say two things. In the first place, divorce is not respectable in Georgia——

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator means divorced people are not respectable.

Mr. BACON. I mean the institution of divorce.

Mr. TILLMAN. How is it that anything the Legislature of Georgia has enacted into law is not respectable?

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator permit me to make a remark? I do not want to enter into a colloquy with him.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will sit down while the Senator proceeds.

Mr. BACON. If it excites the Senator at all, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator knows my weakened condition, and I have been hurrying to get through. The Senator can make his explanation after I have finished.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TILLMAN. My State is a lonely isle, surrounded on all sides by a turbid flood of raging, maddened waters; and lest we, too, be submerged, I would see the waters subside and the dry land appear, and under the blessed rays of God's moral sunshine would behold once again over our whole country the fruits and flowers of domestic peace, love, and affection, confidence, joy, and contentment.

I beg the pardon of Senators for having digressed. But as I was going on to say, statistics on the number of divorces granted in States where women have the vote would be very valuable. It would enable us to see the connection between woman suffrage and family life. It appears to me that the relation between "votes for women" and divorce, if not one of cause and effect, is at least one of mutual acceleration. I am no pessimist, but I am enough of a scientist to accept the truth wherever I find it, be it pleasant or unpleasant, and I have read history to no purpose if it has not taught me that the purity and stability of the family has in all ages been the surest bulwark of the State. It has ever been that when the marriage relation became insecure and women quitted their own sphere to enter that of man, the decay and fall of States followed. So often has this happened that I must believe that the one set of events is the result of the other. I have, therefore, sounded this feeble note of warning. As Hannibal gazed mournfully on the bloody head of his dead brother, Hasdrubal, which the Romans threw over the wall into his camp, and prophetically exclaimed, "Carthage, I see thy fate," so I, looking at the growing craze of woman suffrage and the rapid increase in the number of divorces granted in this country, sadly think, if I do not say, "America, thy race is almost run unless something is done to check thy headlong speed."

The demoralization and consequent degradation which have been produced by the divorce evil are illustrated by the notorious Diggs-Caminetti affair in California. The ease with which divorces are obtained in Reno led to that place being selected as the one to carry the two once respectable girls from Sacramento, and the promise to marry these women after divorces were obtained no doubt had much to do with overcoming their scruples. Such a tragedy in domestic life could not happen at all in South Carolina. It could not happen anywhere in the South, even in those States where divorces are obtained, and I say it in no boasting spirit.

We have bad women in South Carolina and throughout the South. But the habits of our people and their customs, inherited from our forefathers, all make it dangerous to "monkey with men's womankind." Some northern people call us barbarians because we shoot the seducer and lynch the rapist. If the California men had our customs Diggs and Caminetti would

not be alive now, because they would have been shot like dogs, and the fathers of the girls they have ruined would be acquitted almost without the jury leaving the box. The "unwritten law," as it has been called, is the best law to protect woman's virtue that I have ever heard of, though there have been abuses of it and men at times have gone scot free who ought to have been punished. The more I think about the Diggs-Caminetti case, the more outraged I grow at the state of morals and society which not only permits such crimes but encourages them. I am too much of a savage myself to think upon such things with calmness and equanimity. However, this case is now being tried, and perhaps I ought not to comment on it. But I am speaking as I do, not for the purpose of influencing the jury or public opinion for or against the men who are indicted. I am only using the case to illustrate the argument I am making on the demoralizing effects of woman suffrage and easy divorces.

Among our very rich people in America degeneration and bestiality have gone so far that swapping wives is a common practice. Family life is no longer what it ought to be and once was, and the watering places by the seaside and hotel resorts in the mountains afford opportunities for getting acquainted with other men's wives and other women's husbands. Lust takes the place of love, with the result that divorces are soon arranged and the swap is perfected under the forms of law.

The women are just as bad as the men and divorce their husbands on any slight pretext if they come across a man they like better who makes love to them.

A most disgraceful and mortifying fact which every American must blush for is to see how the American millionaires are buying their daughters titled husbands. Some count, baron, or lord, no matter how much of a debauchee and scoundrel he may be, but always with an empty purse, is looked up by the rich father and purchased in the open market just as he would purchase a bull or a stallion. The woman submits to legal prostitution for a time. Then the titled debauchee whose relatives have sneered at the plebeian wife all along are relieved of her presence. She finds a title a poor substitute for manhood and love and tires of her bargain. A divorce follows, and the unnatural alliance between money and scoundrelism is ended. O, the shame of it! but that is the way modern society is "progressing." God save the mark!

To me such people seem to be going straight to hell, and I am no stickler for religion either. I only abhor from the bottom of my soul the degradation and rottenness now becoming too common in society.

The danger, if danger there be, in giving woman the ballot at all is increased by the cowardice of public men everywhere. Politicians the world over have always had a keen eye to see which way they think the people are going; and it seems to me that the men politicians are trying to make peace with the women politicians and get on their good side now while it is fair weather. I noticed in Saturday's paper that the headlines threatened dire consequences hereafter to any public man who dared oppose the demand for woman suffrage now. I am afraid some of the weak-kneed men will be influenced in their attitude on this momentous subject by this fear. No man who is a man worth standing in shoe leather will be influenced by any such motive, and only cowards will yield their convictions and vote to give the women the ballot unless they believe honestly that it is for the best interests of the women and of the country. The history of the world is full of "crazes," or what they now call obsessions. The crusades are an illustration of what I mean.

Peter the Hermit, a fanatical monk, who was very eloquent, aroused the religious fervor of the Christians in western Europe to such a pitch that hundreds of thousands enlisted for the holy war against the infidels. No doubt this fervor was necessary to prevent the crescent from supplanting the cross. It was like two storms coming from opposite directions and meeting. The Saracens overran Egypt and northern Africa and crossed the Strait of Gibraltar into Spain. They crossed Spain and invaded France, and were only beaten back by Charles Martel, who defeated them at the Battle of Tours. It was six centuries before the Moors were expelled from the Spanish Peninsula and compelled to return to Africa.

Later when the Turks had conquered Constantinople the followers of the crescent overran southeastern Europe up to the walls of Vienna, where the rising tide of Mohammedanism was checked and beaten back by John Sobieski, the hero King of Poland. After centuries of enslavement to the followers of the crescent, Christianity triumphed and the so-called Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula with the aid of Russia regained their independence. The liberty of Greece and the restoration of its kingdom came about in 1820 largely through the help of England.

The recent war in the Balkans has wrested almost all of that peninsula from the Turks, but there was so little Christianity, patriotism, and sense among the allied nationalities that racial and religious prejudices and hatreds brought on a fratricidal strife among themselves to the disgust and horror of all Christendom. Patriotism and love of liberty drove them to combine against the Turk, and their preparedness and valor surprised the world. After winning great victories, each of the four small nations covering itself with glory, peace was forced upon Turkey, with the loss of all but a small slice of her territory in Europe. Then the pitiable spectacle was presented of their fighting each other like cats and dogs over the carcass they had brought down together. This last war cost more blood and treasure, perhaps, than the first one, but there was no glory in it for anybody. It is probable that another will soon break out, for those peoples seem hardly half civilized.

In one of the crusades the children were crazed by the priests and tens of thousands of them gathered and began to march toward the East. What they could do after they got there never seemed to enter their minds at all. They were simply lunatics frenzied with the religious idea, and thus made into fanatics.

First and last, historians tell us that upward of 1,100,000 people perished. The pitiful story is told that five shiploads of these children who started for Palestine were sold into slavery to the infidels by their so-called Christian leaders. The greater part of the rest of the children died from exposure and starvation.

It may not be worth while to recall these things, and I only mention them for the purpose of directing attention to the dangerous forces which are being set in motion by those who are preaching and agitating for female suffrage.

Priests and princes for their own selfish purposes appealed to the religious instinct of the people and produced a thousand years of war, bloodshed, and horror; selfish and sordid politicians of to-day, by appealing and yielding to the beautiful but fatuous idea of "woman's rights," may usher in another thousand years of moral blight and sexual depravity and degradation.

I am aware that in reciting all these horrid and cruel things I am chargeable with making a jeremiad or lament for the decay of our civilization. To others there may be no appearance of decay at all. I may be blinded or giving way to vain imaginings, but it seems to me very real, and I speak my thoughts frankly and bluntly as I have always done, for I was taught by my mother long ago to always tell the truth and to shun anything like hypocrisy, falsehood, or double-dealing.

"Of man's whole terrestrial possessions and attainments, unspeakably the noblest are his symbols," says Thomas Carlyle, and his highest earthly symbol is woman. She is his goddess of innocence and purity, and if ever she steps down, or man removes her from her high place at our altars, then God have mercy upon us, for the golden bowl of purity will be broken; the silver chord of chastity will be loosed; the sound of mourning will be heard in the streets; and the "reign of Chaos and old Night" will have come.

I pray God my foreboding of evil and prophecies of disaster may never come true. I would depart when my time shall come with much more confidence in the future of my country if I could believe that the women of our great land would always remain as pure and as high as most of them now are.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say right here that the Senator from South Carolina has been misinformed in regard to North Carolina. I doubt if there is a State in the Union, except South Carolina, that has so few legal causes for divorce as North Carolina. I wish to say to the Senator, also, that several years ago, I regret to say, we did have many causes for divorce. Some, in the language of the Senator, were trivial. They have all been repealed except two——

Mr. TILLMAN. Thank God!

Mr. OVERMAN. And now there are but two legal causes for divorce in my State—impotence and adultery.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the original article of Dr. Bledsoe, edited by TILLMAN, be again inserted in the RECORD and published as a document.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I must object, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will assure the Senators that I will leave in it nothing that is objectionable to anyone.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. If it is to be considered at all, it ought to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am willing it shall be referred to the Committee on Printing, if the Senator wishes that done.

Mr. GALLINGER. I shall not object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The matter will be referred with the request of the Senator from South Carolina to the Committee on Printing.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed, at page 64, line 15, and the Secretary proceeded to read the first paragraph of Schedule H—spirits, wines, and other beverages.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I was requested by my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] to offer a substitute for Schedule G, the agricultural schedule. I have just been informed that he has arrived in the city and will be here this afternoon, perhaps in a very few minutes. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will kindly agree to let the schedule be pending, so that my colleague, when he returns, may offer his amendment to the schedule?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, my understanding has been that we are now reading the bill principally for the committee amendments, and that any Senator could offer hereafter any amendment that he might desire. I should think that would meet the situation.

Mr. GRONNA. Will it be in order, then, to return to Schedule G and offer a substitute at any time before we have finished the bill?

Mr. SIMMONS. It probably would be in order; but I would prefer, and I think the committee would prefer, after we leave a schedule not to return to it until we have finished the other schedules imposing duties, and the free list. Then we can return to any schedule to which any Senator may desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRONNA. If the amendment proposed by my colleague should be offered now would it be pending and could it be taken up and voted upon at any time before we conclude the reading of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can offer it at any time, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from North Dakota that the committee amendments in Schedule G have not yet all been passed upon. There are one or two paragraphs which have been referred back to the committee. In the usual and ordinary course of parliamentary procedure, as the Chair understands, the committee amendments have precedence. The Senator can offer the amendment now, as far as that is concerned, or later, after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. If I may make a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair has just stated that certain clauses and paragraphs have been referred back to the committee. Of course, until those are disposed of the schedule as a whole is not closed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly not. That is what the Chair was trying to explain to the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator will lose nothing by waiting until his colleague comes into the Senate Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator's colleague will not lose the opportunity to offer his amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that Schedule E, relating to sugar, molasses, and manufactures thereof, be taken up.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator consent to going on with Schedule H at the present time? The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is absent from the Chamber, and I know the last time he spoke to me about the matter he stated that he was preparing to speak upon Schedule E. I really do not know whether or not he is prepared to go on now. If it will make no difference to the Senator from North Carolina, we can take up Schedule H at this time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should prefer not to take up that schedule at present, because I do not believe there is much in the schedule that will be the subject of controversy except the last paragraph; and the committee has been considering that paragraph, and has been having some hearings upon it. Until we have finished the hearings, and have reached a decision, I should rather not take up the schedule. I will say to the Senator, further, that there are some other matters in connection with the schedule that I wish to look into.

I do not think there will be any trouble about the Senator from Michigan having abundant time, as there are other Senators ready to go on with the sugar schedule. The Senator from Michigan is in the city, and I think he will get here in time to speak upon the sugar schedule. At any rate, it was put over week before last with the understanding that it was to be taken up last week; and last week, as we were not quite ready, we went on with the agricultural schedule.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not so understand. I thought it went over just the same as any other paragraphs that have been passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; it went over by a sort of agreement. Several Senators asked that it go over for their convenience. One of the Senators from Nebraska, I think, suggested that he had to be away for a day or two, and would like to have it go over; and other Senators made the same suggestion, so that it went over by consent until the agricultural schedule was finished.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, do I understand that Schedule E is now before the Senate?

Mr. SIMMONS. I had requested that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Schedule E; yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to offer an amendment to the first paragraph of Schedule E. I send it to the desk and ask that it may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of paragraph 179, with the committee amendment, and paragraph 180, in the following words:

179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, seventy-one one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test, twenty-six one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40°, 15 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40° and not above 56°, 2¼ cents per gallon; testing above 56°, 4½ cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test: *Provided*, That the duties imposed in this paragraph shall be effective on and after the 1st day of March, 1914: *Provided further*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

180. Maple sugar and maple sirup, 3 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state, or unmanufactured, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on and after the 1st day of May, 1916, the articles hereinbefore enumerated in this paragraph shall be admitted free of duty.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

179. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test, twenty-five one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional and fractions of a degree in proportion; from and after June 30, 1916, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test, two one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional and fractions of a degree in proportion; from and after June 30, 1919, testing by the polariscope not above 75°, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscopic test fifteen one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses testing not above 40°, 20 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40° and not above 56°, 3 cents per gallon; testing above 56°, 6 cents per gallon; sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

108. "Maple sugar and maple sirup, 3 cents per pound; glucose or grape sugar, 1½ cents per pound; sugar cane in its natural state, or unmanufactured, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I have prepared a summary of what I desire to say on this amendment in manuscript form. I would prefer to read it and not to be interrupted until I have concluded the manuscript. After I have finished the manuscript, I shall be glad to answer any questions that I can, and then I expect to present some tables which I intend to ask to have printed. So, if Senators will kindly wait until I am through with the manuscript, which I think it will take probably about 40 minutes to read, I will appreciate it.

Napoleon Bonaparte may properly be called the father of the beet-sugar industry. Its success really dates from his famous decree of 1811, when he ordered approximately 79,000 acres of land planted to sugar beets and sent out a corps of instructors to teach the farmers how to grow them. He established six schools for instruction in the processes of the production of beets and the manufacture of sugar. In fact, a century ago he established agricultural schools and experiment stations for sugar-beet culture similar in many respects to the efforts we are now making along general agricultural lines. It is true that German scientists more than half a century before had discovered the process of extracting sugar from beets, and an occasional feeble effort had been made in Germany and France to establish factories for that purpose. But they all failed.

When Napoleon read the report of Chaptal, who had been designated by the French Institute to inquire into the process

of extracting sugar from beets, his active mind grasped the possibilities of such production. He became intensely interested and visited a factory where the experiment was being made. With his usual promptness, he determined to develop the production of beet sugar in France and thereby make his empire as far as possible independent in the production of this great commodity of universal consumption. His detailed attention to the establishment of this industry in France in the years 1811–1813, when he was struggling with such tremendous military and political problems, is another striking illustration of the marvelous versatility of that wonderful man. After half a century of failure in Germany and many futile efforts in France he commanded its production, and within two years France was furnishing her people more than 2,000 tons per annum of refined sugar from her beet-sugar factories.

The impetus which Napoleon gave the industry made France for 50 years, despite the industrial disturbances that followed the vicissitudes of her turbulent history, the leading country in the development of beet-sugar production. About 1835 Germany began to realize the great advantage to any country in producing its own sugar, and she adopted in various forms the Napoleonic method of developing the industry. Since that time every important European nation, with the exception of Great Britain, has adopted a policy for promoting domestic sugar production. Practically all of them for years imposed heavy impost duties on imported sugar, to stimulate the home industry, and they also provided a bounty on sugar that was exported.

While Germany moved slowly in the early stages of the development of this resource, during more recent years she has made great progress. She not only levied high-tariff duties on imported sugar, but also paid bounties upon that exported by her factories. These bounties were first provided in a very ingenious way. In 1869 it was estimated that in round numbers it required 12 tons of beets to make 1 ton of sugar. Nearly all European nations levy an excise tax on sugar production and consumption. Germany's method of levying this tax was to impose it upon the number of tons of beets that were sliced by the factories. Then she provided that for every hundred pounds of beet sugar exported the Government would give a drawback; but the drawback was on the weight of the sugar, not on the weight of the beets. The excise tax was first fixed at approximately 17 cents per hundred pounds of beets sliced. It was estimated that 1,200 pounds of beets would produce 100 pounds of sugar. This tax therefore produced a revenue of approximately $2 per hundred pounds of sugar.

The result was that when the German factory sliced 1,200 pounds of beets it paid an excise tax of $2 to the Government, and when it exported 100 pounds of beet sugar it received from the Government a drawback of $2. The excise tax being levied upon the number of tons of beets sliced upon the ratio of 12 tons of beets to 1 ton of sugar, and the drawback being on the pounds of sugar exported, it offered a great inducement to the German factory to increase the saccharine strength of the beet and also to improve the method of extracting the sugar from the beet so as to have the smallest waste and secure the largest number of pounds of sugar that it was possible to get from the beets sliced. If the German factory could increase the productiveness of the beets so as to get a hundred pounds of sugar out of 1,000 pounds of beets instead of 1,200 pounds, it would pay an excise tax of 17 cents per hundred, or $1.70 on the 1,000 pounds sliced from which it would secure 100 pounds of sugar; and when it exported that 100 pounds of sugar it would receive a drawback of $2, or 30 cents more than the excise duty paid, which was equivalent to a net bounty of 30 cents per 100 pounds. This great inducement for increasing the saccharine strength of the beet and improving the methods of extraction of the sugar from the beet resulted in a rapid development along both lines, so that for several years Germany led the world in the saccharine richness of her beets. While the German Government was offering this skillful and enticing inducement to the beet growers to increase the fertility of their product she was protecting them from competition in the home market by an excessive customs duty of $2.59 per 100 pounds of raw sugar and $3.24 per 100 pounds on refined sugar.[1]

This system of export bounty was adopted in modified form by Austria, Russia, and other great sugar-producing countries. At the same time they protected their domestic market from foreign competition by high import duties. Austria's tariff was $2.76 per 100 pounds on raw and $3.68 on refined,[2] while Russia at times imposed a duty as high as $4.28 per 100 pounds on raw and $5.71 on refined.[3] It was by such radical policies that these countries became great sugar-producing nations. The ingenuity and the industry of the German people have been manifested by the wonderful development of their sugar production, for while France had pointed to her the way and for years led in the amount produced, Germany in time outstripped her rival. France has finally attained the dreams of Napoleon and is now producing her entire sugar consumption, but Germany not only produces the entire amount of her consumption but is exporting about 1,000,000 tons per annum. There is no doubt but that the European nations imposed excessive burdens on their people in the development of the sugar industry. That fact, however, emphasizes the importance they have attributed to the policy of domestic sugar production. After their supply was sufficient for their home demands there began among them intense competition for foreign markets.

The fierce rivalry that developed between these nations during the last decade of the nineteenth century in their struggle for a market for their surplus led in 1902 to a commercial treaty, known as the Brussels convention, whereby it was agreed that bounties for exports should be abandoned and that none of the countries that were parties to the convention should charge more than 52 cents per 100 pounds import duty. Russia did not become a party to this convention at that time, but later joined with the other European countries under a specific clause that she might continue her bounty system and be permitted to export within five years a million tons. This convention was recently renewed, and the amount Russia was permitted to export was increased to 950,000 tons in the years 1911, 1912, and 1913, and 200,000 tons a year thereafter.

Great Britain did not join the Brussels convention originally because her people were the beneficiaries of the struggle on the Continent for supremacy in sugar production, but later she did become a member of the convention under certain conditions, being induced to do so because of her vast colonial cane-sugar interests. She is not a party, however, to the last agreement.

I should add that the export limitation imposed on Russia by the Brussels convention only applied to the countries that were parties to the agreement. She is at liberty to export all that she can to countries that are not parties to the convention.

I refer to these historical facts to show that the statesmen of the greatest nations of the civilized world, since the process of extracting sugar from beets has been known, have thought it wise to encourage the development of sugar production by various systems of taxation. Great Britain has not sought to develop sugar production at home. Her climate and soil are not adapted to beet culture, but her colonial possessions produce vast quantities of cane sugar, and her leading statesmen have believed that the Empire's interests are better served in the encouragement of commerce with her colonies by purchasing from them her sugar supply and in turn providing them with manufactured commodities from her mills and factories. With the exception of Great Britain, every great civilized country has encouraged the development of beet-sugar production as a domestic industry wherever it was practicable, and in most of them their factories are now able to supply the sugar necessities of their own people.

Since the establishment of our Government, with the exception of one brief period, from 1891 to 1894, sugar has been a source of taxation for revenue, and a part of the time heavy protective duties have been imposed for the purpose of developing the industry in our own country.

For almost a hundred years we feebly followed the plan of European nations with indifferent success, but in 1897 began our effective development of the production of beet sugar. In the Dingley bill a duty of 95 cents per 100 pounds was imposed on sugar testing 75 degrees pure, and 3½ cents more was added for each additional degree of purity, making pure sugar carry a duty of $1.82½, and on sugar that had gone through the process of refining there was added 12½ cents as a refiner's differential, making the full duty on refined sugar such as is produced in beet-sugar factories $1.95 per hundred. These duties, as compared to those imposed by European countries, were very low, yet our experience has shown that they were sufficient. From the passage of the Dingley bill beet-sugar production in the United States has developed faster than it ever developed in any country in the history of the industry. It took France almost 75 years to bring her sugar production up to an amount sufficient to supply her demands, approximately 1,000,000 tons per annum.

Germany started later but made more rapid progress; yet it required about 60 years for her to develop the industry so as to supply her domestic consumption. During the 16 years that have passed since the Dingley bill was enacted the production of beet sugar in the United States has increased from approximately 40,000 tons in 1897 to 698,952 tons in 1913, and the estimated crop for this year is 715,000 tons. If this ruinous legis-

[1] U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Bureau of Statistics, p. 27.
[2] Ibid., pp. 40, 41.
[3] Ibid., p. 114.

lation which is now proposed could be defeated, in my humble judgment, within less than 20 years from this hour we would be producing within our own borders every pound of sugar which the American people consumed. Since the enactment of the Dingley bill a reciprocity treaty has been entered into with Cuba which gives her a discount of 20 per cent from our tariff duties; 300,000 tons have been admitted free from the Philippines, and Porto Rico has been annexed to the United States, so that there is practically no longer any sugar imported upon which the full duty is paid.

The great increase in our own production, plus that from Porto Rico, the Philippines, and Cuba, supplies our demands. The duty of $1.90 is in fact a fiction, there being no importations of consequence at that rate, the real protection to our domestic sugar being the Cuban rate. The standard grade of imported Cuban sugar is 96 per cent pure, the duty on which is $1.348 per hundred pounds. In commenting on this fact Willett & Gray's Sugar Trade Journal, on May 1 of this year, said:

> Accepting as fact that Cuba centrifugals can not be produced below 2 cents cost and freight without loss, it is evident that the production of sugar in our domestic and insular possessions has already increased to an extent to bring about competition between these several crops without any influence felt from the 18,000,000 tons total crops of the world, 14,000,000 tons of which are outside our own privileged crops, which are now estimated to reach about 4,000,000 tons to meet our year's consumption of about 3,600,000 tons. Under these conditions the United States is entirely independent of European values and 0.73 cent per pound beneath the parity of the world's price as fixed at Hamburg.

The Cuban reciprocity agreement in 1904 and the free sugar from Porto Rico and the Philippine discount were equivalent ultimately to a reduction in the duty of 20 per cent from the rates fixed in the Dingley bill.

As a result of that agreement there has been developed a sugar production in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines which, added to that produced in continental United States, supplies our demand independent of the world's production, as stated in the quotation that I read.

The immediate effect of this treaty was to somewhat retard the development of our beet-sugar industry, yet by 1906 it recovered and has since made marvelous growth. I submit herewith a table showing the sugar production in the United States for each year, both beet and cane, since 1897, and the estimated production for this year. I will not read the table, but ask that it be printed.

Mr. LODGE. What is the total?

Mr. BRISTOW. The total for this year in the United States of the estimated crop is 715,000 tons of beet sugar. There is no estimate on the cane sugar, or I have not been able to get an estimate on the amount of the cane sugar. On account of the floods in Louisiana the cane production has been comparatively small for last year and this year. Last year it amounted to only 188,000 tons.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, in the United States proper?

Mr. BRISTOW. In the United States proper.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What was the tonnage of the beet-sugar production last year?

Mr. BRISTOW. It was 698,952 tons.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For 1912?

Mr. BRISTOW. For the sugar year of 1912–13.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Part of that is estimated, is it not?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; the figures for 1912–13 are complete, because the sugar year of 1912 extends into 1913 before all the product is ground and marketed. The yield, as I have said, was 698,952 tons.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the table to which the Senator from Kansas refers show the production of the different States?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; it merely shows the total in the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The table referred to by the Senator from Kansas will be printed in the RECORD in the absence of objection. The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Cane and beet sugar produced in the United States 1897 to 1914.*[1]

| Year.[2] | Cane sugar. | Beet sugar. |
|---|---|---|
| | *Short tons.* | *Short tons.* |
| 1897 | 322,088 | 42,040 |
| 1898 | 354,126 | 45,246 |
| 1899 | 284,394 | 36,367 |
| 1900 | 161,275 | 81,729 |
| 1901 | 311,887 | 86,082 |
| 1902 | 364,325 | 184,606 |
| 1903 | 372,903 | 218,406 |
| 1904 | 262,976 | 240,604 |
| 1905 | 392,000 | 242,113 |
| 1906 | 383,040 | 312,921 |
| 1907 | 272,160 | 483,612 |
| 1908 | 394,240 | 463,628 |
| 1909 | 414,400 | 425,884 |
| 1910 | 375,200 | 512,469 |
| 1911 | 355,040 | 510,172 |
| 1912 | 361,920 | 599,500 |
| 1913[1] | 188,200 | 698,952 |
| 1914[2] | ..... | 716,800 |

[1] 1897 to 1912 from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1910, p. 218; and 1912, pp. 254 and 772.

[2] The periods relate to sugar-production years.

[1] From Willett & Gray's Sugar Trade Journal, July 24, 1913.

[2] Estimate from Willett & Gray's Sugar Trade Journal, June 26, 1913.

Mr. BRISTOW. It costs more to produce beet sugar in the United States than it does in Europe. The increased cost in this country consists principally in the higher price that is paid to the farmers for the beets. The average price of beets in Germany per short ton for the years 1907 to 1911 was $4.49[1]; in France, 1907–1910, $4.06[2]; in Russia, 1911–12, $3.90[3]; and in the United States, 1907–1911, $5.11[4]. The statistics cited show that for the years referred to the farmers in this country received 62 cents per ton more than they did in Germany; $1.05 more than in France; and $1.22 more than in Russia. Mr. Roy I. Blakey, in his admirable work on the United States beet-sugar industry, published by the Columbia University, written in 1911, said:

> Although on the average the German grower gets 50 cents to 75 cents per ton less for his beets than the American grower, he gets from $7 to $8 more per acre on account of the greater yield, and the sugar in the beet costs the German factory about 50 cents to 80 cents less per hundred pounds of granulated sugar, owing to lower prices per ton and higher sugar content of the beets.

The prices paid for beets in our country for 1912 and 1913, since this book of Mr. Blakey's was written, are above the average for the years submitted, being about $5.90 per ton. Some of the factories in California are paying $7 and over. In Colorado the price is from $5 to $6; in Nebraska, from $5 to $5.85; in Kansas, from $5 to $5.50; in Wisconsin, from $5.50 to $6.50; and in other States similar advances have been made. From the most accurate information I have been able to procure it appears that for the last two years the American farmer has been receiving about $1 per ton more for his beets than has the German farmer. The beet is the largest element of cost in beet-sugar production. There is not so wide a difference in the cost of extraction between American and European factories as there is in the cost of beets, showing that a large percentage of the additional cost for the production of beet sugar goes direct to the grower of the beet. That can not be successfully contradicted and will not be by anyone who is informed.

Russia I regard as a more dangerous competitor for our sugar factories than Germany because of the cheapness of her labor and her almost unlimited beet-producing area. I believe, however, that $1 a hundred pounds would be abundant protection for the American producer as against European competition.

The real menace, however, of free sugar to the sugar producers of our country is not the beet-sugar production of Europe, but the cane-sugar production of the Tropics. In the cane-sugar-producing countries there is an entirely different civilization from ours. The wages paid labor in those countries are very small. The necessaries of life are few and the character of the civilization is low. To force the American sugar producer to compete on equal terms with the cane producer of the Tropics is to force him out of business. This I believe is largely conceded by the advocates of free sugar. Cane sugar can be produced in Cuba,[5] San Domingo,[6] Java,[7] and other tropical islands for amounts ranging from $1.25 to $2.10 per 100 pounds, depending upon the conditions surrounding the immediate factory. Add to that the cost of refining and transportation, and we have an actual cost of refined sugar at New York at from $2.10 to $2.80 per 100 pounds, while the cost of producing beet sugar in our country ranges from $2.70 to $5.14, showing the difference in the cost of production to range from 60 cents to $2.34 per 100 pounds.[8] So it readily appears that free sugar

[1] From quarterlies of German imperial statistical office.

[2] From bulletins of statistics of minister of finance.

[3] From figures of minister of finance.

[4] From Hardwick committee hearings. These figures are averages as compiled from the reports of 33 factories.

[5] Willett & Gray, in 1910, give cost price of Cuban sugar at average f. o. b. Cuba $1.85 per 100 pounds, and at average c. i. f. New York $1.95 per 100 pounds.

[6] H. C. Prinsen Geerligs, in The World's Cane-Sugar Industry, p. 194, gives cost prices of sugar prepared in the more modernized factories at $1.25 per 100 pounds, and in the old-fashioned factories at $1.80 per 100 pounds.

[7] H. C. Prinsen Geerligs, ibid., p. 139, gives cost price of sugar Nos. 11–13 D. C. at $1.63 per 100 pounds.

[8] Hardwick hearings, p. 2379.

from the Tropics will practically destroy our domestic sugar industry. A few factories might survive, such as the Spreckels factory at Spreckels, Cal., and possibly some of those in Colorado and Utah, but the great majority of them will be closed.

I believe that the duty of $1.95 per 100 pounds, when it was imposed in 1897, was justified. Since that time we have developed the saccharine strength of our beets and improved the methods of extraction so that now the cost of producing 100 pounds of beet sugar in the United States has been reduced, and as large a duty as was necessary in 1897 is not now needed. I submit herewith a table showing the increase in the saccharine strength of our beets and the improvement in the methods of extraction:

*Beet sugar produced in the United States 1901 to 1911.*[1]

| Crop year. | Average sugar in beets. | Average extraction of sugar based on weight of beets. |
|---|---|---|
| | *Per cent.* | *Per cent.* |
| 1901 | 14.8 | 10.95 |
| 1902 | [2]14.6 | 11.52 |
| 1903 | [2]15.1 | 11.59 |
| 1904 | 15.3 | 11.69 |
| 1905 | 15.3 | 11.74 |
| 1906 | 14.9 | 11.42 |
| 1907 | 15.8 | 12.30 |
| 1908 | 15.74 | 12.47 |
| 1909 | 16.10 | 12.56 |
| 1910 | 16.35 | 12.61 |
| 1911 | 15.89 | 11.84 |

[1] Source, Statistical Abstract of United States, 1912, p. 254.
[2] These averages are not based on data for all the factories, as some of them failed to report results of tests, but it is believed that they fairly represent the character of the total beet crops.

Believing that the present duties should be lowered, I have submitted an amendment which reduces the general duty on the refined sugar from $1.90 per hundred, as now provided for in the law, to $1.52½. It then provides for additional reductions in periods of three and six years until the duty is finally reduced to $1.27½. It leaves the Cuban 20 per cent preferential stand as it is now, because I do not think it wise at this time to disturb the reciprocal relations we have with Cuba; and under this amendment the duty on Cuban 96, which is the real protective duty the American producer receives, will be reduced immediately to $1.14 and ultimately to 97.2 cents. In my opinion our relations with Cuba and the reciprocity agreement which we entered into should not at this time under any circumstances be disturbed. It would possibly bring about additional international complications that would be exceedingly embarrassing. I believe these reductions can be made with absolute safety to our sugar industry and that it would continue to grow and prosper. If this should prove to be true, then we will have developed a domestic sugar supply at a less cost than has any other country in the world's history. I invite the attention of anyone who is interested in the subject to investigate this matter. It will be found that the statements which I make will prove to be not only true but highly interesting. As I said, we shall have developed the production of sugar in our own country sufficiently to satisfy our ultimate and complete demands with the least possible burden that has ever been imposed upon any people in the history of civilization.

Since I have been in the Senate I have contended for a reasonable reduction in the existing sugar duties; a reduction that could be made without materially impeding the development of the industry, and that would not permit the local producers to charge the American people excessive prices. But I have never favored free trade. I can not understand how anyone can believe that it is for the best interests of our country to destroy our home production of sugar. First, it will lessen the amount of the sugar supply of the world and result in an increased price everywhere. This is clearly demonstrated by the great advance in the price of sugar in 1911. The world produces about 18,000,000 tons of sugar per year; we consume approximately one-fifth of the entire world's production. In the sugar year 1911–12 there was a shortage in the world's production of about a million tons, and the price of sugar in the United States went up as high as $7.50 per 100 pounds, an advance of about $3 per hundred.

The enactment of free-sugar legislation would reduce our production at least a half million tons. A shortage of a half million tons in our own production would inevitably have a corresponding influence upon the world's price and the benefit expected by the advocates of this bill in sweeping reduction in prices would not be realized. The greatest objection to the destruction of the American industry, however, is that it would give the cane-sugar refiners a monopoly of our sugar market. Tropical sugar is produced in a raw state, shipped to the United States, and there refined, and then put upon the market as refined or granulated sugar. The refining business is controlled by three concerns, with headquarters in New York. They cooperate in fixing prices. Their only competitor in our market is the American beet-sugar producer. When the refiners control the market they fix the price as high as the market will stand, regardless of the cost of production to them. Their resources are so tremendous and their financial strength so great that no cane-sugar producer in any country would have the hardihood to fight them in a commercial warfare for the control of the American market. So with the beet-sugar producer eliminated they would be supreme in the sugar markets of this country. A few years ago, when they learned of the possibility of beet-sugar production in our country under the protective duties that existed, they started this campaign for free sugar. Their purpose is to destroy the beet-sugar industry. It is their only competitor in this market. The legislation proposed in this bill will destroy that industry in the United States, and the refiners are for it. And it should not be forgotten that it was the cane refiners that robbed the United States Treasury a few years ago of millions by a system of false weights. They will profit more by this legislation than all others, for it will put out of the way their only competitor in our market, and then they will raise the price as high as they can. In fact, up to this time the greatest advantage which the beet-sugar producers have been to the people is in beating down the excessive prices which the refiners charge when they control the market. This is illustrated by the rise in the price of refined cane sugar when the beet product is exhausted and the decline in the price whenever the beet sugar is being put upon the market in large quantities.

To illustrate, in March of this year heavy quantities of beet sugar were being sold, and the refiners' margin between the raw sugar duty paid in New York and the wholesale price of refined sugar in New York ranged from 58½ to 68½ cents per 100 pounds. That represented the difference between what they paid for the raw and what they received for the refined. It was the amount of toll which the refiner took for refining and marketing sugar. During the months of April, May, and June, as the pressure of beet sugar on the market grew less, the price of refined was advanced by the refiners until their margin of profit in July reached 96.8 cents per 100 pounds, an increase of about 40 cents per hundred. There was absolutely no justification for the increase, because the refiners paid no more for their raw sugar in July than they did in March. They increased the price to the American people 40 cents a hundred pounds simply because our domestic beet-sugar supply had been exhausted, and it was within their power to do it. Let me repeat, they sold the refined sugar for 40 cents a hundred more profit, because there was no beet sugar in the market, although they were paying exactly the same for the raw sugar from which this refined was made. This has been their invariable practice. In June of last year they ran the price up until the margin reached as high as $1.176; that is, they took from the American people about 60 cents per 100 pounds more than they could when our markets were supplied with the beet-sugar product. I submit herewith a table showing for the last five months the weekly New York prices on raw and refined cane sugar and the refiners' margin:

*Weekly New York prices of raw and refined cane sugar and refiners' margin.*[1]

[United States beet crop begins in July and October.]

| 1913 | Raw. | Granulated, net cash. | Margin. |
|---|---|---|---|
| July 24 | $3.54 | $4.508 | [2] $0.968 |
| July 17 | 3.57 | 4.508 | .938 |
| July 10 | 3.54 | 4.41 | .87 |
| July 2 | 3.48 | 4.41 | .93 |
| June 26 | 3.36 | 4.214 | .854 |
| June 19 | 3.33 | 4.116 | .786 |
| June 12 | 3.33 | 4.116 | .786 |
| June 5 | 3.33 | 4.116 | .786 |
| May 28 | 3.33 | 4.116 | .786 |

[1] Above figures from Willett & Gray's Sugar Trade Journal for weekly quotations.
[2] Willett & Gray say "Domestic beet granulated of the old crop is practically all contracted for, as is also the early production of the new crop, which has begun in California."

*Weekly New York prices of raw and refined cane sugar and refiners' margin*—Continued.

| 1913 | Raw. | Granulated, net cash. | Margin. |
|---|---|---|---|
| May 22 | $3.30 | $4.018 | $0.718 |
| May 15 | 3.33 | 4.116 | .786 |
| May 8 | 3.36 | 4.116 | .756 |
| May 1 | 3.39 | 4.116 | .726 |
| Apr. 24 | 3.39 | 4.116 | .726 |
| Apr. 17 | 3.36 | 4.067 | .707 |
| Apr. 10 | 3.36 | 4.067 | .707 |
| Apr. 3 | 3.45 | 4.165 | .715 |
| Mar. 27 | 3.48 | 4.165 | [1] .685 |
| Mar. 19 | 3.58 | 4.165 | [2] .585 |
| Mar. 13 | 3.58 | 4.214 | .634 |
| Mar. 6 | 3.54 | 4.214 | .674 |

[1] Willett & Gray say "American beet-sugar factories have finished their campaigns."
[2] Lowest margin for year.

When you place sugar on the free list you place in the hands of these sugar refiners the weapon with which to destroy their competitor; and, having destroyed their competitor, they will exploit this market to their heart's content. However worthy may be the motives of those who vote for free sugar, they are, in fact, voting directly in the interests of the Sugar Refining Trust and handing over to it, for exploitation and pillage, the greatest market for refined sugar on the earth.

A further illustration of the power of the sugar refiners over the American market, if the beet-sugar industry is destroyed, is the difference in the price of American sugar as compared with foreign sugar at the time that our beet-sugar production is being marketed. In March and April this year the refiners sold their refined sugar at from 47.6 cents to 62.3 cents per 100 pounds less than the Hamburg price plus the duty and freight. That is, they were selling at about 60 cents a hundred pounds under the world's parity. During that period it can not be said that the American consumer was paying all the duty, for he was not. In July this year, when the supply of beet sugar had been marketed, the refiners raised their price until they came to within 8 cents of the Hamburg price plus duty and freight, demonstrating beyond question that our beet-sugar supply forces down the price, and that during such periods the consumer does not pay the full duty, as is so confidently alleged by those who have not taken the time to study the subject. Indeed, at one time last year, before the beet-sugar crop came upon the market, the refiners put the price of granulated sugar in the United States up as high as 31 cents per 100 pounds above the Hamburg price plus freight and duty. That was in October last year, and when the beet-sugar supply came upon the market the price went down from 31.1 cents above the world's parity to a point 62.3 below it, a reduction of almost $1 per 100 pounds, which was the direct result of the pressure on the market of the domestic production. Yet, in the face of this showing, men will stand here upon the floor of the United States Senate and advocate a policy that will place the American sugar market absolutely in the control of these refiners, and unwittingly become the agents of this giant combination in its efforts to monopolize our sugar supply.

Willett & Gray's Sugar Journal of April 17, 1913, in commenting on this subject, said:

> The consumer gets cheaper sugar under the protection of duty to the home industry than he will without such protection against the European speculative sugar exchanges. To-day sugar is 74 cents per hundred pounds below world's prices. This is equivalent to a duty of 61 cents per hundred pounds on Cuba raws, instead of $1.348, because our free and privileged supplies of sugar have so increased under protection that we are independent of European prices and now under the influence of competition among the sugar producers at home.

The sugar refiners being aware of the fact set forth in the quotation from Willett & Gray, knowing that duty-paid Cuban 96 sugar was selling only sixty-some cents above the world's price, have nevertheless distributed broadcast throughout the country millions of circulars stating that with free sugar the American consumer would be able to buy his supply about 2 cents a pound less than he is now paying. This statement was circulated persistently by men who knew it to be false, by the men who put the price of sugar up as high as the market will stand as soon as the domestic supply is exhausted. In this campaign for free sugar the refiners are just as dishonest in their methods as they were when they robbed the Government Treasury by their system of false weights.

I herewith submit table showing the weekly New York prices of granulated sugar, the prices of sugar from Hamburg laid down in New York, and the differences, for the past five months, demonstrating the accuracy of my statements:

*Weekly prices, granulated sugar, New York and Hamburg.*[1]

[New York duty paid equivalent for Hamburg prices given. United States beet crop begins in July and October.]

| Date. | New York granulated, net cash. | First marks German granulated equals New York duty paid. | New York sells below Hamburg parity, per 100 pounds. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1913. | | | |
| July 24 | $4.508 | $4.59 | [2] $0.082 |
| July 17 | 4.508 | 4.62 | .112 |
| July 10 | 4.41 | 4.65 | .24 |
| July 2 | 4.41 | 4.65 | .24 |
| June 26 | 4.214 | 4.67 | .456 |
| June 19 | 4.116 | 4.68 | .564 |
| June 12 | 4.116 | 4.64 | .524 |
| June 5 | 4.116 | 4.67 | .554 |
| May 28 | 4.116 | 4.64 | .524 |
| May 22 | 4.018 | 4.64 | .622 |
| May 15 | 4.116 | 4.64 | .524 |
| May 8 | 4.116 | 4.67 | .554 |
| May 1 | 4.116 | 4.71 | .594 |
| Apr. 24 | 4.116 | 4.72 | .604 |
| Apr. 17 | 4.067 | 4.69 | .623 |
| Apr. 10 | 4.067 | 4.68 | .613 |
| Apr. 3 | 4.165 | 4.71 | .545 |
| Mar. 27 | 4.165 | 4.69 | .525 |
| Mar. 19 | 4.165 | 4.69 | .525 |
| Mar. 13 | 4.214 | 4.69 | .476 |
| Mar. 6 | 4.214 | 4.69 | .476 |

[1] Weekly quotations are taken from Willett & Gray's Sugar Trade Journal.
[2] Willett & Gray say: "Domestic beet granulated of the old crop is practically all contracted for, as is also the early production of the new crop, which has begun in California."

As I have said, in 1897 we produced about 40,000 tons of beet sugar. Since then there has been a rapid increase in the amount of beet-sugar production. It has grown step by step until now we are producing approximately 700,000 tons per year, an increase in 16 years of 1,650 per cent.

This is an unprecedented increase. You may search the history of the sugar industry in every nation on the earth and you will not find anywhere else such a rapid development of sugar production as there has been in our country within the last 16 years.

This large production of beet sugar has stimulated many other lines of business. It has made a market for millions of dollars worth of machinery, which has been manufactured in American factories and made by American workmen, who in turn have been fed by the American farmer and gardener. It has produced a market for millions of dollars worth of lime, an important ingredient in the clarification of the beet juice, and a hundred other items, such as tools for the farmers who grow the beets, machinery for the construction of irrigation ditches, fuel for the factories, bags for the sugar, and labor of many kinds and varieties. It touches our whole industrial life and stimulates practically every line of American business.

Villages have grown up in the sugar-beet producing regions; farms have been developed for that specific purpose, and men have engaged in various occupations that are necessary for the comfort and happiness of the people who compose the communities that are engaged in the production of this great commodity. These communities were founded and millions of dollars invested in beet-sugar production upon the invitation of the United States Government when it paid bounties to encourage the production of domestic sugar or imposed heavy import duties for the same purpose.

The sugar industry is not a local enterprise; it is nation wide in its influence, and its destruction will be a national calamity.

I believe that a reduction of approximately 20 per cent of the present duty can be made immediately, and additional reductions made later without materially impeding the progress of our sugar development. But instead of making such reductions, which would be just to the sugar producer and fair to the consuming public, it is proposed to abolish the duty, which will not only stop the development of the industry, but close a majority of the factories that are now in operation. Such a blind and senseless policy has never been followed by any nation in the history of civilized government without disaster. And the astounding thing is that there can be found in the American Congress patriotic men so blind to the interests of their country as to advocate such a policy.

We consume about 3,600,000 tons of sugar per annum. We produced last year about $50,000,000 worth of sugar. This value is based upon the price of raw. If we had not produced the $50,000,000 worth at home, we would have been compelled to send out $50,000,000 more of our resources into foreign lands to purchase the sugar which our people consumed. We would therefore have been $50,000,000 poorer than we are to-day. Our resources would have been impoverished to that amount. It will be said by some that our farmers should have grown corn, wheat, and other crops. But I answer that we now have a full supply or surplus of the cereals. To abandon beet culture and produce more corn, wheat, and potatoes is to further glut our markets with these staple articles. One of the greatest needs of our agricultural life to-day is diversified crops, and for that reason we should encourage the production of beets. We imported something over $115,000,000 worth of sugar last year; that is, we sent out of the country more than $115,000,000 for sugar. If next year we could ourselves produce the $115,000,000 worth that we imported last year, if we could take out of our own soil and gather from our own atmosphere that amount of additional wealth by the employment of our own labor and the utilization of our rains and sunlight, we would as a people be approximately $115,000,000 richer than we would otherwise be. Is not it desirable for a nation to develop its own resources, to bring into activity its dormant wealth, to produce the things from its own soil which its people need, and thereby husband its financial and industrial strength? If such a policy is desirable, then the policy proposed in this bill is deplorable. But the statesmen who by accident have been put in temporary control of the affairs of this country, in the face of the facts heretofore presented, propose by this bill to destroy our sugar industry. Such a policy in France, Austria, or Germany would be regarded as industrial treason, and this is the first time that it has been seriously proposed in our history. But a school of false political economists, unfortunately, are in command here, and from the debates that we have listened to in this Chamber during the last two months we must infer that they have a malignant hatred toward certain American industries and American producers. They seem to regard the beet-sugar producer and the sheep grower as public enemies. They say that the woolman has been coddled for a century and that he is a failure and deserves no further consideration. They malign him because he has not grown sufficiently while he has been the recipient of public favor; then they turn and denounce the beet-sugar man because he has grown and established a virile and thriving industry. They propose to cripple the woolman because he has not prospered and to kill the beet-sugar man because he has. But the amazing thing to me is that men who know that this bill is wrong are not only willing to acquiesce in its passage, but are actually supporting it. If every Senator in this body should vote his honest judgment on this schedule, it would be defeated. There are many Senators here who believe that free sugar is wrong and not for the best interests of their country, yet they will vote for it. They say that they do this for the sake of party harmony and regularity. They are obeying the decree of a party caucus against their consciences, the interests of their constituents, and the welfare of their country.

This leads me to suggest that while I believe the bill itself to be imperfect and unjust I regard the manner of its preparation as infamous. Four years ago, with all the vehemence of which I was capable, I denounced the stiff-necked and arbitrary methods of the Republican leaders then in control of the National Legislature, and I hold the same views now. But Mr. Aldrich, at the very apex of his political power, when he dominated the proceedings of this Chamber as few men have in the history of this country, never had the hardihood to propose such outrageous and unwarranted methods in the making of his tariff bill as have been followed by the majority in control of this Congress. Bold as Mr. Aldrich was in the execution of his desires, he never undertook to perfect legislation in the secret sessions of a partisan caucus, where debate was muffled and wily statesmen with impunity could conceal their attitude on vital questions from their constituents. The public knows nothing of the positions taken by its representatives in the star-chamber proceedings of a secret caucus except as information leaks out through the keyholes.

The political caucus has been one of the most corrupting influences in American politics. It is the agency through which ward heelers have risen to power, and through them sinister influences have controlled the legislation of the country. It has been most potent in the slums of our cities, but its baneful influence has extended to the village and the township.

The political system which rested upon the caucus has become so hateful to the American people that they have outlawed it in a majority of the States of the Union. But while an indignant public was abolishing by the enactment of direct primary laws the caucus in the States the friends of this foul system have found a place of refuge for it here in Washington at the National Capitol.

By the caucus process less than 20 per cent of the Members of this body can control its action, and I have been informed that in the making of this bill that has actually occurred. Yet full-grown, self-respecting men will not only tolerate such a system, but actually defend it.

To frame a great bill like this, affecting thousands of industries and the welfare of millions, in a secret party caucus, where the people of the country are not permitted to know the position taken on such measure in detail by the men sent here to represent them, is a menace to free government, and the party or the administration that is responsible for the establishment of such a system of legislation merits the unmeasured condemnation of the American people.

Personally, in considering the schedules of this tariff bill, I am standing to-day where I have stood during the last four years. I believe that we should have protective duties that will measure the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad; duties that will preserve legitimate American industry and maintain the standard of American wages and at the same time protect the American people from exorbitant prices. The amendment which I offer to this paragraph, I believe, meets that requirement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Would the Senator mind my asking him a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LODGE. I have listened with great interest to the very concise and admirable statement of this case made by the Senator from Kansas. I noticed that he said that the reduction of the world's supply of sugar as a probable result of the passage of this bill, assuming that it results in the destruction of a large part of the American production, will be about 500,000 tons.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is the lowest estimate I would make. I think it will be more than that.

Mr. LODGE. In that connection is it not true that in order to make an estimate we should have to take the normal crop of Louisiana? Of course last year, as the Senator pointed out, it was not a normal crop. That is in the neighborhood of 300,000 tons.

Mr. BRISTOW. Between 300,000 and 400,000 tons.

Mr. LODGE. In Porto Rico, which had a production of 60,000 tons at the time we took over the island, the production has risen to 367,000 tons. A decline in that production has begun already, owing to the fear that has been created by the pendency of this bill, and the smaller producers there are going out of the business. Many of the smaller plantations are in the hands of receivers already. So there will be a reduction in the Porto Rican production also, and I suppose some, perhaps, in Hawaii. It seemed to me the Senator was putting it very low when he said there would be a reduction of 500,000 tons.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think I am.

Mr. LODGE. I think it will be nearly a million tons.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is probably true. I think it will be at least 500,000 tons within the continental United States. Of course, there will necessarily be a reduction in Porto Rico, because since Porto Rico became a part of the United States, and has had the advantage of the American protective laws, the production has advanced from about 60,000 tons to 367,000 tons, and in Hawaii the production has more than doubled.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; and, of course, we should lose the whole of the Louisiana production.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes. I think there will be a greater reduction than that in our domestic production, considering the outlying territory which is under our jurisdiction.

Mr. LODGE. Which, of course, would have an immediate effect on the price of sugar.

Mr. BRISTOW. An immediate effect; yes. I think that is true.

Mr. LODGE. There are two other points to which I should like to refer, if the Senator will allow me.

The Senator spoke of the $115,000,000 sent out of the country for the purchase of foreign sugar during the past year, and what he said is quite true. It would be, in my judgment, a great benefit if we kept that sum at home for our own sugar,

as I think we should do in a comparatively short time if the beet-sugar industry were given assurance as to its future. But the Senator omitted, I think, the point that on that $115,000,000 we now get a certain compensation, because a large portion of the sum goes in articles of American production to Cuba, where they have a special market under a preferential rate. Of course the moment we have free sugar the Cuban treaty falls and we cease to have that preference.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. We do get now a certain recompense for that expenditure.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that is true. I have not undertaken to estimate the value of the Cuban trade, but there is no doubt that we will lose a lot of it and that every business man, every factory, every farmer, every producer of any article that is sent to Cuba will have his business that much curtailed.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely.

The other point is this: I know the Senator could not cover everything; but there is one point that he did not touch upon, or at least I did not hear him, which is, I think, an important element. I refer to the improvement which has been effected by beet culture in the productiveness of land. The Senator may have referred to that subject when I was out of the Chamber.

Mr. BRISTOW. I did not deal with it in the manuscript, but I have here an article directly on that line that I think I shall read into the RECORD. It is a little illustration which shows that beet culture is of great use to the land. I probably should have dealt with that matter in the part of my address where I was discussing the value of diversified crops, because there is nothing that American agriculture needs more than diversified crops. That is known to every man who has given any study to our agricultural industries. The farmers appreciate that the beet production as a change of crops is of the greatest value.

Mr. LODGE. It has had the effect in Germany certainly of increasing the productivity of land in other crops.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that has been one of the features of agriculture that has induced European nations to strive so persistently to develop the sugar production within their own countries.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, of course, every Senator on this side of the Chamber understands that we have been treated to a most excellent discussion of the great question that is now before the Senate. In detail, in fairness, in candor, and in unanswerable logic it is difficult to conceive a better presentation than has been made by the Senator from Kansas. Yet I desire to call his attention and the attention of Senators to the fact that during that discussion of an important question, vital to the American people, the other side of this Chamber has been practically without representation.

During all the time of this discussion there were but three or four Senators on the other side of the Chamber. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] sits here before me and his colleague [Mr. RANSDELL] sits upon my left. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has honored the speaker with his presence; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] in the chair. Beyond that there has not been the slightest attention or consideration given to the unanswerable argument of the Senator from Kansas.

I think it is a very sad commentary upon the deliberation of our membership and the importance of the work that is going on here that Senators upon the other side will content themselves with a caucus declaration and then absent themselves from the Chamber during an argument which many on this side of the Chamber believe to be unanswerable and vital to the interests of the American people.

Mr. President, I desire to express my mortification and shame that they should have thus abandoned their seats during this able address. I am afraid that our efforts to save this industry are hopeless, no matter how strong the argument of Senators who favor the American sugar industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to have the Senator explain the effect of his amendment and the effect of the bill as it is now before the Senate shorn of all technicalities. Will he just give the amendment and the provision of the bill itself in plain terms so that an ordinary person may understand what the bill means as it is now before the Senate and what the Senator's amendment means?

Mr. BRISTOW. My amendment would reduce the duty on refined sugar from $1.90 to $1.52½ per hundred pounds. As I explained in the address which I delivered, that duty is merely a fiction, and the protection of Cuban sugar in this market is its real purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. The real effect would be to still lower the duty, taking into consideration the 20 per cent preferential to Cuba.

Mr. BRISTOW. Taking into consideration the 20 per cent preferential to Cuba, it reduces the duty on 96 centrifugal, which is the Cuban sugar we import, from $1.348 immediately to $1.14, and then again another reduction is made after three years to $1.07, and in three years more to 97½ cents. So it reduces the duty on sugar to something less than $1 per hundred pounds in stages.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the real duty provided for in the bill now before the Senate. How much does it reduce the present duty?

Mr. BRISTOW. It reduces it approximately to $1, and then, after three years it places sugar on the free list.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the bill reduces it to $1, taking into consideration the 20 per cent reduction that we have in reference to Cuban reciprocity?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, I should like to ask the Senator what, in his judgment, would be the effect after three years, when sugar goes on the free list, upon our treaty with Cuba?

Mr. BRISTOW. That is a pretty big question. The lawyers and the diplomats of the Senate will have to figure it out. I think it nullifies the treaty, but others may see that different.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRISTOW. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the reciprocity treaty with Cuba provides that if either party to the treaty comes to the conclusion that the arrangement is not advantageous owing to tariff changes—I am stating it in general language—they are at liberty to terminate the treaty with a notice of six months. Of course, the only advantage to Cuba in the treaty is the sugar preferential. She gives us entry into her markets for a great many articles which are specified. Now, if sugar goes on the free list, of course a preferential becomes impossible and Cuba ceases to have any advantage whatever from the treaty. Therefore she would, I assume, give notice that the treaty having ceased to become advantageous to her she terminates it.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the point I thought ought to be brought out in connection with the admirable address of the Senator from Kansas. Whatever benefits we get we would lose if we put sugar on the free list.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that is a very important subject for consideration.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I will yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is a very interesting question as well as an important one. There is a curious conflict, as it seems to me, presented in the bill before us. I have little doubt that the bill itself abrogates the treaty with Cuba, because it is in conflict with it. But there is a paragraph the effect of which may very well be considered. It is in the administrative part of the proposed law, which provides——

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator takes that up—I know he has examined the treaty with care—would he mind my asking him if he does not agree with my statement as to the practical effect of free sugar?

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, undoubtedly, Mr. President. But I am inclined to go a little further. I am inclined to the opinion that in the absence of the paragraph I am about to read the law which we are now about to enact would be an abrogation of the treaty instantly. However, I want to call the attention of the diplomats and the lawyers upon the other side of the Chamber to this provision in the proposed law. It will be found on page 250. It is paragraph B. I quote:

> That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the 11th day of December, 1902, or the provisions of the act of Congress heretofore passed for the execution of the same.

I take it, therefore, inasmuch as the act specifically reaffirms all the obligations of our reciprocity treaty with Cuba, in so far

as the terms of that treaty are in conflict with the specific provisions of this law the treaty will prevail and the provisions of the law will be nugatory and of no effect.

If that be true, I should like to know from some of the students of the subject whether the supposed advantages of the reduction in the duties upon sugar will be realized, because it is specifically declared that no part of this bill when it becomes a law shall be construed to impair or affect any of the provisions of the Cuban treaty. I am at a loss to understand how the proposed duties on sugar and finally free sugar can be reconciled with the Cuban treaty, and if they can not be reconciled, whether the treaty is to prevail or the law is to prevail. Undoubtedly the law would prevail if the paragraph I have just read had not been put into the law, because we can abrogate a treaty by legislation as effectually as we can in any other manner; but I do not know just what our friends upon the other side hold with respect to this point, whether they concede that the sugar schedule does violate the Cuban treaty. Before any of them will answer that question, I beg to call their attention to the treaty itself. The second article of the treaty provides—I quote—that—

During the term of this convention all articles of merchandise not included in the foregoing Article I and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States shall be admitted at a reduction of 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, or as may be provided by any tariff law of the United States subsequently enacted.

Again, I read from Article VIII:

The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of this convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries, and, in return for said preferential rates of duty granted to the Republic of Cuba by the United States, it is agreed that the concession herein granted on the part of the said Republic of Cuba to the products of the United States shall likewise be, and shall continue, during the term of this convention, preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries.

The bill before us declares that the obligation which I have just read shall not be impaired by anything in the bill, but shall continue in full force and effect. However, I have not read the entire provisions of Article VIII.

*Provided*—

This follows what I have just before read—

*Provided*, That while this convention is in force, no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897, and no sugar, the product of any other foreign country, shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States, while this convention is in force, at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

Again I remind my friends upon the other side that the bill about to be passed declares that that provision shall remain in full force and effect, not in the least impaired or affected by any of the specific items or paragraphs of the bill.

I will not pursue the matter further at this time. At a later time I may feel warranted in expressing my views at greater length, but I think that when we are dealing with a subject like this, which affects our relations with Cuba, which may determine whether they be friendly or unfriendly, which may determine whether Cuba will admit to her markets our products under a preferential ranging from 25 to 60 per cent, as I remember it, we might very well have the opinions of the distinguished lawyers upon the other side. I confess there is great difficulty in my mind in reaching any conclusion as to just what shall be our relation to Cuba after we pass this bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. NELSON. This Cuban reciprocity was an agreement between two countries, was it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. It was.

Mr. NELSON. Can the mere fact that we declare on our side that that treaty remains in full force while we change the fundamental element of it bind the other side of that treaty? Can we modify it and change the conditions and still maintain the treaty in force without the consent of the other side?

Mr. CUMMINS. Unquestionably not; but I went further and pointed out that in the very act it does modify the treaty and does give to Cuba the right to abrogate it; we expressly say that no part of the treaty shall be changed; that whatever obligation, in other words, we have undertaken toward Cuba shall continue and be in full force and effect. I shall wait with a great deal of interest and curiosity an elucidation of that international situation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it so happened that I drafted the proviso which has just been read in the Cuban reciprocity treaty. The treaty was on the eve of failure on account of the opposition coming from the sugar interests of the United States, and a compromise was made by the insertion of that proviso, which, as I said, I drafted.

In this bill, on page 250, as the Senator from Iowa has pointed out, it is stated—

That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty.

Of course abrogation must be distinguished from the right reserved in a treaty to terminate the treaty, which is a wholly different thing. It is, that nothing in this act contained shall of itself and of its own force and effect abrogate the treaty and make it cease the moment it becomes a law.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Just a word more and I will yield to the Senator. He has been very kind. It will be observed that the proviso of which I speak says:

That while this convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba, and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba, shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897. * * *

Now, the reduction on the tariff rates of the act of 1897 amounted to a reduction of 3.8 cents in round numbers. This bill makes a reduction, we will say, in round numbers, assuming the rate fixed for the next three years is one and the same, from $1 to 80 cents a hundred pounds. That is not a greater reduction than was made by the reduction on the Dingley rate; it is a less reduction. The proviso was directed only against a greater reduction; that is, it was a provision that if we raised the duty to 3 cents the Cuban should still receive a reduction of only 3.8 cents, but if in our bill here, or at any other time, we reduce the amount—and it was slightly reduced in the Payne-Aldrich bill—if we reduce the amount so that it is not greater than the reduction effected by the 20 per cent off the Dingley rate, which is merely the standard by which it is to be measured, we have not abrogated the treaty.

That is a totally different question, of course, from the question whether by our change of tariff we have created a situation which the other party to the treaty thinks is disadvantageous. Article X provides:

It is hereby understood and agreed that in case of changes in the tariff of either country which deprive the other of the advantage which is represented by the percentages herein agreed upon, on the actual rates of the tariffs now in force, the country so deprived of this protection reserves the right to terminate its obligations under this convention after six months' notice to the other of its intention to arrest the operations thereof.

That is a special privilege for termination. Of course the general privilege of termination involves a year's notice, but each side is given a special privilege of termination.

Now, if Cuba is dissatisfied with getting her sugar in at 80 cents instead of a dollar, as compared with the present preferential where she gets it at $1.348 a hundred pounds instead of $1.90, she has nothing to do but give us a notice under the treaty. I differ from my friend from Iowa, with whom I have had some talk upon this subject, as to the construction of the proviso. I think only one construction is possible. It certainly was drawn with that intention. I can testify to that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I gave no interpretation to the proviso. I read the proviso.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean to misrepresent the Senator, of course.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not attempt to interpret it. The earlier part of Article VIII, however, contains an obligation on the part of the United States that we will maintain a preferential rate of duty in favor of Cuba. I have no doubt about the power of Congress to abrogate the treaty by the passage of a law, but in the very measure which we have before us, which does destroy the preferential rate of duty, we reenact the treaty and declare that Cuba still shall have a preferential rate of duty. To me there is an irreconcilable conflict between those provisions.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we do not destroy the preferential for three years to come. Then we do destroy the preferential beyond a doubt.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; but we are destroying the preferential to take effect three years hence.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will be destroyed as to one article when sugar goes on the free list. That would not destroy the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the Senator knows that is all that Cuba gets.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Cuba has a right to give notice. She has that right anyhow.

Mr. LODGE. She has a right at any time, if she thinks it is not to her advantage. Of course, practically the only thing of value in the treaty to Cuba is the preferential on sugar, and that will perish when sugar is made free, of course. But for the next three years I am not able to see that we abrogate the treaty at all, because that proviso limits our powers only in the direction of making the reduction greater; that is, it was a protection to us; it was not a guaranty of anything to Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that that provision was put in at the request of our own sugar producers.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. It was put in on account of the opposition of the beet-sugar interests to the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, in order to get it through in this country, not in order to get it through in Cuba.

I want to say that there is a point about the treaty, if the Senator will pardon me, that has challenged our attention and which we are considering. There is nothing in this that violates the treaty, but there is the point that when sugar goes upon the free list perhaps Cuba might come to the conclusion that although the differential on only one article had been destroyed that was an article of such great importance with her as compared with all these other articles that she had practically ceased to get any benefit from the treaty and might take advantage, therefore, of her right to give notice to abrogate it.

Mr. LODGE. We do not import anything else substantially from Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say it is a matter of such great importance in comparison with the balance of what she sells us she might say substantially you have put aside all the advantage we have. I wish to say to the Senator that that matter will be under consideration by the committee, and it will be submitted—and I do not want to throw a red flag in the face of the Senator from Kansas, either, when I say it—to the wisdom of a Democratic caucus, where it will be freely discussed and debated and fairly decided upon. I hope that will not hurt the Senator's feelings.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BRISTOW. Will the Senator let me finish and then take the matter up, unless it is something he wants to put into the RECORD at this point?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to state the reductions proposed in the amendment offered from the present law.

Mr. BRISTOW. All right.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asked what the reductions were in the Senator's amendment. I have figured them out hurriedly, and this is what they are:

Ninety-six per cent sugar, as that is the Cuban sugar imported, has a rate of duty under the present law of $1.348. Under the amendment of the Senator from Kansas the rate on 96 per cent sugar until June 30, 1916, will be $1.14, or a reduction of 20.8 cents per hundred. After June 30, 1916, the Cuban rate on 96 per cent sugar will be $1.056, or a reduction from the present rate of 29.2 cents per hundred. After that time the Cuban rate on 96 per cent sugar will be 92 cents, or a reduction from the present rate of 37.8 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion in regard to the wages paid in the different sugar-producing countries. I do not think that the scale of wages can be used as an accurate argument in regard to the cost of sugar production, because the producing power of one man varies greatly as compared with that of another. In my address this afternoon I set forth in a brief form the facts gathered from the most reliable statistics that are to be had. I now desire to read from some tables that I have here statements of fact as to the wages that are paid, so that the information may go into the RECORD for what it is worth.

In Santo Domingo the wages in American money—that is, gold—vary from 50 cents to 75 cents per day of 12 hours. In Cuba the wages are from $1 to $1.50 a day.

I desire to say that the best wages paid in any tropical country in the world, so far as I have been able to ascertain, are paid in Cuba, and wages have gone up materially in Cuba since Cuba has had the advantage of the American market for her sugar. The 20 per cent preferential that was given to Cuba has had a wonderfully stimulating effect upon the production of sugar in Cuba, and also a corresponding effect upon the wages paid in the cane fields, so that while we have been giving Cuba only 20 per cent protection, that 20 per cent protection has been of inestimable value to her wage earners.

In the British West Indies wages are from 26½ cents per day for men to 16 cents per day for women; in the Fiji Islands, from $6 per month for men to $4.80 per month for women; piecework, 24 cents per day for men to 18 cents for women. In British India wages are about 4 cents a day; in the Straits Settlements they are from 8.4 to 11.2 cents.

As I have said, these wretched wages that are paid are, of course, paid to people who can not produce anything like that which can be produced by our wage earners, who receive in our sugar-beet fields from $1.75 to $2.50 a day.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Has the Senator from Kansas finished?

Mr. BRISTOW. I have finished my statement in regard to this phase of the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. On that point I wish to say that, under date of August 12, Vice and Deputy Consul General De Witt C. Poole, jr., of Berlin, sends a report, which is published in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports. Has the Senator that report before him?

Mr. BRISTOW. No; I have not that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to make an observation right here.

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The daily wages in the sugar-beet fields of Germany are reported by our consul to be, in Saxony, for a man, 59 cents per day; for a woman, 39 cents a day; and for a child, 19 cents a day. In Silesia, for a man, 51 cents a day; for a woman, 34 cents a day; and for a child, 18 cents a day. In Mecklenburg, for a man, 78 cents; for a woman, 46 cents; and he was unable to get the wages of children. This is the latest report, under date of August 12, and gives the exact wage conditions in the Province of Saxony, Prussia, and in Mecklenburg.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have here a statement of the wages paid in French factories to factory help for the years 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, and 1910 in tabular form. The table shows that the wages of men in those factories—this is factory help, and not the beet-field employees—run from 76 cents per day to 83 cents per day for men; for women, from 42 cents per day to 46 cents per day; and for children, from 33 cents to 35 cents per day.

I also have a table showing in detail the wages in a number of German factories, the wages for each particular occupation, and a comparison. I will read some of them merely for the information of the Senate, because it is quite interesting.

In Hungary the wages run for unloading beets from 24 cents to 50 cents per day; in Austria they average 48 cents, and in Belgium 48 cents. In Germany they are paid by the ton. The corresponding wages in the United States average $2.18. The wages of beet feeders in Hungary run from 50 to 60 cents; in Germany from 48 to 52 cents; and in the United States the wage is from $2.10 to $2.40. Beet cutters in Belgium, from 50 to 60 cents; Germany, from 43 to 84 cents; and in the United States from $2.10 to $2.88, and the table goes on giving the compensation in each occupation.

Take machinists. Machinists in Hungary are paid from 40 to 50 cents; in Austria 50 cents; in Belgium 60 cents; in Germany $1.02; and in the United States from $4.20 to $4.80, showing a great difference in the wages paid to labor in this country and in our competing countries. I believe it is a fact that American labor is far more efficient than is the labor that is worked such long hours and paid such low prices in these competing countries, and this great disparity of wages does not mean such a wide difference in the cost of producing the sugar. I have given that, I think, with as absolute accuracy as it can be ascertained in the address which I have delivered.

There is a great difference in the cost of producing sugar, and I have selected here statements from a wide range of authority as to the cost of producing sugar in Cuba, which is really the competitor of the American sugar producer.

Col. Tasker H. Bliss, of the United States Army, who was collector of the Port of Habana in 1902, gave the cost delivered at Habana at the seaboard at $2.25 per 100 pounds.

Mr. Lacosta, the Cuban secretary of agriculture, the same year gave it at $2.20; Mr. Edward P. Atkins, interested in Cuban plantations and also connected, I think, with the Sugar Refining Trust, gave it at $2.25 per hundred; the United States Department of Labor in 1905 gave it at 2 cents f. o. b. Habana; Truman G. Palmer, representing the Association of American Beet Sugar Manufacturers, gave it at $1.50; Horace Havemeyer, interested in Cuban sugar plantations and in American beet-sugar plantations, gave the cost at $2, including freight to New York; Henry T. Oxnard, of the American Beet Sugar Co., gave it at from a cent and a half to 2 cents per pound; Edw. F. Dyer, builder of beet-sugar factories, gave it at from 1¼ cents per pound up, without giving the maximum. He gave that as the minimum. Joseph H. Post, president of the National Sugar Refining Co. of New Jersey, gave it at 2 cents per pound f. o. b. at Habana; Moriz Weinrich—his occupation I have not here—gives it at 1½ cents per pound, under the most favorable conditions. I think that is the lowest estimate that has ever been made so far as I have observed for Cuban sugar.

Mr. D. P. Machado, sugar planter at La Grande, Cuba, gives it at the Cuban port at $2.06 per hundred.

George R. Fowler, sugar planter at Santa Clara, Cuba, places it at $2.13.

J. W. De Castro at $1.31. That was in 1900, while Mr. Fowler's estimate was given in 1905 and in 1906. De Castro gave it at $1.35 in 1900 and Mr. Fowler gave it at $1.31.

George Bronson Rea, a resident of Cuba for 13 years, places it at $2.25. That is the highest point at which it has been placed by any experienced man that I have noticed.

Edward Atkins, owner of the Soledad Central near Cienfuegos, at 2⅛ cents.

Hugo Kelly, of the Central Teresa Co., Manzanillo, at $2.16 per hundred pounds.

Miguel Mandoza, of the Central Santa Gertrudis, Banaguises, at 0.02¼.

Mr. Armstrong, in the Cuban reciprocity hearings, at 0.02.

R. B. Hawley, who is an ex-Member of the House of Representatives, from Galveston, Tex., at 0.02.

C. F. Saylor, special agent, United States Department of Agriculture, who wrote annual reports on "The Progress of the United States Beet Sugar Industry," placed the Cuban production cost at 1½ cents a pound.

Dr. H. Paasche, a German scientist, placed it at 1.94.

Dr. Julius Wolf, another German statistician, placed it at 1.94.

The German consul general in Santiago placed it at 1.78½.

Sereno E. Payne, of the Ways and Means Committee, placed it at 2 cents.

Hon. George B. McClellan, a former member of the Ways and Means Committee, placed it at 2 cents f. o. b. Habana.

H. C. Prinsen Geerligs placed it at $2.03 per hundred pounds.

Willett & Gray placed it at $1.85 per hundred pounds.

Roy G. Blakey, professor of political science in Cornell University, placed it at 2 cents a pound.

I put these statements in the RECORD because it seems to me that they cover every phase of the sugar discussion. They are the opinions of men looking at it from every phase of sugar production—those who are interested in the trust, those who are interested in beet-sugar factories, those who were producing in Cuba, and the statisticians of the British and German Governments, who were investigating Cuban production with a view of ascertaining the effect that it might have upon sugar industries in their own countries and in the countries that are under their jurisdiction.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. CHILTON. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very entertaining discussion of the Senator from Kansas. I was in the Chamber a little while ago when the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was calling the roll of the Democratic Senators who were present. I dislike to see this very interesting part of the discussion go on in the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan. Possibly the Senator from Kansas has not noticed his absence and would want him present while the discussion is going on. I have been here practically all of the time, and was just going to call attention——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why not ask a page to go for the Senator?

Mr. CHILTON. That is a very appropriate suggestion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan is taking lunch at this moment. He has been here all morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No one ought to sacrifice a speech for lunch.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I have some other data here which are of interest to me, and I think will be of interest to the discussion, being the latest that I have been able to collect in regard to the prices paid for beets in the United States now and last year. The figures are not given in any of the statistical books I have examined; but I have searched all of the data that is available, and examined various journals, and I find the following as to the prices paid for beets in our country, which I think is of interest: The price in Arizona in 1912 was $5 a ton; in Ventura County, Cal., the average was $6.95 a ton—some of the California general factories paid as high as $7.25 a ton, and very few less than $6 a ton—Nebraska, Scottsbluff Sugar Co., $5, with 50 cents per ton additional for siloing, if a hundred thousand tons are delivered 25 cents per ton additional, and if 135,000 tons are delivered 50 cents additional to each farmer; Michigan, Menominee River Sugar Co., $6 a ton, flat rate; Nevada, Fallen factory, $5 per ton—that was in 1912; this year they have increased it to $6 a ton—California, Spreckels, $5 per ton for 11 to 14 per cent beets, with an increase of 25 cents for each additional per cent over 14; Colorado, National Sugar Manufacturing Co., $6 a ton—from $5 to $5.50 was paid last year, $6 being paid this year—some Colorado factories pay $5 per ton and a half interest in the profits over 10 per cent; Kansas, Garden City, $5.50 per ton; Montana, Billings, $5 for beets containing over 12 per cent and under 15 per cent, $5.50 for 15 and 16 per cent beets, and 25 per cent advance for each per cent over 17; Wisconsin, 1913, $5.50 per ton for beets delivered before December 1, $6 for those delivered in December, and an additional 50 cents per ton if Congress does not pass adverse sugar legislation this year; in Montana the average price this year is $6; in 1912 Montana had a graduated scale and it averaged about $5.50, this year the price is up a little; in California the Visalia factory, $5 per ton for 15 per cent beets and 30 per cent advance for each 1 per cent of sugar. I thought those figures would be of some interest.

I have here the average cost of 31 German factories, as given in the official monthly of the industry for 1907, page 45, from the hearings of the Senate Committee on Finance, and also statistics of 8 German factories for 1909 and 1910, which I ask to incorporate in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Average cost of 31 German factories as given in the official monthly of the industry, 1907, page 45.*

| Year. | Price per ton of beets. | | | Total expenses, including depreciation. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Minimum. | Maximum. | Average. | Per ton. | Per 100 pounds, raw. |
| 1897 | $3.03 | $4.20 | $3.85 | $5.58 | $2.18 |
| 1898 | 3.37 | 4.80 | 4.17 | 6.00 | 2.24 |
| 1899 | 3.33 | 4.80 | 4.16 | 6.13 | 2.25 |
| 1900 | 3.67 | 4.93 | 4.39 | 6.12 | 2.17 |
| 1901 | 2.98 | 4.72 | 3.81 | 5.48 | 2.01 |
| 1902 | 3.16 | 4.84 | 4.13 | 6.28 | 2.15 |
| 1903 | 3.08 | 4.72 | 3.82 | 5.53 | 1.95 |
| 1904 | 4.06 | 6.01 | 4.80 | 6.77 | 2.27 |
| 1905 | 3.33 | 4.84 | 4.08 | 5.71 | 1.94 |
| Average | | | 4.14 | 5.96 | 2.13 |

*Statistics of 8 German factories, 1909 and 1910.*

[From hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on H. R. 21213, first print, pp. 379, 381.]

| No. | Name. | Capital. | Daily capacity. | Beets sliced. | Sugar in beet. | Raw sugar obtained. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Tons.* | *Tons.* | *P. ct.* | *P. ct.* |
| 1 | Salswedel | $257,000 | 1,250 | 96,810 | | 17.10 |
| 2 | Linden | 136,000 | 1,060 | 60,440 | 16.45 | 16.01 |
| 3 | Nakel | 266,000 | 610 | 28,800 | 17.00 | 15.52 |
| 4 | Wabern | | 700 | 43,500 | 15.20 | 14.80 |
| 5 | Pelplin | 490,000 | 1,000 | 72,860 | 17.90 | 17.12 |
| 6 | Demmin | 178,600 | 894 | 63,200 | 16.30 | 15.75 |
| 7 | Bruschwits | 591,000 | 2,023 | 146,000 | 17.05 | 16.63 |
| 8 | Haynan | 143,000 | 515 | 34,750 | | 17.43 |
| | Total | | | 546,360 | | |
| | Average | | | | | 16.47 |

*Statistics of 8 German factories, 1909 and 1910*—Continued.

| No. | Name. | Sugar produced. | Expenses, including depreciation. | | Receipts for by-products. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Total. | Per ton. | |
| | | *Tons.* | | | |
| 1 | Salswedel | 16,555 | $693,000 | $7.16 | $16,710 |
| 2 | Linden | 9,676 | 432,750 | 7.16 | 16,325 |
| 3 | Nakel | 4,470 | 204,000 | 7.08 | 6,750 |
| 4 | Wabern | 6,438 | 340,900 | 7.81 | 9,810 |
| 5 | Peiplin | 12,474 | 455,380 | 6.25 | 16,473 |
| 6 | Demmin | 9,954 | 357,000 | 6.30 | 8,673 |
| 7 | Bruschwits | 24,280 | 956,300 | 6.55 | 68,360 |
| 8 | Haynan | 6,057 | 257,700 | 7.42 | 7,910 |
| | Total | 89,904 | 3,697,030 | ..... | 151,021 |
| | Average | ..... | [1] 2.05 | 6.767 | ..... |

[1] Per 100 pounds.

| | |
|---|---|
| Total expenses, less credits for by-products | $3,546,009.00 |
| Per ton of beets | 6.49 |
| Per 100 pounds of raw sugar | 1.97 |
| Per 100 pounds of granulated | 2.21 |

Mr. BRISTOW. I have here very interesting information as to the sugar produced per acre in the United States and a number of European countries, and the tons of beets produced per acre. It covers a period of three years, and, of course, is the average. In the United States we have produced on an average of 2,790 pounds of sugar per acre, with an average production of 10.19 tons of beets; Germany produces an average of 3,803 pounds of sugar per acre, being about 900 pounds per acre of sugar more than we get, and 11.74 tons of beets per acre; Russia, 2,346 pounds of sugar per acre, and 7.35 tons of beets per acre; Austria-Hungary, 3,235 pounds of sugar per acre, and 10.82 tons of beets per acre. So it goes on. Denmark produced a larger amount of sugar per acre than any other sugar-producing country, and she also produced the largest number of tons of beets per acre, Denmark's production being 3,943 pounds of sugar per acre, or 13.96 tons of beets—approximately 14 tons per acre.

The great advantage which the European countries have over us is due to the long period during which they have been developing the fertility of their sugar beets. They have employed very ingenious devices, such as I indicated in my address this morning. For instance, they would put an excise tax on the number of beets sliced and then give a drawback on the amount of sugar exported. Austria not only did that, but she had a similar device for encouraging the improvement of machinery for extracting the sugar from the beet. The countries that resorted to these legislative inducements secured the desired result; that is, a very high production of sugar per ton and of beets per acre. Of course the smaller European countries have a system of intensive cultivation which would be very material aid.

Mr. THOMAS and Mr. RANSDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Colorado, and then I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator awhile ago, in giving the price paid for beets, to mention, among other places, the price paid at Durango, Colo.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I think there is no sugar factory there, and I suggest that perhaps the Senator meant some other place.

Mr. BRISTOW. Probably the wrong town was mentioned in transcribing the notes. I read from the notes. I will look it up and correct it.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do, very gladly.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator made a very interesting statement during his address about the effect of the cultivation of beets upon the production of other crops, and he promised to give us more extended information on that subject. In connection with what he has just said about the yield of beets in Germany and in other countries I wish to ask him if it is not a fact that in Germany and the countries of Europe generally they get a yield of practically twice as much wheat, barley, and rye per acre as we get in this country, and if it is not thought to be due more to the cultivation of beets than to any other one cause? I should also like to have the Senator state in that connection what, in his judgment, would be the effect upon the general production of wheat and other cereals in this country if we were to encourage and fully develop the beet industry?

Mr. BRISTOW. I believe that feature of the development of our sugar industry should be given more consideration than has been given it in the past. There is at Garden City, Kans., in my own State, a small sugar factory which during recent years has enlarged its capacity; has extended the area for beet production, and has been testing the different parts of the State as to qualities of soil, and so forth. It induced a number of farmers of Lyon County, Kans., some few years ago to experiment in beet production; and I have clipped from a copy of the Emporia Gazette a write-up of the experience of those farmers and some interviews with them, which I will read:

Mr. Fowler, whose farm is 4 miles southeast of Emporia, had three plats of land, all the same soil and adjoining, in wheat, sugar beets, and corn in 1912. This year he had all of this land in wheat and had changed his beet field to one of larger acreage. The 13 acres of land that was in corn last year and in wheat this year did not grow a good crop. In fact, he plowed up 3 acres and had but 10 acres to harvest—

That is 10 acres of wheat on his former corn land—

The 20 acres he had in wheat in 1912 and again this year, at harvest time presented the average looking field of grain, and on this field Mr. Fowler used 2 pounds of binding twine to the acre.

When Mr. Fowler's binder went into the 7 acres of wheat growing on land that raised a sugar-beet crop in 1912, he found that the binder used 5 pounds of binding twine to the acre. This caused Mr. Fowler to think a bit. He decided that he would thrash the crop from the three fields separately, and find out just what was the difference in the yields.

So the crop from the different fields went through the separator at different runs and a careful account was kept of the yield. It was found that the 10 acres of wheat on land that was in corn last year produced 5 bushels of wheat to the acre. The 20 acres that was in wheat in 1912 and in the same crop again this year yielded 16 bushels of wheat per acre. The 7 acres of wheat grown on land that was in sugar beets in 1912 thrashed out 40 bushels of wheat per acre.

Mr. Fowler, after this demonstration, thoroughly believes the statements of the sugar-beet experts that the root crop is most valuable in preparing land for other crops, and that the deep rooting of the beets aerates the soil and deposits valuable humus and that the intense tillage of the fields greatly improves the soil. Mr. Fowler has demonstrated the value of sugar beets in crop rotation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I did not quite hear all that the Senator read, but did I understand him to say that the ground that had been in corn produced only 5 bushels of wheat the next year?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; 5 bushels.

Mr. REED. And the ground that had been in wheat produced 16 bushels.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. REED. And the ground that had been in beets produced 40 bushels?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; that is the statement made here.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator, as a farmer, think it rather remarkable that ground that had been in corn the year before produced only one-quarter as much wheat as ground that had been in wheat the year before?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes.

Mr. REED. There is something the matter with that experiment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course, I do not know a thing about it, except what I am reading from this statement. My judgment would be that the corn land was either plowed with the stalks not having been raked and burned, and a dry spring, with the stalks turned under, caused the wheat to dry out, or the wheat was drilled in the rows and a good stand not secured. That would be my judgment in regard to the matter. I do not know. I am simply guessing at it from my limited experience in farming in the prairie country.

Mr. REED. I did not rise to interrupt the Senator, but does the Senator know whether these interviews or statements were just given to the paper by farmers who happened to be interested, or whether they were inspired in some way?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not know. This is an article that is taken from the Emporia Gazette, which comes to my office, and this was clipped out. I know that at Emporia they have been trying to get the farmers to grow sugar beets, although they get only $5 per ton, it being necessary to transport the beets quite a long distance to the factory. I think this is a friendly write-up on the part of this paper, which believes it to be for the best interests of the county to develop this diversified crop there instead of growing wheat and corn continually. That is my judgment about it.

Mr. REED. My reason for asking the question is that from some testimony that was produced before the Hardwick com-

mittee and some which was produced before the lobby committee, I have been led to believe that the sugar-beet factory owners are engaged in a systematic effort to fill the newspapers with just such matter as the Senator is reading. I thought possibly there were some earmarks by which the Senator could judge as to that.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not know a thing about this, and I will say that I have not personally interviewed these gentlemen. I am simply reading from this newspaper article. Whether these are interviews that have been sought or are wholly voluntary I do not know. I am giving the names and addresses of the men, and if anyone cares to write to them I shall be very glad to have him do so.

I do not know whether these experiments can be verified or whether they will be denied. I do not vouch for this at all. I have not made a personal inquiry into the matter. But I know the paper—it is a most reliable journal—I know the community, and I know there has been a great deal of interest in that community in recent years in the development of beet-sugar production. The most energetic and progressive citizens of the county believed that if they could develop this agricultural industry there in connection with what they had it would add to the wealth and the prosperity of the community.

I believe, of course, that these are genuine and honest expressions of sentiment. I believe it from what I know of the community and of the paper. But of course I do not vouch for it as a matter which I have personally investigated by having conferred with these men themselves.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I had not supposed anyone would seriously dispute the proposition that the growth of beets upon land prepares the land and makes it better for other crops. I know it is a notorious fact in Michigan, and I suppose it applies everywhere else in the same way. As to the proportion of benefit I am not prepared to state, but I know it to be a fact that crops rotating after beets are much more productive, the yield is much greater than where beets have not been grown. As I said, I have never known that that was disputed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Michigan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas further yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I will ask the Senator from Michigan whether it is not true that crops rotated with alfalfa, crops rotated with cowpeas, and crops rotated with crimson clover, also produce these remarkable results?

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is not any question but that where alfalfa can be grown or where cowpeas can be grown, as the Senator suggests, and are plowed under to fertilize the soil, they are great fertilizers. But there are places in Michigan, as I suppose there are in other States, where neither alfalfa nor red clover will grow, but where beets will grow as well as in certain other sections which seem to be naturally fitted for that particular product. Clover, of course, and all crops of that kind that grow largely with roots, if plowed under, will produce a fertilizer that is of great value.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not intend to go into the question of alfalfa, red clover, crimson clover, cowpeas, and all that. By the way, however, cowpeas do not need to be plowed under. They furnish a very rich fertilizer without that, and can be cut for hay and still improve the land.

I want to say in this connection, leaving all that aside, that it is true of sugar beets that they do put the land in a condition which brings a larger production of wheat or some other crop. It is also true of turnips; it is true of cabbage; it is true of kale; it is true of truck farming of any description. I want to add to that the fact that England, which produces no sugar beets at all, makes a larger yield of wheat per acre than Germany, in the sugar-beet country, one being about 32 bushels per acre and the other something less than 30. So that what the Senators are attributing to sugar beets, as if sugar beets in themselves added something of fertility to the soil, is not true. The cultivation of sugar beets does it, because the land has to be so carefully cultivated to put it in condition for the sugar-beet crop. In England, where they raise no beets at all but resort to the same sort of cultivation in order to raise turnips for the feeding of cattle, sheep, and so forth, the same result has followed.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will read an interview with just one more person. There are a number here. I will read this at the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana.

A Mr. Wingert, whose farm is about 5 miles from Emporia, says:

> Beets make the best crop we have. They are no harder to care for than corn, except the thinning. I don't know what I could put land into that would make as much profit as beets. I had two thin cows last year and fed them for 40 days on the beet tops and sold the cows for $137. I am convinced that the beet tops make the best of feed. The work done on the land in cultivating the beets is worth $2 per acre per year in putting the land into a higher state of cultivation.

I read those because of the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say one word?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can speak from experience in this matter. That is true of all the root crops. A crop of potatoes demands high cultivation and a rich, loose subsoil. It is true with the sugar beets as with the mangelwurzel beets. The sugar beet and the mangelwurzel beet are both of similar character, except that one is of a yellow character and the other is of a red character. The mangelwurzel beet is used for cattle food and makes the same general demand upon the soil, and the process of subsoiling is that from which it derives its fertility. It loosens up the soil, aerates it, and readily permits the permeation of the air and the moisture.

The same result that is accomplished with the sugar beet would be accomplished with any other beet. I think, however, that the instance given by the Senator from Kansas, where only 5 bushels were raised on the soil following a crop of corn, and then a crop of 40 bushels on the immediately adjoining plat that raised beets, if the soil was absolutely alike and the seeding was done at the same time, is a little extravagant.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think that would be very unusual. It would be due, in my judgment, to some such circumstance, as I suggested to the Senator from Missouri.

The Senator also spoke of alfalfa. In certain sections of the prairie country an alfalfa field plowed under may not produce well the next year at all. I have known of a practical failure on an alfalfa field plowed under, because the roots seemed to make the ground too loose, and it would have to be cultivated a year or two before it got at its best. But, of course, in countries where there is an abundance of rainfall that would not be the case; it would have just the opposite effect.

I have here a statement of the cost of manufacture of beet sugar as reported by the factories. It is a statement compiled from the Hardwick committee hearings, and given from 33 factories. I ask leave to insert it in the RECORD. I think it will be of interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Cost of manufacturing beet sugar as reported by the factories.*

[Hardwick committee hearings. These figures are averages compiled from the reports of 33 factories.]

| | 1906-7 | 1907-8 | 1908-9 | 1909-10 | 1910-11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tons of beets sliced | 81,371 | 71,845 | 65,647 | 73,012 | 70,043 |
| Sugar extracted per ton of beets | 235.2 | 269.9 | 248.5 | 252.7 | 262.2 |
| Average price paid per ton of beets | $4.95 | $5.01 | $5.08 | $5.12 | $5.41 |
| Cost of raw material at factory per ton of beets | $5.71 | $5.73 | $5.86 | $6.00 | $6.49 |
| Cost of manufacture per 100 pounds of granulated sugar: | | | | | |
| (a) Raw material (mostly beets) | $2.439 | $2.268 | $2.339 | $2.431 | $2.621 |
| (b) Factory cost | $1.153 | $1.217 | $1.215 | $1.243 | $1.120 |
| (c) Overhead and administration charges | $0.156 | $0.208 | $0.267 | $0.253 | $0.242 |
| (d) Taxes and insurance | $0.075 | $0.093 | $0.104 | $0.098 | $0.117 |
| Total | $3.823 | $3.786 | $3.925 | $4.065 | $4.100 |
| Total, including 10 other factories | $3.94 | $3.56 | $3.87 | $3.73 | $3.89 |

Mr. BRISTOW. I also have here another statement of a partial list of beet-sugar factories and their location, the cost per

pound of producing sugar in each, and the selling price per pound. This was taken from the reports of the beet factories, an interest in which was formerly owned by the Havemeyer Sugar Co. Since it is the report of the managers to the stockholders as to the cost of production, I give it a great deal of weight, because I do not think the factories would undertake to deceive their stockholders as to excessive costs. I should think these would be probably the minimum costs.

I ask to have this matter inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Partial list of beet-sugar factories in the United States, their location, cost per pound of producing sugar at each factory, and selling price per pound.*

| Name. | State. | Cost.[1] | Selling price.[2] |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Cents.* | *Cents.* |
| Michigan Sugar Co. | Michigan | 3.48 | 5.554 |
| Great Western Sugar Co. | Colorado | 3.43 | 5.327 |
| Billings Sugar Co. | Montana | 3.49 | ..... |
| Scottsbluff Sugar Co. | Nebraska | 3.85 | ..... |
| Amalgamated | Utah and Oregon | 3.05 | ..... |
| Lewiston | Utah | 3.03 | ..... |
| Utah-Idaho | Utah and Idaho | 3.53 | ..... |
| Alameda | California | 4.32 | ..... |
| Spreckels | do | 2.70 | ..... |
| Menominee | Michigan | 4.39 | ..... |
| Continental | Michigan and Ohio | 4.08 | 5.55 |
| Iowa | Iowa | 5.14 | 5.73 |
| Carver County | Minnesota | 3.75 | 5.637 |

[1] As shown by reports of these companies to the American Sugar Refining Co., p. 2379 of the hearings before the special committee on the investigation of the American Sugar Refining Co. and others, campaign of 1910-11.

[2] As shown on p. 3149 of the same hearings, the above prices being the average net wholesale price in each case for the season of 1911, up to Nov. 1, 1911.

NOTE.—When the production of each of these factories is considered, the average cost is 3.54 cents per pound. Average of cost by factories—production not considered—3.71 cents per pound. As above, Mr. Truman G. Palmer says cost of production of beet sugar per pound in this country in 1909 was 3.67 cents per pound. (H. Rept. 331, 62d Cong., 2d sess., p. 23.)

Mr. BRISTOW. I have here a large amount of data that I shall not ask to have inserted now, but as the discussion runs on, if I find it necessary to answer any further inquiries I shall be glad to use the matter. I shall not burden the RECORD with it now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to answer what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] had to say about this bill violating in some manner the treaty with Cuba.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will pardon me, I have not had my lunch yet; so the Senator will excuse me if I do not remain during the entire time of his discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, Mr. President, I thank God for the fact that there is nothing either in the law or in the Constitution of the United States compelling us to listen to one another. It would be the most miserable life in the world if we had to stay here all the time and hear one another. I am speaking, as all of us do, chiefly for the RECORD and the country. I know the Senator would not intentionally commit any sort of impoliteness of any description to anybody.

The Senator from Iowa has sought to find in this bill something which brought about a necessary conflict between it and the reciprocity treaty with Cuba. He sought to find that especially because this bill, in a part of it, provides that nothing in the bill shall abrogate or violate anything contained in the reciprocity treaty with Cuba. Then he sought to find certain provisions which prevented us from changing our laws.

I am anxious to get this matter in the RECORD, so that Senators may be saved the trouble of making the investigation themselves to a large extent and chiefly for use upon this side of the Chamber.

Article I of the Cuban reciprocity treaty has nothing to do with the question.

Article II has nothing to do with it. After providing that articles of merchandise imported from Cuba into the United States shall bear a preferential of 20 per cent of the rates provided by the tariff act of the United States of July 24, 1897, this article goes on very significantly and adds these words:

Or as may be provided by any tariff law of the United States subsequently enacted.

Article III, which provides for a preferential of 20 per cent upon all articles coming into Cuba from the United States, after providing for the preferential adds this significant language:

At a reduction of 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as now provided or as may hereafter be provided in the customs tariff of said Republic of Cuba.

There is nothing else, then, that has a bearing upon the question until you come to Article VIII. The other articles following Article III are the schedules in the main part. Article V provides that regulations to prevent fraud, and so forth, if they have the effect of decreasing or increasing, shall not violate the treaty.

Article VI deals with tobacco, and says that that shall not be one of the articles covered by the treaty, but shall be exempt. Importations of tobacco into Cuba do not enjoy the differential.

Article VII is a provision that each country shall receive equal treatment in regard to its importations into the respective ports of the other country.

Article VIII has a slight bearing upon this matter. I will read it:

The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of this convention—

Mark the significant language, now—

preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries, and in return for said preferential rates of duty granted to the Republic of Cuba by the United States it is agreed that the concession herein granted on the part of the said Republic of Cuba to the products of the United States shall likewise be, and shall continue during the term of this convention, preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries.

Then follows the proviso that has a somewhat direct bearing in the minds of some people, which seems to have had it in the minds of the Cuban legation, because the Cuban legation has made representations to the State Department, and the State Department has communicated those representations to the chairman of the Finance Committee.

This proviso at the end of Article VIII, following the part I have just read, says:

*Provided*, That while this convention is in force no sugar imported from the Republic of Cuba and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba shall be admitted to the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent or the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

I will stop reading for a moment to make a comment. This is another illustration of the manner in which special interests influence not only our laws, but our treaties with foreign powers. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] this morning confessed that this language was put in the treaty at the demand or at the request of the sugar interests of this country. It was put in not to advantage Cuba, but to advantage them, so that we should not make another and a later reciprocity treaty with Cuba making a differential even greater than 20 per cent. So that in order to get votes enough for the treaty it was put in—votes enough in this country, not in Cuba. In other words, this special interest had to be begged and bought to give consent to the Cuban reciprocity treaty.

Now, I shall continue to read from where I left off. I will repeat part of my reading, so that I may get the connection:

Shall be admitted into the United States at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereon as provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

As the Senator from Massachusetts well said, this does not fall within that description. But here follows this language, which seems to have deceived the Cuban Legation, and seems to be what they are relying upon:

And no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted—

They seem to have read it—

shall be admitted into the United States.

But it reads:

And no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by treaty or convention into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty than that provided by the tariff act of the United States approved July 24, 1897.

It does not say that no sugar shall be introduced into the United States while this convention is in force at a lower rate of duty, but that it shall not be introduced by convention or treaty at a lower rate of duty. The evident intention was to prevent Cuba, which had gone into a reciprocity treaty with us, being forced to surrender all of her advantages under that reciprocity treaty by some reciprocity treaty we might make with some other sugar-producing country. The insertion of the language "by treaty or convention" is very significant, because it leaves the balance of the language of the treaty undisturbed, and leaves us, of course, free to permit imports of sugar into the country by law and by a change of our customs duty at a less rate than under the law of 1897.

Article IX has no bearing upon this subject.

Article X has no bearing upon the subject.

Article XI has no bearing upon the subject.

I have quoted this from Senate Document No. 357, treaties, conventions, and so forth, 1776 to 1909, volume 1, being a document of the Sixty-first Congress, second session, 1909 to 1910. The treaty from which I have quoted begins on page 353 and goes down to the middle of page 357.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Mississippi did not clearly understand the point I made. Let me say, in the beginning, that I have no well-settled conviction with regard to the interpretation that should be given to the treaty in connection with the law that is about to be passed. I give only my first impression.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi with respect to the meaning and application of the last clause of the proviso. I am not prepared at this moment to dispute the construction given to the first clause of the proviso by the Senator from Massachusetts, and now reasserted by the Senator from Mississippi, although it is very difficult for me to reach that conclusion. It is very hard for me to understand how a government would deliberately agree, or attempt to agree, to foreclose itself from the exercise of a power which would continue and which could be exercised at any moment. We will all agree that after the treaty was entered into it was within the authority of the Congress of the United States to admit Cuban sugar at a rate of duty the equivalent of more than the reduction provided in the Cuban treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means a preferential rate.

Mr. CUMMINS. We could do that at any time; and, as it seems to me, it was a useless and futile thing for us to agree that we would not do so. I thought when first reading it that there must be some other obligation in the first clause of the proviso than simply an obligation by which we undertook to bind our own action with regard to our own affairs. If that was the purpose, I can hardly understand its mission, or how it could be applied, at any time or under any circumstances.

Those things, however, were not the things in my mind when I rose to ask the Senator from Kansas a question.

Disregarding entirely now the proviso in Article VIII, let us see how we stand toward Cuba.

We have agreed in the treaty that the rate of duty on Cuban sugar into the United States should be a preferential rate. We have agreed that it should be not more than 80 per cent of the full rate. If the treaty means anything at all, it means that we have undertaken to allow Cuba to come into our markets so that she would have an advantage over the other countries of the world.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that we have not stipulated that the rate upon sugar should be a specific rate. We have not stipulated that it should be the rate announced in the law of 1897; but we have agreed with Cuba that she should have a preference of 20 per cent in our market. Any duty that we attach to sugar which will not permit Cuba to avail herself of this preference is a violation of the treaty. There can be no doubt about that. We have reserved to ourselves the right to change the duty from time to time. No one disputes that. But we have not reserved to ourselves the right to deny Cuba the preference we granted to her unless we do it through the abrogation of the treaty, against the terms of the treaty. That is perfectly evident.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Mississippi will allow me to read one sentence which he himself has read, I will then yield to him. It is the beginning of Article VIII:

> The rates of duty herein granted by the United States to the Republic of Cuba are and shall continue during the term of this convention preferential in respect to all like imports from other countries. * * *

It goes without saying that if we admit sugar without duty Cuba has not a preferential rate, and therefore I can reach no other conclusion than that when we deny to Cuba the preference we gave her above all other nations with regard to sugar we have violated our stipulation or agreement with her upon this subject. We have a perfect right to violate it. I do not mean that we have an ethical or moral right to violate it, but it is within our power to violate it. If Congress should pass a law admitting sugar free, in my opinion, hastily formed, it is a violation of this treaty, but the act of Congress is valid. It is the treaty which falls, not the act of Congress. Therefore we would have free sugar.

Now, all that is upon the assumption that this bill contains nothing more than a declaration for free sugar; that is, a bill for the admission of sugar without duty. If it had ended there, I would have no doubt about the validity of the law. I would have no doubt that sugar would come in from all the world free at the end of three years. But the part of the proposed law which I am unable to reconcile with the conclusions I have just stated is found in the administrative provisions of the bill, page 250. Therefore I have said that if the act proposed to be passed contained nothing else than the legislation regarding sugar, its validity would be undoubted, its effect would be unquestioned. But in the same law, in connection with the same legislation, we say:

> That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded, etc.

When you put the paragraph I have just read with the paragraphs relating to sugar it is my opinion, open, of course, to reconsideration, because I have not reflected upon it as carefully as I shall do in the future, that it will be the treaty that will stand and the statute will fall.

The only question I have is whether the entire sugar schedule, in so far as it disturbs Cuba, will become invalid or whether only that provision of the sugar schedule which provides for free trade in sugar. But if it is true that by reaffirming the treaty and reasserting that it shall stand in every part and that all its obligations shall still remain we lift the treaty above the law, then the law which is in conflict with it must necessarily fail, and the courts will declare either the entire sugar schedule void because it conflicts with the treaty thus reasserted and reestablished or they will declare that part of the law which provides for free sugar after three years void and of no effect.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to say that on that last conclusion the Senator would be correct, because the last paragraph of the last section of the act expressly provides that—

> If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of said act, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Colorado for calling that to my attention. I had it in mind. I am not clear, however, whether even under that provision the sentence which establishes free trade will be eliminated or whether it will be the entire sugar paragraphs or schedule. But it is impossible for me to avoid in my reasoning one or the other of those conclusions.

Now, it can very well be retorted on me that I ought not to be very much concerned, inasmuch as I am opposed to free sugar. But I am looking more to the effect it will have upon our relations with Cuba. I think before we pass a law of this sort we ought to have an understanding with Cuba, or we ought to proceed in the way in which the treaty points out to denounce and to abrogate the agreement. Common courtesy and good faith between nations would seem to me to require a course of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has merely repeated the argument which he made this morning, and to which I undertook to reply. His argument proceeds altogether upon the assumption that there is a conflict between the treaty and the act. That is just what I undertook to prove does not exist. What the Senator seems to leave out of sight is that there is an immense difference between the violation of a treaty by an act of the United States and the doing of something by the United States which under the terms of the treaty may give to the other power a right to abrogate or to give notice of abrogation. He makes the entire argument as if this treaty were made about sugar. The treaty was made about all the imports into the United States from Cuba, including tobacco and a great many other things as well as sugar, and the guaranty is that the rates shall remain preferential.

The other provisions which I read to the Senate a moment ago fix limitations and conditions as to sugar itself. The limitations fixed upon sugar itself are simply two: First, that it shall not be admitted at a reduction of duty greater than 20 per cent of the rates of duty imposed under the act of July 24, 1897; and, secondly, that no sugar the product of any other foreign country shall be admitted by another reciprocity treaty while this provision is in force at a rate of duty lower than that provided by that act, thereby inferentially there, and I presume elsewhere, providing that this does not effect a reduction by a law.

Now, Mr. President, there is another clause of the treaty with regard to the right of abrogation. That treaty says:

> It is hereby understood and agreed that in case of changes in the tariff of either country which deprive the other of the advantage which

is represented by the percentages herein agreed upon, on the actual rates of the tariffs now in force, the country so deprived of this protection reserves the right to terminate its obligations under this convention after six months' notice to the other of its intention to arrest the operations thereof.

That is what the Senator is getting mixed up with the violation of the treaty. That this undoubtedly will give to Cuba, if she wanted to take that view of it, the right to give the notice to us that she desires to have the treaty terminated is, of course, true. But I rose to defend ourselves from the charge of bad faith and violation of a treaty obligation, which is a totally different thing from the cause and reason to abrogate it.

Now, as Cuba gets her tobacco in at a differential of 20 per cent and some other things at a differential of 20 per cent—I started to say iron ore, but we have put iron ore on the free list; if this free sugar is a violation of the treaty, so is free iron ore—she may conclude, as she gets a great many other things at a differential of 20 per cent, and especially tobacco, which is a very valuable export, it is to her interest to maintain this treaty anyhow. She may conclude that as some seventy-odd per cent, I believe, of her exports to the United States consist of sugar, and that is such a great part of the advantage she reaps from the bargain, she would prefer to enter into renewed negotiations for a new treaty, and give notice of the abrogation of the old one.

But I rose to defend this bill and to defend the House from the charge of bad faith involved in the idea that the bill is a violation of a treaty, which is a totally different thing, as every student of international law knows, from making changes of legislation which may give to the other side a right to ask an abrogation and a refashioning of an existing convention.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understood that difference, and had it in my mind. If there was nothing else in this bill except the adjustment of tariff duties there would be much in the argument of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator sees the point is that the courts will take no notice of it, because it is a violation of the treaty.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think it can be so looked upon, inasmuch as the bill itself confirms the treaty, perpetuates the treaty, and, as far as an act of legislation can, it declares that nothing in it shall be held to be an impairment of any privilege granted by the treaty. The present bill provides:

That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty.

It can not be said that if we eliminate from the act everything that either abrogates the treaty or impairs or affects any of its provisions there will be anything left in the bill that will give good cause to Cuba to recede or withdraw from the treaty. But let me ask the Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I admit that under this clause about the abrogation clause of this treaty or any change of tariff duties in Cuba or any change here expressly under the abrogation clause, the matter is relegated to the respective parties to say whether or not they shall abide by or abrogate the treaty. That is a totally different question from a violation of the treaty.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi did not mention, nor did I, the original Article I. A question with regard to that article may shed some light upon this matter. It provides that—

During the term of this convention all articles of merchandise being the product of the soil or industry of the United States which are now imported into the Republic of Cuba free of duty, and all articles of merchandise being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba which are now imported into the United States free of duty shall continue to be so admitted by the respective countries free of duty.

At that time bananas were on the free list. This bill puts a duty upon bananas. I am not arguing about bananas, I do not care very much whether there is a duty on bananas or whether they are free, but we agreed with Cuba that we would admit——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator was arguing the question as to whether reducing the duty or putting sugar on the free list impairs the treaty, and now the Senator's argument is whether taking the duty off bananas abrogates the treaty. I think there is more soundness in the last argument than in the first.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am applying bananas to the agreement with Cuba. We agreed with her that bananas should come in free, and there were no conditions upon that agreement save a final condition that the treaty might be abrogated. We put bananas on the dutiable list and at the same time we assert in the most solemn manner that we do not intend in this enactment to impair or affect in any manner our agreement with Cuba made in 1902. I should like to know whether the Senator from Mississippi believes that that is a mere violation of the treaty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Article II and Article III say what I shall read. I will not read both, for they are the same language. But the language is significant. I understand this language was drawn by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It is pretty carefully worded, whoever drew it:

During the term of this convention all articles of merchandise not included in the foregoing Article I—

That is, not included in the free list—

and being the product of the soil or industry of the Republic of Cuba imported into the United States, shall be admitted at a reduction of 20 per cent of the rates of duty thereof as provided by the tariff act of the United States, approved July 24, 1897, or as may be provided by any tariff law of the United States subsequently enacted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question the Chair thinks is first to be taken on the committee amendment to perfect the paragraph before the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I had no idea that Schedule E was to be taken up this morning or I would have been prepared to go on this afternoon and discuss the pending paragraph. I will, however, be ready to go on to-morrow morning. I know there are a number of other Senators who desire to speak upon this paragraph, I believe, on both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I confess I was in some doubt whether to say anything upon this question or not, but my interest in the principle involved, as well as my interest in an industry which I think would be a great benefit to my State if established there, impels me, almost against my will, to say a few words.

In my mind, no subject under discussion in the consideration of this tariff bill so well illustrates the beneficent and wholesome results of the protective principle as the question of the sugar industry, and especially the beet-sugar industry.

Referring for a moment to the principle underlying all this discussion and the discussion of nearly every feature of this bill, I think we can for a moment consider the ideas and beliefs of some of the fathers of the Republic. The men of 1787, as we know, gave us that great instrument under which we have maintained all these years our political independence. Alexander Hamilton was one of these. But in his great report on manufactures he gave us another constitution. Upon the observance of the principles laid down in that constitution has rested in great degree our economic independence—our independence of foreign nations in regard to the things that we consume.

Briefly I wish to recur to a few statements by two of the founders of our Government. Alexander Hamilton in this report on manufactures, when discussing the question of protecting manufactures and as to whether such protection should be by means of duties imposed on imported goods or whether the protection should be by means of a bounty, said:

But it is to the interest of the society in each case (whether of duty or bounty) to submit to a temporary expense, which is more than compensated by an increase of industry and wealth, by an augmentation of resources and independence, and by the circumstance of eventual cheapness, which has been noticed in another place.

I quote from page 230 of the work entitled "Official Reports on Public Credit," and in which is found his report on manufactures, made by him as Secretary of the Treasury to Congress in 1790.

The "other place" in this report to which he refers is at page 212, where he discusses at length the benefits that will come to the people under a protective system, although possibly involving a present sacrifice, by reason of the ultimate cheapening of the product.

I recall the idea expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in his address delivered early in this discussion to the effect, or in substance, that while we were in a sense old and while in the older parts of the country we might have some industries of long standing which were well developed and were equipped with all the modern facilities, yet in this great country of ours we are ever new, in the fact that we are continually opening up new portions of this great domain of ours to new industries. In the development of these new resources we are a little like or, by analogy, like what was said by the old philosopher when they were trying to find out something about the origin of being, of the world, of the cosmos, and who held it not either "being" or "not being," but the coexistence of both, or, in other words, a "becoming," as it were, and so in our development, taking the industries that we have and considering the possibilities of the future as relates to this development of ours, we are always becoming.

Is Alexander Hamilton in the statement of his to which I have referred corroborated in any degree? I want to call

attention to expressions by that father of modern Democracy, that great patriot and statesman whose memory I love and revere because he could rise above some of the technicalities of the time and some of the ideas in regard to the strict construction of the Constitution which otherwise hedged him in, to do what he did for the welfare and for the glory of this country in the Louisiana purchase.

I say that the principles advanced by Hamilton and afterwards supported by Jefferson are as applicable to-day, in a degree, as they were away back at the beginning of our Government. Mr. Jefferson, discussing this question and what we should do with reference to the protection of our manufacturers, in a letter to a friend, Benjamin Austin, Esq., the letter being written at Monticello, January 9, 1816, said:

We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them, at the will of a foreign nation?

We may ask ourselves the question, as we go along here, as to the applicability of this statement to the subject under immediate discussion, the protection of our sugar industry—a home industry—it having been demonstrated, I think, beyond doubt, that within the short period of 10 years, by proper protection and encouragement, we shall have arrived at that stage in our development which Hamilton and Jefferson said we should ever have in view, namely, the production of those things upon which we must depend as necessaries of life independently of the other nations of the world.

He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of these. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort, and if those who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me—

Note this, involving as it does, the very idea expressed by Hamilton, one which I think we can all afford, in the development of the industries of this great Nation, to have in mind; and it is but the part of patriotism and the part of having a proper sense of the welfare and growth of this Nation that we do have it in mind, namely, the ability and the willingness to make a little temporary sacrifice in order that we may profit in the end and produce in greater quantity and at a cheaper price to the ultimate consumer in whose welfare we are concerned.

If those—

Says Jefferson—

who quote me as of a different opinion will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not soon have a supply at home equal to our demand and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has wielded it.

Further on he shows how he would fit protection to new conditions, as, Mr. President, we want to fit protection to new conditions in this country, and if by reason of the cost of labor in this country, if by reason of added and increased facilities of production there is no difference between the cost of production here and abroad, we may then as a general proposition, and not till then, afford to do without protection to that industry.

Here, however, is the principle which I think well worthy of consideration. Suppose in all these questions of per cents, in all this close figuring now as to whether or not protection is needed for a particular industry, that industry being one which supplies a great demand on the part of our people, there remains a doubt, how should we as patriots and public-spirited citizens—I will put it on that high ground—resolve that doubt? I for one would resolve the doubt in favor of protecting and developing that industry which will mean so much to the country. This is how Jefferson himself viewed it:

If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply, the question of '85 will then recur, will our surplus labor be then most beneficially employed in the culture of the earth, or in the fabrications of art?

This splendid development of ours could never have been had we pursued the policy hoped for by England and other nations of the world, for they would have kept us a nation of farmers. While we know what the 35,000,000 now engaged in farming mean in the stability and in the progress of our country, our greatness lies partly in the fact that we are not a nation of farmers, in other words, that agriculture is not our only great industry.

But a few words more from Thomas Jefferson:

We have time yet for consideration, before that question will press upon us; and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist; for in so complicated a science as political economy, no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances, and for their contraries. Inattention to this is what has called for this explanation, which reflection would have rendered unnecessary with the candid, while nothing will do it with those who use the former opinion only as a stalking horse—

He evidently refers to the opinion some had had of him, that he stood for free trade instead of for protecting our infant industries. He proceeds:

to cover their disloyal propensities to keep us in eternal vassalage to a foreign and unfriendly people.

So much, Mr. President, for the foundation principle and for those who stood for it. As I have said, in the course of our development with these successive industries of a new kind coming into being there is still the need and the demand for the application of that principle.

Mr. President, I have said that my interest in this industry, which will be so important to my own State, is one, if not the main, consideration that led me to say a word or two here. I desire now to briefly call attention to a statement made in my remarks which were delivered in the Senate on the 29th of July last. I at that time submitted a letter with some tables received from the head of the chemistry department of our agricultural college.

Talk about the production of beets and the per cent of saccharine matter in them. We have heard much about it this morning. There is no State in this Union, according to the report of this chemist, who has devoted almost a lifetime to the service of the State, which excels the State of South Dakota in the qualities of soil and climate adapted to the raising of sugar beets.

I will merely read the result of a series of about 16 tests made to ascertain the per cent of sugar contained in beets in that State in 1911. They run all the way from 16.2 per cent, as the lowest, up to 22 per cent, as the highest. In all those 16 tests as to the pounds of sugar beets produced to the acre the quantity runs all the way from 26,515 pounds per acre up to 48,510 pounds, all except the first one I have named being considerably over 30,000 pounds per acre.

Another word—and I here quote from the letters to which I referred, written me by Prof. Shepard, which are so applicable to this discussion. He says:

Again, sugar beets will add immensely to the yield of our regular grain crops, owing to their beneficial effect on the soil itself. They are subsoilers and open up the soil for the penetration of water. They are a cultivated crop and so will clean the ground from weeds. If the tops and pulp are returned to the soil, little exhaustion takes place, since sugar comes wholly from the air.

In corroboration of what has already been said on the floor of the Senate this morning, reference has been made to the other kinds of root crops which we may produce instead of beets. Reference has been made to turnips and to potatoes, both valuable as improving and conserving the soil, so that better crops of wheat and barley and rye and oats may thereafter be raised. I have seen, after a well-cultivated crop of potatoes in South Dakota, the three successive crops of wheat raised on that well-cultivated potato ground; and because they were better you could readily distinguish those crops of wheat for the three years from the wheat raised alongside on the same kind of land and otherwise as well farmed. To a greater degree will sugar-beet culture improve and conserve the soil than will the potato crop.

Do we want, as suggested by the Senator from Mississippi, to compare the raising of turnips, as in England, for example, with sugar beets in this country as it relates to the preparation of the soil for other crops? Granting that the turnips are to be fed to cattle, you have in the tops and in the pulp of the sugar beet as good, if not a better, food for the stock than you have in the turnip, a more nutritious food, with, of course, the added consideration that while you are raising the sugar beet you are also favoring this great industry, which will mean in the comparatively short time I have mentioned the production of all the sugar which this country consumes. But we will not have it, we can not have it, with sugar to go on the free list within three years from this time. Prof. Shepard says in regard to that:

I am anxiously watching the sugar-tariff proceedings. We were scheduled to have two or more factories in our State next year. I honestly believe that no State can raise better sugar beets, and I know that the advent of sugar-beet culture means the greatest prosperity to our State.

Prosperity, Mr. President, in the mere development of that industry itself, in the diversity in industry which the beet-sugar factories will make in our State. In what other respect will there be benefit? There will be benefit in the additional amount of stock we shall produce in South Dakota.

The claim is made that this bill and our labors here are for the purpose of reducing the high cost of living. How shall we bring down the price of cattle? By encouraging an industry which in turn will encourage every farmer in the raising of more cattle and give a new impetus to mixed farming and stock raising.

The cattle from the ranges are fast going. A letter from a friend the other day indicated that out in the great plains country in South Dakota west of the Missouri River, where formerly hundreds of thousands of cattle could have fed and did feed, he thought there were not to exceed 25,000 head now. That is on account of the opening up of all that country to homestead settlement within the last 8 or 10 years.

How may we best supply the deficiency except by giving such protection directly, in the first place, by a moderate tariff on cattle, and, indirectly, in the second place, by so treating the beet-sugar industry as to encourage every farmer in South Dakota to maintain on his farm of 160 acres all the stock which he can raise and feed? With such a policy we would soon hear less of the dearth of cattle or the high price of cattle; farmers would be induced to raise more of them, and with the greater cheapness and facility with which cattle would be grown there would be a corresponding increase in quantity. The greater number which he thus will be led to produce will keep the farmer as well off, or better off, than he will be with the present higher prices. And as with cattle so with other farm stock. It all means the bringing of the farm up to its highest efficiency.

I will not stop to read further from this letter of Prof. Shepard; but the justice of the claims of the beet-sugar industry seems to me so evident that I am almost inclined to plead with the Members of the Senate on the other side on behalf of South Dakota, believing as I do in the possibilities of this one industry for our State.

I think the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] said in the Senate the other day that free sugar would mean the prevention of the establishment of another beet-sugar factory in Montana. It certainly will mean the prevention of the establishment of any beet-sugar industry in South Dakota. Why do we want the beet-sugar industry there? We want it, as I have said, primarily that we may diversify our industries, but the indirect beneficial results will be even greater than the direct benefits. Granting that they include eventually a lower price for sugar than now obtains, the added crops——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota has referred to the Senator from Montana, let me inquire of the Senator from South Dakota, with all the advantages which that State possesses in the matter of beet-sugar culture, why should they not have had beet-sugar factories in that State all these years?

Mr. STERLING. I think the answer is obvious. Our State lies wholly to the west; it is a newly settled State, and the people have been absorbed and interested in the opening up of the farms, the cultivation of wheat, corn, and so forth, and have not as yet established any beet-sugar industry on that account. Capital as yet, so far as that is concerned, has not found that a favorable field for investment, and I think perhaps a doubt as to what eventually might happen to the tariff on sugar has had within the last year or two an influence in preventing the establishment of the beet-sugar industry.

Let me say further to the Senator that, according to Mr. Shepard, at least two sugar factories were scheduled for South Dakota, and the only thing, as he indicates in another part of his letter, that will prevent their establishment will be the putting of sugar on the free list in three years.

Mr. WALSH. I thought possibly, Mr. President, that it might be due to the same fact that has prevented the multiplication of beet-sugar factories in Montana. I might say, likewise, that we have had at least half a dozen beet-sugar factories scheduled for Montana for 10 years, but we have not got them. When all the preliminaries were arranged for the construction of another beet-sugar factory in the Gallatin Valley, the powers that be in that industry put their veto upon it, and it was not built. Exactly the same conditions exist in the Bitter Root Valley; and I thought possibly some of those influences might have operated to prevent thus far the establishment of factories in South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator that I do not know to what he refers when he says "the powers that be in that industry put their veto upon it." It might be that some such powers would try to prevent for the present the establishment of sugar factories in South Dakota, but I have never heard that they were seeking to prevent their establishment.

Mr. WALSH. For the information of the Senator, then, I will say that if he examines the testimony before the Hardwick committee, he will learn that the establishment of a beet-sugar factory at Bozeman, in the heart of the Gallatin Valley, than which there is no greater agricultural valley in all America, was prevented by the combination of Mr. Morey, representing the Great Western Sugar Co., and Mr. Havemeyer, the head of the Sugar Trust.

Mr. STERLING. There may be an occasion now and then when that is true, when influences of that kind have been brought to bear against the establishment of any beet-sugar factories; but I will say that I do not know and never heard of any such happening in South Dakota. Further, I will say to the Senator—and I think he will agree with me—that, taking South Dakota as a whole, in the matter of the "lay of the land," the character of soil, and the quantity of land adaptable to beet-sugar raising, it excels his State of Montana, although here and there there may be valleys in Montana well adapted to sugar-beet raising.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I desire to remind the Senator from Montana as well as the Senator from South Dakota that the sugar-beet industry in the entire country is a new one; it has only been in operation for about 16 years in any part of the country. It began about 1897, as I recall, and has been going ahead very rapidly, more rapidly, as the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] very well showed in his admirable address this morning, than it has developed in any other civilized country in the world.

It began in my State about the year 1897 with a single small factory. We have now some five or six extensive factories, and but for the threat of the passage of this bill we would have had other factories. The industry has been extended into Idaho within the last six or seven years, and it has been extended into Montana within the last few years, where a single factory has been built.

The Senator from Montana himself conceded the other day, as I understood him, that but for the pending legislation other factories would be established in Montana; at any rate, he said that, in his judgment, the effect of putting sugar on the free list would be to discourage the establishment of additional factories in his State.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for the sake of accuracy in the history of this matter, lest any misunderstanding might arise, I desire to state that the beet-sugar factory in Montana has been in operation for seven years. It has been operated during all of that time with most marked and distinguished success—with such success as ought naturally to have invited the establishment of other factories at other places within the State, but they have not been built, and I have indicated one of the principal reasons why they have not been built.

Lest any error might arise from anything that has been said by myself, I answered the Senator the other day that if the present immense subsidy to the beet-sugar industry is continued as a matter of course factories are more likely to be built than if you take that subsidy away. It would be the height of absurdity for anybody to assert anything to the contrary; but I said, in the same connection—and I have been endeavoring to give some attention to offsetting the cost to the people of this country of protecting this industry against the advantage which accrues—and I said in that connection that it was not a mere matter of a gift to have that beet-sugar factory, but that my State was paying a subsidy—not to speak of the rest of the Nation—in the aggregate, as I calculated, of at least $250,000 a year to sustain the industry; and I questioned whether, after all, it was wise to continue that subsidy.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will pardon me just a moment further——

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is not anything in the world more timid than a dollar except two dollars. I think that has been said before. The Senator from Kansas this morning called attention to the effect which Cuban reciprocity had upon the sugar-beet industry in the western part of the country, and he was entirely correct about that. When that measure was pending before the House of Representatives I was one of the Republicans who opposed it, and so was my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I think there were some thirty-seven Republicans who, although we did not go into a caucus, went into a conference, declined to be bound by the judgment of the majority of our colleagues, and refused to follow the importunities of the then President of the United States upon that subject.

I was not afraid at that time that the beet-sugar factories were going to be closed, but I was fearful that the passage of the Cuban reciprocity bill would retard the further development of the industry. That is precisely what happened. In my judgment, if it had not been for the Cuban reciprocity bill, instead of producing in the neighborhood of 700,000 tons of beet sugar per annum, as we are to-day, we would have been producing over a million tons. The industry received a setback of two or three

years from that legislation; capital was timid about investing. If you pass this legislation it will cause a setback for a score of years, for, when the Republican Party comes back into power—as it will do in four years from now—and this work is undone still, we can not undo the effect of it and the development of the whole sugar-beet industry will have received a setback from which it will take it many years to recover.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. As my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] well says, Cuban reciprocity had a great deal to do with retarding the growth of the sugar industry of this country. I want also to call attention to the fact that from that time until the present there has been a constant agitation for a change in the sugar duty or for free sugar. In 1911 we had such a proposition pending in the House of Representatives; in 1912 we had it again; we have had it in every campaign, and, of course, men are not going into an industry if they know that by one simple act of Congress that industry can be destroyed. They do not propose to put their money into that or any other industry without at least some chance of ultimate success.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from South Dakota will pardon me, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he ought not, in frankness, to confess that in spite of Cuban reciprocity and in spite of the agitation, there is not in the world any occupation or any industry that has developed and prospered and has been so profitable in this country as that of beet sugar during the very years he has been talking about?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I do not agree with the Senator; but I can say to the Senator that if it had not been for Cuban reciprocity and the eternal agitation which has been going on all the time, instead of making 700,000 tons of beet sugar to-day we would be making a million and a half tons of beet sugar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Still, as compared with other industries, cotton and a dozen other things that other people are interested in, that are not bolstered up at all and have not been hurt by the agitation of Cuban reciprocity, people engaged in the raising of beets and making beet sugar have made greater progress than almost anybody else.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that comes about from the very fact that as soon as sugar is made it finds a ready market. There is an immense demand in this country for it that in the past it has been absolutely impossible, and is to-day impossible, to fill without importations of sugar. As long as that extreme demand exists, as long as we do not produce the amount of sugar that we consume in this country, there will always be money to invest in this industry if there is a likelihood or a chance of legislation not being passed that will destroy it. I do not mean cripple it; I mean destroy it. No one wants his sugar investment absolutely wiped out. I say to the Senator that just as soon as a sugar mill closes, all it is worth is for old junk, old iron. It can not be used for any other purpose on earth, and it is a total loss. That is why the industry has not increased even more than it has. There is a great, broad field for it to increase now. We are using in this country 4,000,000 tons of sugar every year, and continental America and Hawaii and Porto Rico and the Philippines altogether produce only something like 2,000,000 tons.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. STERLING. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to ask a question? As I understood his argument, he said that wherever the sugar beet was planted, on account of the cultivation of it and the by-product from it in the form of pulp, there was an increased production of wheat; the land was greatly enriched.

Mr. STERLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That there was also an increase in cattle feed, and therefore that would encourage cattle raising and cattle production.

Mr. STERLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And a lot of other by-products. Now, if that be true, in view of the high price that wheat is now bringing and the contention on the other side that the consumption is rapidly catching up with the production, and in view of the abnormally high price of meat, does he not think that the beet growers might cultivate the beet for the meat product and the wheat that might grow afterwards?

Mr. STERLING. I will say, as has been suggested here, that it is a pretty dear fertilizer. Here is an opportunity to serve the two purposes.

Just a few words, in conclusion, Mr. President, in regard to this industry; and here, it seems to me, is the situation, first, from the standpoint of a State: The establishment or the nonestablishment of a great productive industry that will mean, by rotating the sugar-beet crop with oats and wheat and barley, a vastly increased production of those several grains. I think it has been demonstrated beyond doubt that in Germany and France, where they have rotated crops of wheat and barley and oats and rye with sugar beets, the increased yield of these grains has been 80 per cent in a comparatively short period of time.

So what is involved here? Instead of producing 13 or 14 bushels of wheat to the acre, as the farmer is doing in South Dakota now without the advantage of this rotation of crops or the inducement to it, he will with such rotation produce 25 or 30 bushels of wheat to the acre. Instead of 30 or 35 bushels of oats to the acre, he will produce on sugar-beet ground 50 to 60, or even 70, bushels of oats to the acre.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina rose.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will permit me just a moment, what does that mean? What does it mean in the world's production and in feeding the consumers of the world? A greater abundance of these staple crops, the necessaries of life. Will the farmer be any poorer by it? No, no. He will have increased riches. In the additional number of cattle and of sheep he produces, in the added quantity of wheat, of barley, of rye, and of oats he raises, he will be the gainer, and he will make more than at the present higher price because of his increased production, while at the same time the larger supply will mean a lower price to the consumer.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. STERLING. I yield; yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will those sugar beets grow without the tariff?

Mr. STERLING. Oh, I suppose the sugar beets will grow without the tariff, but they will not grow——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They never have grown before without it.

Mr. STERLING. But the industry will not be encouraged in our part of the country without it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. According to the Senator's own figures as to the vast increase in wheat and in meat, it seems to me it would be a pretty good compensation to grow beets for increasing the meat and wheat revenue rather than for the purpose of being enriched on the beets.

Mr. STERLING. I grant the Senator that it is some compensation—in fact, great compensation—and ought to be some inducement, as I believe it is; but so far it has not proven to be sufficient inducement. I think it is taken for granted that there is nothing which so enriches or conserves the soil as the growing of the sugar beet.

So much for the situation locally and the good the sugar industry will do for a State. What does it mean nationally?

I can not help but think that we are pursuing anything but a farseeing and wise policy when we put sugar on the free list and thus cripple, if not prevent, the further growth and development of this industry.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will not disturb the Senator; but before he goes on to that branch of this question, I was interested in a statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] that his State was levied upon each year for a subsidy or a contribution of about $250,000 to maintain this industry. I should like to know how he arrives at that conclusion or how he obtains those figures.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. I do not like to duplicate what I said. If the Senator will do me the honor to read an address that I had the honor to present to the Senate here two weeks ago, he will find a direct answer to the question. But I shall be very glad to state it briefly now, if the Senator is desirous of knowing.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; I heard the address, but I do not remember just what the Senator refers to.

Mr. WALSH. It was a very simple calculation. If sugar goes on the free list the importer will not have to pay a duty of $1.34 a hundred pounds, as he does now.

Mr. BRISTOW. But if the Senator will just wait a moment, does not the Senator from Montana know that the importer does not pay $1.34 more per hundred pounds for his sugar than is paid for the same sugar in the European market as a result of this duty? Does he not know that the statistics of importations show that during the greater part of the year he pays only about 60 or 70 cents more than the European parity, and that the Cuban sugar sells far under the European parity in the New York market?

Mr. WALSH. He pays for every pound of sugar he imports 1.34 cents more than he would pay if he did not have to pay the duty.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does not the Senator know that the importer in New York gets his sugar for from 60 to 70 cents per hundred pounds less than the European price, plus the $1.34, for exactly the same quality of sugar in the European market?

Mr. WALSH. He would get his sugar for $1.34 per hundred pounds less if he did not have to pay the duty.

Mr. BRISTOW. But the Senator shows that he is not informed upon the price of sugar—its import price in New York and its price in Europe.

Mr. WALSH. That may be; but the Senator has been diligently endeavoring to inform himself.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will examine the statistics I submitted this morning, he will learn that there is not paid for the sugar at New York $1.34 per hundred pounds more than that same sugar will bring in Europe, but it was only about 60 or 70 cents more during the last year.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator can not possibly learn that he will get it for a cent less than $1.34 more than he otherwise would pay.

Mr. BRISTOW. Just a moment. If it sells for but 60 or 70 cents more in New York than it sells for in the European markets on the same day—the same sugar from the same country, Cuba—does not that show that the New York price is but about 60 or 70 cents more than the European price? And does not that represent the additional cost which the New York importer pays, instead of $1.34?

If it was $1.34 more in New York than it is in Europe, the exact amount of the duty, I will agree that it would be an increased price of $1.34; but when quotations in New York and in Hamburg show that instead of being $1.34 more it is only about 60 or 70 cents more, does not that show that the price is not increased by the amount of $1.34 per hundred pounds?

Mr. WALSH. There is nothing that can show that the price paid for the Cuban sugar can be one penny less than it otherwise would be and $1.34 per hundred.

Mr. BRISTOW. It simply shows that the Senator from Montana has made his statements without examining the facts, as shown by the prices paid on importations in New York. I should advise him to look up the facts before he makes on the floor of the Senate statements that can not be verified by the records affecting a great industry of the people of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana has made no statement that the record will not justify, and no statement that can be controverted, namely, that Cuban sugar costs the import price plus $1.34.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am willing to leave it to the record and the importer's price in New York, and invite any man who is interested to investigate the statements made by the Senator from Montana and myself. He will find that time after time sugar from Cuba has sold in New York as much as 73 cents below the European price plus the duty.

If the Senator from South Dakota will pardon me further, the Senator from Montana seems to think that there has been a very slow and sluggish increase in the development of beet-sugar production in our country; and he has asked the Senator from South Dakota his opinion as to why, with these wonderful possibilities, there have not been factories established long before this in South Dakota. With the permission of the Senator from South Dakota, I desire to give the number of factories that were manufacturing beet sugar in the United States in 1897, when the Dingley bill was enacted.

In 1897 there were 7 factories manufacturing beet sugar in the United States. In 1898 there were 9. In 1899 there were 15. In 1900 there were 31. In 1901 there were 34. In 1902 there were 39. In 1903 there were 44. In 1904 there were 53. In 1905 there were 51; there was a decline when Cuban reciprocity came in and disturbed the development of the industry. In 1906 there were 53, the same as in 1904. In 1907 there were 63. In 1908 there were 63. In 1909 there were 63. In 1910 there were 65. In 1911 there were 63. In 1912 there were 67. In 1913 there were 73. So the number has increased, since the Dingley bill was passed, from 7 to 73.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And yet the same industry has been ruined by the agitation and the passage of the Cuban reciprocity bill.

Mr. WALSH. I simply wished to inquire for information from the Senator from South Dakota why the factories did not come to his State, and I was wondering whether it was for the same reason that they have not multiplied in my State. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas can inform us as to that.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me, in the opinion of the Senator from Kansas, since this industry requires a large investment of capital in the establishment and the erection of a mill or a factory, running in the neighborhood of $1,000,000, it is necessary to present to the minds of men who are to invest their capital in such an enterprise conclusive proof that it is to be profitable. With the development of an industry that has only been of recent origin the Senator must know that it takes time to bring about that degree of certainty in the mind of the investor that the investment will be a safe and a wise thing. The experiment has not been tried extensively in South Dakota, since we have been advancing gradually to ascertain where the soil and the climate will produce beets most successfully. I think it has been altogether reasonable that there should not have been any more rapid advancement in the establishment of this industry than there has been. As I said this morning, we have advanced more rapidly in our country since we began than any other country that has ever developed a domestic sugar supply.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, it may be well, from a national standpoint, to refer briefly to the average price per pound at wholesale in New York during the years between 1870 and 1910; this simply for the purpose of showing that, comparatively speaking, no great burden is now imposed upon any class of people on account of the price of sugar. It has been cheapening all the while.

In 1870 the price per pound at wholesale in New York—the average price for the year—was 13.51 cents per pound. In 1880 it was 9.80 cents. In 1890 it was 6.27 cents. In 1900 it was 5.32 cents. In 1910 it was 4.97 cents. Take the consumption of sugar in the United States as another proof that the price of sugar is not proving any great burden upon any class of consumers in this country. In 1830 the consumption per capita was 10.2 pounds. In 1840 it was 12.9 pounds per capita. In 1850 it was 19.8 pounds per capita. In 1860 it was 29.6 pounds per capita. In 1870 it was 32.7 pounds per capita. In 1880 it was 39.5 pounds per capita. In 1890 it was 50.7 pounds per capita. In 1900 it was 50.9 pounds per capita. In 1910 it was 79.9 pounds per capita of consumption.

The broad assertion is frequently made that each individual in the United States consumes 80 pounds of sugar each year. Literally construed, that would mean that every man, woman, and child in the United States consumed each year 80 pounds of sugar. Of course we realize that this can not be true. Aside from the use of sugar in the manufacture of candies, I think a little over 50 pounds per capita is consumed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me there?

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In connection with the figures which he has given showing the decline in price, I wish to remind the Senator that relatively the fall in the price of sugar has been very much greater than his figures would indicate, because while during the last 10 or 15 years the price of every other food commodity has been going up the price of sugar has been going down. So if we were to measure it by the other articles of food, we would find that the fall in the price of sugar has been very remarkable, indeed.

Mr. STERLING. I realize that, and I thank the Senator for calling attention to that fact.

The sugar industry appeals to me, from the national standpoint, because of the prospect within 10 years from now of producing in this country every pound of sugar we use with the establishment of the beet-sugar industry, or with the retention of the tariff, such as is suggested by the Senator from Kansas, that will afford reasonable protection to the industry. Is not that worth considering? Meanwhile, we shall not have increased the price of sugar in any degree whatever, nor shall we have burdened any part of our population to whom payment for the ordinary comforts of life is any burden at all. On the contrary, if a tariff increases the price at all, this lower tariff proposed by the Senator from Kansas will reduce even the present low price. We shall in no event have burdened the consumer with any additional cost of sugar, and the eventual result will be the production of all the sugar we consume and of making sugar cheaper than it is now.

So I can not help but think, as I said at the outset, that here is one of the finest examples in all the tariff bill of the proper,

just, reasonable application of the protective-tariff principle; and I appeal to the same principle now and to-day that Hamilton and Jefferson invoked in their time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question. I think I understood him to say that the growth of the domestic sugar industry in Montana was prevented by the Havemeyers and some one else whose name I did not quite catch. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. That they did intercept the building of a factory at Bozeman I understood to be quite a well-established historical fact.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That they prevented the building of a factory?

Mr. WALSH. That they prevented the building of a factory.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How did they do it? What was the process?

Mr. WALSH. I shall be very glad to-morrow morning to put the letters again in the RECORD—letters from Mr. Morey to Mr. Havemeyer and from Mr. Havemeyer to Mr. Morey.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I think they are trying to prevent the growth and development of the sugar industry now, aided by the Democratic Party. My mind was refreshed by the statement of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], who was a Member of the House, as was my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], at the time reciprocity with Cuba was perfected. I resisted that attempt because I believed it would tend to arrest the development of our domestic sugar industry, which I regarded as of the utmost importance to the economic welfare of the American people. The effect of that legislation, in my judgment, was instantaneous and harmful.

The industry was growing rapidly and private individuals were investing in the domestic sugar business. The moment that legislation was passed—indeed, during the preliminary agitation—many of those men took to cover and sold their interest in these local sugar factories. That interest, in many instances, was acquired by the men who had strongly opposed the development of the industry in this country, and by the very trust of which the Senator from Montana complains, until they acquired quite a considerable holding in the sugar-beet industry of my State; I do not know exactly how extensive.

Mr. WALSH. So that the Senator may understand fully, the Mr. Morey that I spoke of is the president of the Great Western Sugar Co., which is distinctly a beet-sugar company, the Senator understands.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What composes the Great Western Sugar Co.?

Mr. WALSH. The Great Western Sugar Co. is a company that owns a large number of factories in the State of Colorado and adjacent territory. It owns all of the stock of the Billings Sugar Co., which owns the factory at Billings, in my State.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it connected with the American Sugar Refining Co. or the Havemeyer interests?

Mr. WALSH. It is connected in just the same way that those in the Senator's State are.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. By the ownership of a minority interest?

Mr. WALSH. The testimony before our committee the other day was to the effect that the same interests own 33⅓ per cent of the stock of the Michigan Sugar Co.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is the Michigan Sugar Co.?

Mr. WALSH. The Michigan Co. In the same way the same interests own 33⅓ per cent of the stock of the Great Western Sugar Co., which owns all of the stock of the Billings factory.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan permit me an interruption?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have here a statement taken from the hearings of the Committee on Finance, giving the exact interest of the Havemeyer Co. in the beet-sugar plants. It gives the names of the plants, the kind of stock owned, the par value of the shares, the total issue, and the percentage owned by the Havemeyer interests.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator the date of that.

Mr. BRISTOW. This is under date of May 23, 1911. I have been informed that the Havemeyer interests have sold quite largely of this stock. I may add, if the Senator will permit, that at the time this stock was acquired it evidently was the purpose of the sugar-refining trust to get control of the beet-sugar industry by the purchasing of shares of stock in as many factories as it could throughout the country; but in recent years it has concluded that it would be cheaper and easier to destroy the industry by free sugar than to control it by owning any interest in the stock. So it started on this campaign for free sugar some three or four years ago.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to make a slight contribution to the facts, because the Senator from Kansas might draw an erroneous inference. The representative of the Michigan Beet Sugar Co. testified before our investigating committee only the other day that at the time the Hardwick testimony was taken they owned, my recollection is, 42 per cent of the stock of the Michigan Beet Sugar Co.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is given here as 35 per cent common and 55 per cent preferred. So I presume, as to the average, that is about right.

Mr. WALSH. Let me finish. He went on to say, however, not that they were dissatisfied with the investment, but they were afraid of the Sherman Act, and they disposed of their stock down to 33⅓—not because they thought they could accomplish any end by getting free sugar, but they were afraid of the enforcement of the Sherman Act.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is just the point I want to make. When they undertook to pass this Cuban reciprocity they discouraged individual investments in that great enterprise, and as a result the representatives of the refining company set their agents to work and acquired a holding. The Michigan Sugar Co., however, does not mean the entire Michigan sugar industry. It means eight factories with an investment of probably $5,000,000, but there is $20,000,000 invested in the sugar industry of Michigan alone.

Mr. WALSH. My recollection is that they own nine factories in that State.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Eight, I think, although I would not dispute the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator from Michigan will permit me, I will have this printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BRISTOW. For information I will say the statement shows that of the Billings (Mont.) Sugar Co., referred to by the Senator, the trust owned 26 per cent of the common and 38 per cent of the preferred, the Alameda Sugar Co. owned 49 per cent, the Spreckels Sugar Co. 50 per cent, the Utah-Idaho Sugar Co. 49 per cent, the Amalgamated Sugar Co. preferred 50 per cent, the Lewiston Sugar Co. 37 per cent, the Iowa Sugar Co. common 75 per cent, the Carver County Sugar Co. 80 per cent, the Menominee River Sugar Co. 36 per cent, and the Continental Sugar Co. 35 per cent.

The table submitted by Mr. BRISTOW is as follows:

TRUST'S INTEREST IN BEET SUGAR.

[From briefs and statements filed with the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, first print, p. 409. See Hardwick hearings, p. 100.]

*The American Sugar Refining Co.'s interests in beet-sugar companies May 23, 1911.*

| Names of companies. | Capital stock. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Kind of stock. | Par value of shares. | Total issued. | Owned by American Sugar Refining Co. | Per cent owned. |
| Alameda Sugar Co | Common | $25.00 | $745,825 | $371,250 | +49 |
| Spreckels Sugar Co | do | 100.00 | 5,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 50 |
| Utah-Idaho Sugar Co | Preferred | 10.00 | 9,449,090 | 4,650,500 | +49 |
| | Common | 10.00 | 1,470 | ..... | ..... |
| Amalgamated Sugar Co | Preferred | 100.00 | 2,551,400 | 1,275,700 | 50 |
| Lewiston Sugar Co | Common | 10.00 | 606,430 | 225,000 | +37 |
| Great Western Sugar Co., including Billings Sugar Co., and Scottsbluff. | do | 100.00 | 10,544,000 | 2,735,500 | 26 |
| | Preferred | 100.00 | 13,630,000 | 5,159,200 | 38 |
| Michigan Sugar Co | Common | 100.00 | 7,471,107 | 2,607,400 | 35 |
| | Preferred | 100.00 | 3,703,500 | 2,043,800 | 55 |
| Iowa Sugar Co | Common | 100.00 | 550,000 | 416,500 | +75 |
| Carver County Sugar Co | do | 100.00 | 600,000 | 483,700 | +80 |
| Menominee River Sugar Co | do | 10.00 | 825,000 | 300,000 | +36 |
| Continental Sugar Co | do | 100.00 | 1,200,000 | 415,440 | −35 |
| Total | | | 56,883,617 | 23,183,990 | −41 |

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from Kansas has presented these figures.

I desire to direct the attention of the Senate to this singular coincidence. Those are figures gathered in 1911, and I venture the assertion, although I am not prepared to sustain it in detail, that the American Sugar Refining Co. or any of its owners have not purchased a share of stock in a domestic sugar company since the Democratic Party came into power pledged to free trade in sugar, and they will not buy any of that stock until you have passed your bill and the three years of strangulation depresses its value to the point at which they are willing to buy.

It would not surprise me at all if, discouraged and disheartened as the owners of these industries now are, they should dispose of their stock at any price to any purchaser, whether it be the American Sugar Refining Co. or anyone else.

I dislike to think that this vast investment of $20,000,000 of money invested by the people of my State is to be thus dissipated by a bare majority of the Democratic caucus. If that industry is throttled, as I believe it will be, the stock will be picked up by its arch competitor, the Sugar Trust, and competition in the field of domestic sugar production will have disappeared entirely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that the Sugar Trust will pick up this stock at their own price. I have understood him on a previous occasion to say that if sugar went on the free list there would not be any industry. Then would the Sugar Trust have any temptation to take it at nothing?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why should they pick it up then?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. They will be tempted to do it because the country will understand, indeed it is understood now, that the lease of power the Democratic Party is enjoying is but temporary. There will be a reaction perhaps in the value of this stock when the right of the public is again asserted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the power of the Democratic Party is temporary and we are not going to stay in long enough to bring on this calamity, and it is so certain that the Sugar Trust is going to pick it all up, why spend all this time demurring and debating and talking and describing the calamity and telling what great distress there is going to be, and suffering, and so forth? Why not just pass the bill and then turn us out of power and reestablish your lines and go ahead?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi is the last man on the other side of the Chamber who should make such an observation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi in a formal statement over his own signature, in which he was joined by the Senator from Texas and several other Senators——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; in other words——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Absolutely promised that the condition we confront to-day in this bill would never exist.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator says that we are not going to confront these conditions, and it is going to be merely a temptation——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We are confronting it now. The industry is suffering to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Merely a temptation to the Sugar Trust to get rich by picking up beet-sugar factories.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; you confront that situation now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Mississippi has a perfectly distinct recollection of what he said.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I know he has.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator did not say in one breath that an industry was going to be devastated and in the next breath that there was a bunch of financiers in the country that was going out to buy it up.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Mississippi never says anything in one breath, and I did not accuse him of that habit.

Now, Mr. President, I say that the domestic sugar industry to-day is discouraged; that the value of its stock has dropped from nearly par to less than 50 cents on the dollar because of this unfavorable legislation; and when it gets to the point where the trust conceive it to be to their advantage to pick it up they will do it and thereafter monopolize the sugar business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if it is totally ruined, could it ever reach that point?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; just the moment you dispose of the domestic competition in sugar every intelligent man knows that the trust can regain what it has spent by adding the merest fraction to the cost of sugar.

I do not believe that the course which our friends upon the other side are urging will give the consumer cheaper sugar, at least permanently, but it will give the consumer one source of supply and the price will depend largely on caprice. The Senator from Mississippi and all other Senators upon that side of the Chamber know that this bill will restrict the field of competition. One of the most consistent men upon that side of the Chamber in his attitude regarding this question is my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. He does not undertake to reconcile what you are about to do with the past history of your party or your individual professions, but he acts upon the theory that there are more sugar users than there are sugar producers. Therefore he will open the door for them to get their supplies from any part of the world, little realizing that the most gigantic Sugar Trust in the world has bent its every endeavor to bring about this result.

Not long ago I was in southern California, and two farmers took me to a sugar factory which had been built at Santa Ana. That factory cost $700,000, and it was built by the farmers in that vicinity; not only the men who owned the soil from which the beets could be produced, but other farmers.

They had no relation with any trust in the world. They believed it to be a desirable business and they went into it as an investment. It is not too much for me to say that since the party to which you belong has triumphed and your free-trade purpose has been understood these enterprising men have become discouraged and feel that the money they have put into this industry has been largely wasted, at least for the time being. If divisions in our party are reconciled, and I am hopeful they will be, this will be your last tariff law for a generation, and the party of protection to American industry and labor will again assert its dominance in American affairs. How idle it is to curtail the world's sugar production by putting a prosperous and growing industry out of business for the sole purpose of again trying out an old and exploded theory of Government that has never worked successfully in any part of the world. If the world's supply of sugar is diminished those that are left in the business can raise the price to suit their convenience and necessities. The fall of these industries in Michigan and other States will enable the American Sugar Refining Co. to recoup all it spends in achieving the result, and that expense will ultimately be paid by the American people.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just one moment and I am going to suspend, because I had no thought of making any extended remarks.

I have just been reading the speech of a distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the past, the author of the last Democratic tariff bill, one of the most brilliant men and one of the best informed men, I think, who has ever had leadership in your party—I refer to the late Congressman from West Virginia, Hon. William L. Wilson. While Prof. Wilson's economic training tended toward free trade he did not hesitate to say that sugar, above all things, should not be put upon the free list.

He did not hesitate to say that it was a mistake in the tariff bill of 1890 when sugar went upon the free list, even bountyized as it was, and he restored the sugar duties in the Wilson-Gorman bill. Whether he did it because he foresaw that we could produce sugar here, that it would diversify the employment of our people and retain the vast sums that we expended for it from year to year in the circulating medium of the country, thus stimulating other industries, I do not know, but I do know that he deprecated the idea of placing sugar upon the free list, as many Senators on the other side of the Chamber now do in their hearts. If he desired to maintain a duty upon it, either for protection or revenue, he was wiser than the leaders of the Democratic Party to-day, because this vast revenue that you are sacrificing, these industries that you are imperiling, this doctrine that you are establishing, I think, almost for the first time in the history of the Republic, will bring disaster.

While many investors in my State were driven to sell their holdings in sugar factories, I would not have you believe that the American Sugar Refining Co. is a copartner in all these industries. I have a letter before me now from the German-American Sugar Co., of Bay City, in which they say that they have had no representative in Washington; that they are identified with no combination of sugar producers; that they have attended no meetings of such an organization; but that they are intensely and deeply interested in preserving their property.

Mr. President, I think it is idle for us to even hope that the other side will favorably consider the suggestions made by the Senator from Kansas. His suggestions have not always met my favor. I am not always in accord with the Senator from Kansas. That perhaps is not to his discredit; possibly it is to mine. But upon this proposition, which he has studied with so much care, I think as he thinks, that if Senators on the other side of the Chamber were freed from an iron-bound caucus rule under which they seem to be operating, they would accept

the suggestions of the Senator from Kansas and protect these industries, and thus make certain that a million of dollars a week would come into the Treasury of the United States at a time when, in my judgment, that revenue is most sadly needed.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I am not going to yield to the Senator now. I see in his eye a spirit of deviltry which so often characterizes him on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I just want to ask a question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; I know. In one breath?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a plain question, that is all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, I know it will be very embarrassing to me; but all right. What is the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Probably it will be. The Senator is now advising us to take the advice of the Senator from Kansas. I understand that the proposition of the Senator from Kansas now is just what it was at the last Congress. I want to ask the Senator from Michigan if he then took the advice of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; I voted with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You did?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; I voted with him, and I am very glad to acknowledge that he displayed great wisdom in what he did. The Senator surely did not want to embarrass me by saying I was a recent convert to the teachings of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I had not known that the Senator voted for it at the last session of Congress, I would not have asked him the question, to be perfectly frank with him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I voted for his amendment because I saw in it a compromise which I thought would be helpful and would preserve the industry.

I did not intend to say even so much as I have said. I rose for the purpose of putting into the RECORD a letter written to me by the German-American Sugar Co., of Bay City, Mich. This independent company has stated its case so aptly that I feel I can not add to the discussion better than by having the letter read, and I send it to the Secretary's desk for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I want merely to say a word before the Secretary reads the letter. I have also a letter, under date of May 31, from the German-American Sugar Co., in which they say:

That this company has never authorized any person other than its own executive officers to represent it at Washington.

That during the pending of the present tariff bill before Congress this company has had no representative at Washington.

That this company is not affiliated in any way with other manufacturers.

It relies implicitly upon the intelligence and patriotism of Congress to protect it in its rights. Now, if the Secretary will read the letter, that is all I care to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

GERMAN-AMERICAN SUGAR CO.,
*Bay City, Mich., April 26, 1913.*

Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
*Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In protesting against the removal of or a drastic cut in the present sugar tariff the German-American Sugar Co. desires to state that it is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Michigan. It owns and operates two beet-sugar manufacturing plants, one at Bay City, Mich., with a capacity of 1,400 tons of beets per day, and one at Paulding, Ohio, having a daily capacity of 800 tons. It is absolutely independent of any of the eastern refiners or beet-sugar manufacturers by ownership of stock or otherwise.

With our factory equipment and general organization we believe this company is in a position to manufacture sugar as cheaply as any of the 16 factories in this State or of the 5 in Ohio. During the last eight years the net profits of this company, including all by-products, have averaged per 100 pounds of sugar only a trifle in excess of 50 per cent of the present tariff on Cuban sugar.

Free sugar would absolutely kill the beet and cane sugar industry in the United States, as we can not compete against the cheap labor of foreign sugar-producing countries, where the farm and factory wages are less than one-half of what they are in this country and where the cost of beets per 100 pounds of sugar is from $1.14 to $1.23 less than American sugar manufacturers are paying American farmers.

The intense farming necessary to the successful growing of sugar beets improves the land and increases the yield of other crops grown in rotation with sugar beets. This increase is estimated by eminent French and German agricultural scientists to be not less than 50 per cent, and the value of the industry is recognized by foreign Governments by the protection which they give it. The average duties of all European countries on sugar is 4.43 cents per pound. The United States duty on Cuban sugar is 1.34 cents per pound. The United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Denmark are the only European countries having a lower sugar tariff than that of this country.

During the beet-growing season an average of from 800 to 1,000 laborers for each sugar factory will leave the congested cities and go to the farms to work in the beet fields. A large percentage of these laborers purchase farms and become valuable acquisitions to the communities into which they move, thus affording substantial assistance to the "back-to-the-farm" propaganda.

There has been no important movement on the part of the people of this country in favor of free sugar. The agitation for free sugar was started and has been continued by the eastern refiners of foreign raw sugars solely for the purpose of annihilating the domestic beet-sugar industry and putting out of business their only competitors.

The elimination of the beet and cane sugar industries of this country would reduce the world's production of sugar by approximately 1,000,000 tons per year, the effect of which must necessarily be for ultimately higher prices to the consumer.

Pound for pound the manufacture of refined sugar from beets in this country is worth infinitely more to our farmers, our laborers, our banking and industrial institutions, and our railroads than is the process of refining the foreign raw sugar imported into this country by the eastern refiners.

Domestic beet sugar reduces the cost of sugar to the consumer, as it is always sold at least 10 cents per 100 pounds under the price of eastern refiners. This difference in price frequently is 20 cents, and at times has been as great as 40 cents per hundred pounds. During October of 1911 beet sugar was put on the market at over $1 less per hundred pounds than the eastern refiners were asking.

In 1898 there were produced in the United States 36,368 short tons of beet sugar. In 1911 the production was 606,033 short tons. The rapid growth of the industry during these years is evidence that the domestic industry, if not stopped by adverse tariff legislation, will soon develop to such an extent that local competition will guarantee the continuation of low sugar prices. The average New York wholesale price of standard granulated sugar for the year 1880 was 9.8 cents per pound. Willett & Gray, in their Daily Sugar Trade Journal of April 19, 1913, say: "All refiners now asking 4.20 cents less 2 per cent."

The increase in the United States wholesale prices of 33 articles of farm and food products for the 10 years beginning with the year 1900 ranges all the way from potatoes, at 14.4 per cent, to salt pork, at 89.9 per cent, including sugar beets at 26.8 per cent, while sugar, during the same period, decreased in price 7 per cent.

Sugar is only to a small extent a necessity, as about 40 per cent of the sugar consumed in this country enters into the manufacture of candies, chewing gum, chewing tobacco, liquors, etc., in which the quantity of sugar entering the retail package is so small that it would not affect the retail price. Therefore 40 per cent of whatever revenue is lost to the Government through a reduction in the tariff on sugar would never reach the consumer, but would go directly into the pockets of the manufacturers of these articles.

The proposed tariff legislation provides for a 25 per cent reduction in the present sugar rates, free sugar in 1916, and an income tax to make up the deficiency.

The present per capita consumption of sugar in the United States is about 80 pounds per year, 40 per cent of which enters into the manufacture of articles not necessities, as mentioned above. This leaves a per capita consumption of 48 pounds, upon which the reduction in tariff might affect the consumer. The present effective duty on Cuban sugar is $1.34 per hundred pounds. A 25 per cent reduction would make the tariff $1.01, in round numbers, a difference of 33 cents per hundred pounds. Applying this 33 cents to the 48 pounds shown as a result an annual per capita saving of 15.8 cents. Free sugar would effect an annual per capita saving of 64.3 cents. In other words, this proposed legislation would cripple for three years a most important agricultural industry, one whose product has shown since 1898 a consistent annual decline in average price, and at the end of the three years would kill the industry outright, thus putting out of business an industry that is to-day protecting the public against the foreign sugar exchanges and eastern refiners. And if the public were the gainers, what would it amount to? At the utmost about the value of one extra package of chewing gum per month, and that only until the beet-sugar industry had become extinct. The public would then be at the mercy of the monopoly this new tariff would have strengthened.

If with free sugar the proposed income tax does not yield a large enough revenue, it will mean an increased income tax, as the Government must collect from the people in some form sufficient funds for its maintenance. No tax could be more equitable than the tax on sugar, which every person in the country would pay in proportion to their consumption of sugar and amounting annually to so small a figure that it would not be felt.

As long as the people must support the Government, it would be better to secure the revenue by the tax on sugar and continue a legitimate industry than to impose an increased income tax, lose the domestic sugar industry and the protection it affords the consumer against eventually higher prices.

A recognized authority sums up the situation very tersely:

"It might be said that if the domestic sugar industry is no longer an infant industry, requiring protection on its own account, it has reached a point where it requires protection on account of the domestic consumer."

Yours, very truly,

E. WILSON CRESSEY,
*Secretary and General Manager.*

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the last Congress, when we were dealing with the sugar schedule sent over as a separate measure from the other House, I discussed the question at length. I then went very elaborately into the history of the sugar industry and gave reasons, which seemed to me conclusive, for the maintenance of a duty upon sugar. I have no intention, therefore, of detaining the Senate with a repetition of those detailed arguments; but I do desire, before we take a vote upon this schedule, to summarize the reasons which lead me to believe that it is perhaps—although I am aware this may sound like a very extravagant statement—the most entirely indefensible proposition in this entire bill.

The portion of the country from which I come has no interest whatever in the sugar industry in the United States. By that statement I mean that we have no beet-sugar industry at all there. Therefore my feeling regarding this matter is in no degree local; and I shall discuss it simply from the standpoint of proper revenue taxation, of proper protection, and of a wise policy in regard to a great industry.

First, let me speak of the sugar duty as a revenue raiser. Every civilized country in the world, I believe without exception, raises revenue by a duty or by an internal-revenue tax, or both, on sugar. Even England, which is the one free-trade country and which maintains the system to which I assume the Democratic Party desires to attain as soon as possible—even England now imposes a duty of 39 cents per hundred pounds on sugar. The reason for the universal acceptance of sugar as a revenue raiser is because it fulfills all the conditions which economists have laid down as desirable in the imposition of taxation. It is easily collected; it is collected with certainty; it yields a large revenue; it imposes a burden that is but little felt by the consumer; and naturally it distributes the tax with a reasonable approach to fairness over all the community in proportion to the amount that each person is able to pay. For these reasons all the civilized world, as I have said, uses sugar as a revenue producer. This bill casts it aside entirely. It not only abandons, in round numbers, $60,000,000 of revenue, but it declines to raise any revenue from sugar at all. I can see absolutely no defense for the complete abolition of the duty if we are approaching this question merely from the standpoint of taxation upon consumption.

Mr. President, I pass to the question of beet sugar. If all the duties and all the bounties and all the advantages that are given to beet sugar throughout the world were to be abolished and it were to be left in competition with tropical cane sugar, and neither should receive any help from any government at all, tropical cane would extinguish the beet-sugar industry throughout the world in a comparatively few years. The beet-sugar industry can not be maintained without certain tariff advantages or bounties against tropical cane sugar. That has been demonstrated by the experience of a hundred years. Everywhere the beet-sugar industry has been developed either by duties or bounties, or both, and has received and does receive to-day protection wherever it exists and flourishes. Therefore the reason for the establishment of the great beet-sugar industry of the world—for it has become a very great industry, indeed—must be sought elsewhere than in the narrow ground of protection to a domestic industry alone.

It found its origin, as we all know and as has been repeatedly stated here, in the belief of the first Napoleon, that it was absolutely necessary that France should be independent in regard to this great necessary of life. The control of the seas, which had passed into the hands of England, prevented France drawing her sugar supply from the islands of the West Indies, and sugar advanced to a fantastic price throughout France. It was this condition which led the first Napoleon to believe that it was absolutely necessary for the safety of the country, wholly apart from the question of developing an industry, to make the country independent of foreign sugar. There the beet-sugar cultivation began.

After many fluctuations it not only was thoroughly established in France but also in Germany, in Russia, and in other European countries. It was established, as in France, by a system of protective duties and bounties, and in many cases by very large bounties.

It was discovered after a time that the development of the beet-sugar industry led to an immense increase in productivity in the land for other agricultural products; that it had a value which probably was not anticipated by those who started the industry with a view simply to the industrial independence of the country. Only then, by Government aid, either direct, in the form of bounties, or by protective duties, has the beet-sugar industry anywhere been raised to its present proportions.

The only countries which for many, many years gave no assistance to the beet-sugar industry were England and the United States. England, indeed, carried her free-trade principles so far that she permitted the practical ruin of her West Indian Islands by the bounty-fed beet sugar of the continental countries.

In the United States no help was given to the beet-sugar industry until comparatively recent times; or, rather, there was no attempt to benefit it by the sugar duties which were imposed in this country for the maintenance of the sugar industry in Louisiana, and also for revenue; but comparatively recently the beet-sugar industry in this country was taken up and largely developed. The development of that great industry in this country has been thoroughly covered to-day by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], and there is no need of my entering upon any repetition of what he has said. It has now come to the point of producing, in round numbers, 700,000 tons of sugar per annum.

No beet-sugar industry anywhere has ever lived in competition with tropical cane sugar; and if we do not confer any advantage upon it ours will not live in competition with tropical cane sugar. That is the whole case so far as the beet-sugar industry is concerned. There is no need to go into the details of how much it costs to produce a pound of sugar here or there. The broad, historic fact remains that the beet-sugar industry, unhelped and unprotected, can not live against the competition of the tropical cane sugar. Therefore, if we throw it open to that competition, it is doomed; and, of course, with it goes the Louisiana cane sugar, which probably costs more per pound to produce than does beet sugar; and the production of our islands of Porto Rico and Hawaii will be very greatly injured.

To sacrifice $60,000,000 of revenue; to cause the extinction of a great and valuable industry, valuable primarily to the agricultural interests of our country; to take away that competition which has acted to control the price of cane sugar, surely ought not to be done without very conclusive reasons.

Who will be benefited by it? The consumer will not be benefited by it, and there never has been the slightest indication that the consumers of the country have taken the slightest interest in the movement for free sugar. When there is a popular movement for the removal of a duty or a tax on an article of general consumption, the signs and manifestations of such a movement are entirely unmistakable. If you will take the trouble to turn back to the history of the corn-law agitation in England in the first half of the last century, you will see at a glance what a real popular agitation is against a tax on an article of food of prime necessity. There has been nothing of that sort in this case. There has been no demand from the public in regard to this article.

The reason for the indifference of the public to it is twofold: In the first place, the revenue collected through sugar is but slightly felt by the consumer—so slightly that it would not in the least stimulate him to make any movement against the duty. In the second place, the consumer knows, from the daily purchases of his household, that sugar almost alone has not shared in the great rise which most of the articles of daily consumption have shown during the last 10 or 15 years.

I have here the average wholesale prices of sugar, taken from the Statistical Abstract of the Government, beginning in 1882 and coming down to 1912. The price of sugar, like the prices of all commodities largely dealt in, fluctuates from day to day, from week to week, from month to month, and from year to year, according to the crop conditions; but when you take a period of 30 years, and the average price of the article during each of those years, you get a trend in the price which is unmistakable. It will show you that the price is either rising or falling, and that the conditions of the commodity are such that a rise or a fall in the future may be with some confidence predicted.

If you will examine the figures, which I will print in full, you will see that the whole movement of the price of sugar has been downward. As I have said, it fluctuates; it may rise from one year to another, but the general movement over 30 years is downward. These figures begin in 1882 when sugar was selling at wholesale at 9.35 cents per pound. It has come down gradually to the present time. In 1883 it was 8 cents; then comes a period when it sold at 6 cents, then a period of 7 cents, then of 6 cents; then comes a long period when it was rather more than 4½ cents, on an average. In 1900 and 1901 it went to something over 5 cents. Then it went back again to 4 cents and a fraction; in 1905 it went to a little over 5 cents; then it went down and remained at 4 cents and a fraction until 1911; in 1911 the average price was 5.34 cents; in 1912, 5.04 cents; and the quotation of August 7, 1913, is 4.60 cents.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that during this year it has been as low as 4.6 in New York when the domestic beet-sugar supply was being marketed, which is the lowest on record.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely. In other words, it is absolutely demonstrated that the price of sugar has declined; and there is no indication of any substantial rise, which is probably owing to the fact that in good years the production of sugar, both beet and cane, has outrun the consumption, and that it continues to do so. Therefore it is impossible to advance as an argument for placing sugar on the free list that it would tend to lower the high cost of living, for sugar has declined and not advanced in price.

As to sugar being cheapened to the consumer even below the present price, I see no reason to suppose that there will be, or indeed that there can be, any material reduction in the price of sugar under any circumstances.

I do not believe you can push the world's price of sugar very much lower than it is to-day. But what would be the direct effect in our own country? In the course of a comparatively few years you would remove the one competitor within the borders of the United States of tropical cane sugar coming to us through the refineries. Anyone who will study these figures and prices will see at once the truth of the proposition which was so well stated by the Senator from Kansas to-day, and which I need not repeat, that the moment the beet-sugar crop appears on the market it lowers the price of sugar in the United States.

If this demand for free sugar did not come from the consumer—and it certainly did not—whence did it come? I have been able to discover only one active supporter of free sugar, and that is the Federal Sugar Refining Co. For a long time the American Sugar Refining Co. was the one great refinery, which had absorbed all the small refineries which formerly existed and came to be known as the Sugar Trust, and we are apt to speak of it in that way; but there are now two other great refineries which started up as rivals of the American Sugar Refining Co. One is known as the Arbuckles and the other is the Federal Sugar Refining Co., which, I believe, we owe to the efforts of some members of the Spreckels family.

The interests of those three great refineries—the old American Sugar Refinery Co., commonly known as the trust, and the two other refineries—are identical. So far as the duty on sugar is concerned, there is nothing to choose between them. It is for the interest of every one of those refineries to have sugar come here free, or with a very small duty, to put a stop to the beet-sugar production, or, if they can not extinguish it, to check its growth, and then they will be in command of the market with the tropical cane sugar.

I do not regard the agitation carried on by the Federal Sugar Co. as being in the interest of the consumer. They have never seemed to me to be philanthropists, but to be engaged in making as much money as possible. In the year 1911 there was a shortage in sugar, and the price rose very sharply. All the sugar refineries advanced their price; but this friend of the consumer, which has been putting in its sugar barrels pathetic appeals in red print, saying how much benefit it would be to the man who bought sugar to have free sugar, put its price higher than that of the American Sugar Refining Co. I think the American Sugar Refining Co. raised its price to 7.25 cents per pound, while the Federal Refining Co.'s price went up to 7.50 cents. I suppose that was to indicate its particular affection for the consumer. It was said, and I believe truthfully, that the American Sugar Refining Co. cleared something like $14,000,000 that year and the other two companies in proportion. The companies making these great increases in the price of sugar were not checked in their disinterested work until the beet-sugar crop got on the market, and you can take the price list and see how then the price that they had made dropped under the competition of beet sugar, even in that year of scarcity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he is willing to state that he believes that if refined sugar had been at that time upon the free list these refiners could have effected that increase in the price?

Mr. LODGE. Unquestionably.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks putting refined sugar on the free list will help the refiners of the United States?

Mr. LODGE. I think it will help them enormously. Those three great refineries control all the refining of sugar in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We have been proceeding hitherto upon the theory that wherever you let in a finished product from abroad as against a finished product in the United States you hurt the producer of the finished product within the United States. Now, the Senator is taking the position that letting the finished product come in free will help the producer of the finished product in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, general economic principles are all very well if you leave out of sight all the conditions. The Senator forgets the Brussels convention; he forgets that all the markets of the civilized world are tied up in conventional territory and nonconventional territory, and that they settle how much shall go into them and what the price of sugar shall be. They do not want to break down the refineries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think I forget that. If I did forget it, I forgot it unconsciously, nor did I forget the ordinary stock argument of protectionists in connection with questions generally. For example, that it costs so much more for labor in an American refinery than it does in a German or English refinery; that it costs so much more for the standard of living here, and various other things. This is the first time I have heard the doctrine—and I am not quarreling with it—that the free entrance of a finished product does not necessarily put the American producer of that finished product out of business because of the higher wages that he must pay, and for other reasons.

So far as concerns there being any world agreement with regard to sugar, the Senator must know as well as I do that these so-called conventions are founded upon existing tax laws, and when the tax laws are abolished and the whole world is permitted to refine sugar from Cuba and the Danish possessions, as well as from the balance of the world, those conventions can not be upheld and continued.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we are not in that convention. That was a convention made by the beet-sugar producing countries of Europe. They were finally forced into it by Great Britain, which began to see the direction in which bounty-fed sugar was leading her. I have not any question that the rates of wages in foreign refineries are more than they are here; but as to the business of refining sugar, of course what our sugar refineries deal with is the raw sugar, imported, in the main, from Cuba. They take that raw sugar and refine it here; that is all they do. Their source of supply is near at hand; there are only three of them in the field; they are in close connection with the sugar interests abroad; and I think it will be found that they will remain in control of the market; I have not any question that they will. I do not believe for one moment that they would advocate free sugar if they did not think it was for their profit. I do not think it would be quite as profitable to them as a very low duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice the Senator uses the plural pronoun and says "they." I believe the evidence shows that the Federal Refining Co. advocated free sugar and the American Refining Co., generally known as the Sugar Trust, testified that they were opposed to it.

Mr. LODGE. No; none of them were opposed to it. The American Sugar Refining Co. did not meddle at all. Arbuckles took occasion to write me a letter, after I drew the report on the last tariff bill, to say they were earnestly for it. I am certain the American Sugar Refining Co. desire the reduction. I believe a very low duty would suit them a little better, but I think they can get along without a very low duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My impression was from the testimony and what they said that the American Refining Co. and Arbuckles wanted a very low duty on raw sugar and a reduction on refined sugar, with a differential that would render them secure.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes; that is an ideal situation, but they are practical men and they are anxious to get the best they can, and the best they can get is free sugar. Of course, in the early days, the American Sugar Refining Co., being alarmed and knowing what was happening, started in to get a large interest in the beet-sugar industry for their own protection. At one time they owned nearly half the stock in many of the refineries. Either because they found it was impossible to continue that policy, or because of late years they had hopes of better arrangements for themselves, I think they have not of late pursued it, but, of course, it would be of profit to them to close all the beet-sugar refineries which are now scattered through the West and supply the local market and have the benefit of freight protection against the refined sugar of the eastern refineries.

I can not see, Mr. President, that this can be of any benefit except to the refiners. It leaves them without a domestic competitor; it leaves them to take full advantage, as they did in 1911, of any temporary shortage and keep it up. In those four months of that shortage the refineries made more money just on that turn than was made by all the beet-sugar factories in the country. They have this great control. Two of them are called independents. One is called a trust. They are just as like as three peas in a pod, there is no difference, they are equally interested, and they are equally determined to get just as much for their sugar as the traffic will bear. They have made this agitation simply because they thought there was money in it. The repulsive thing about the Federal Sugar Co. is the hypocrisy of their whole campaign.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say a word in closing.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. BRISTOW. Speaking of the Federal Sugar Refining Co., the Senator from Massachusetts will remember that this

year, indeed at this very time, I do not have in mind the exact quotation, but I have it up to within a week, that company is charging about 40 cents a hundred pounds more for refined sugar than it did last March, though it is not paying any more for raw sugar at all.

There is no beet sugar on the market now, and they simply put up the price 40 cents a hundred pounds higher than it was then, although they are paying exactly the same for their raw product.

Mr. LODGE. I do not in the least blame the man who is engaged in the business for making as much profit as he honestly can on the product which he manufactures; but when he travels down here and spends thousands and thousands of dollars in getting up imaginary associations and sending out circulars on the ground that what he wants to do is not to make money, but to help the consumer and make sugar cheaper to the people on whom he raises the price the instant he gets a chance—that phase of the thing, I think, is simply repulsive.

I wanted to speak of the effect on trade and commerce, something which I think is a good deal overlooked. In three years sugar goes on the free list under this bill. The Cuban treaty becomes valueless to the Cubans and they undoubtedly will give us notice and the treaty will be abandoned. I take the figures for 11 months. They are not the figures for a year. The trade with these islands has not been as good during the past year as it was the previous year. I will take the 11 months from June 30, 1912, to May 31, 1913. There has been some falling off. One hundred and twenty million dollars were the imports from Cuba, almost all sugar. Our exports to Cuba were $61,000,000. Our total trade with that island was $181,000,000.

With Porto Rico, that small island of our own, our imports were $42,000,000 in 1912, our exports $37,000,000, making a total of $80,000,000. For the 11 months ending May 31 of this year the imports from Porto Rico were $35,000,000, the exports $29,000,000; in all, $65,000,000 was our trade with Porto Rico for the 11 months.

Our total trade with Austria-Hungary for an entire year was only $45,000,000, and the trade of the little island of Porto Rico alone with this country is $20,000,000 more than the trade with Austria-Hungary; it is $20,000,000 more than our trade with Spain; it is $23,000,000 more than our trade with Russia.

Our trade with Cuba far exceeds our trade with Italy. Our trade with Cuba more than equals our entire trade with Austria, Spain, and Russia.

With Hawaii our total trade for the 11 months ending May 31 last was $65,000,000, the same as with Porto Rico.

With the Philippines our total trade was $42,000,000, a falling off from the previous year. I will print the statement for the previous year. It was then $46,000,000. Forty-two million dollars was our total trade with those islands. They took $23,000,000 of our exports. Hawaii took $28,000,000, Porto Rico $29,000,000, and Cuba $65,000,000 of American products. The total trade for the 11 months ending May 31, 1913, with Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines was $353,000,000. That is larger than our trade with all the European countries put together, except France, Germany, and England. It is a very large trade.

Now, the Cuban trade you are going substantially to kill in three years. You have cut down already the trade with Porto Rico. The sugar crop there is going to be reduced. It is falling off this year, owing to the fact that the small planters and growers, with the prospect before them of this bill and free sugar, can not borrow the necessary money from the banks to carry on the business. If you will look over the court records in Porto Rico you will find that a great many small sugar producers have already gone into the hands of receivers. That means, of course, a reduction in their ability to buy from us. Their trade will be reduced. The same thing is true of Hawaii, and the same thing will be true of the Philippines.

Mr. President, to put sugar on the free list in three years you give up for nothing all that revenue about the imposition of which no one complains, and in a few years destroy a great beet-sugar industry in this country which is not only valuable to the consumer but valuable to the agricultural interests of the whole country. You benefit only three great refineries and damage a great and growing trade with these islands which want to trade only with us, and must trade practically only with us.

I think, Mr. President, it is not only cruel to the industries involved, but I think economically it is the most indefensible action that can possibly be taken in any revenue bill.

I suggest that these two little tables be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The tables referred to are as follows:

*Imports and exports.*

YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1912.

| | Imports. | Exports. | Total trade. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cuba | $120,154,326 | $61,133,985 | $181,288,311 |
| Porto Rico | 42,873,401 | 37,424,545 | 80,297,946 |
| Hawaii | 55,055,816 | 24,418,671 | 79,474,487 |
| Philippines | 23,257,199 | 23,703,935 | 46,961,134 |
| Grand total | | | 388,021,878 |
| Austria | 22,713,794 | 22,388,930 | 45,102,724 |
| Italy | 48,028,529 | 65,261,268 | 113,289,797 |
| Spain | 21,961,134 | 25,057,490 | 46,988,624 |
| Russia | 20,666,923 | 21,515,660 | 42,182,533 |
| ELEVEN MONTHS ENDING MAY 31, 1913. | | | |
| Cuba | $114,606,277 | * $65,030,372 | $179,636,649 |
| Porto Rico | 35,047,466 | 29,967,455 | 65,014,921 |
| Hawaii | 37,548,299 | 28,070,427 | 65,618,726 |
| Philippines | 19,989,501 | 23,007,858 | 42,997,359 |
| Grand total | | | 353,267,655 |

*Wholesale sugar prices (Statistical Abstract).*

| | Cents per pound. |
|---|---|
| 1882 | 9.35 |
| 1883 | 8.65 |
| 1884 | 6.75 |
| 1885 | 6.53 |
| 1886 | 6.23 |
| 1887 | 6.02 |
| 1888 | 7.18 |
| 1889 | 7.89 |
| 1890 | 6.27 |
| 1891 | 4.65 |
| 1892 | 4.35 |
| 1893 | 4.84 |
| 1894 | 4.12 |
| 1895 | 4.12 |
| 1896 | 4.53 |
| 1897 | 4.50 |
| 1898 | 4.97 |
| 1899 | 4.92 |
| 1900 | 5.32 |
| 1901 | 5.05 |
| 1902 | 4.46 |
| 1903 | 4.64 |
| 1904 | 4.77 |
| 1905 | 5.26 |
| 1906 | 4.52 |
| 1907 | 4.65 |
| 1908 | 4.96 |
| 1909 | 4.76 |
| 1910 | 4.97 |
| 1911 | 5.34 |
| 1912 | 5.04 |
| Aug. 7, 1913 | 4.60 |

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to one fact. Canada, our neighbor on the north, produces very little sugar. There is only one factory, I think, in Alberta. She has a duty on sugar only two-thirds of what our duty is. Yet the price of sugar in Montreal is nearly always higher than it is in New York. The reason of that is on account of the home production of sugar in the United States. There can be no other reason.

Mr. LODGE. There can be no other reason.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] spoke of sugar being an article of universal taxation. In this connection I have a table showing the tax that is levied on sugar by the various countries. It represents the tax that was levied in 1912. I should like to incorporate it in the RECORD. I might call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to some of the amounts that are levied as taxes by the various countries. On pure sugar England's tax is 40 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. LODGE. I think I said 39.

Mr. BRISTOW. It is approximately 40 cents; it is 39.9 cents. Switzerland, 79 cents; the German Empire, $1.51; Belgium, $1.75; Denmark, $1.90; France, $2.36; Norway, $2.43; Russia, $2.49; Spain, $3.27; Austria-Hungary, $3.49; Sweden, $3.64; Bulgaria, $4.15; the Netherlands, $4.91; Greece, $4.98; Servia, $5.24; Roumania, $5.67; Italy, $6.21; Portugal, $7.09; Turkey has a 10 per cent ad valorem; Canada, $1.26, on sugar from the English colonies, 84 cents; Australia, foreign, $3.04, from the English colonies, $1.95; East Indies has a 5 per cent ad valorem; Egypt an 8 per cent ad valorem; the United States has $1.90 as a general duty and $1.52 from Cuba. I ask that this table giving the details may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

TAXES.

*Respective duties for sugar for consumption in 1912.*

[From Die Zuckerproduction der Welt und ihre Statistik von Siegmund Ziegler, Zuckerfabricksdirector, Mähren, Osterreich, p. 11.]

| | Import duty. | | Internal taxes. | | Figured per 100 pounds in United States money. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Weight. | Rate. | Weight. | Rate. | Import. | Internal. | Total consumption tax. |
| England .....cwt.. | 1 | 1s. 10d.... | ..... | ..... | $0.40 | ..... | $0.40 |
| Switzerland ...kg.. | 100 | 9 francs... | ..... | ..... | .79 | ..... | .79 |
| German Empire, kg ..... | 100 | 4.80 marks<br>26 marks.. | 100 | 14 marks.. | .52<br>2.81 | $1.51 | 1.51 |
| Belgium.....kg.. | 100 | 6 francs...<br>20 francs.. | 100 | 20 francs.. | .52<br>1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| Denmark.....kg.. | 100 | 10 crowns. | 100 | 5.7 crowns. | 1.21 | .69 | 1.90 |
| France .....kg.. | 100 | 6 francs... | 100 | 27 francs.. | .52 | 2.36 | 2.36 |
| Norway.....kg.. | 100 | 20 crowns. | ..... | ..... | 2.43 | ..... | 2.43 |
| Russia.....pud.. | 1 | 6 rubles... | 1 | 1.755 rubles. | 8.52 | 2.49 | 2.49 |
| Spain .....kg.. | 100 | 85 pesetas. | 100 | 37.50 pesetas. | 7.43 | 3.27 | 3.27 |
| Austria-Hungary.....kg.. | 100 | 5.70 crowns<br>26 crowns [1] | 100 | 38 crowns.. | .52<br>2.39 | 3.49 | 3.49 |
| Sweden .....kg.. | 100 | 14.5 crowns | 100 | 15.5 crowns | 1.76 | 1.88 | 3.64 |
| Bulgaria .....kg.. | 100 | 27.50 francs | 100 | 20 francs.. | 2.40 | 1.75 | 4.15 |
| Netherlands ...kg.. | 100 | 6 francs.... | 100 | 27 gulden.. | .52 | 4.91 | 4.91 |
| Greece.....okn.. | 100 | 73.91 drachmas. | ..... | ..... | 4.98 | ..... | 4.98 |
| Servia .....kg.. | 100 | 30 dinar... | 100 | 30 dinar... | 2.62 | 2.62 | 5.24 |
| Roumania.....kg.. | 100 | 35 francs... | 100 | 30 francs... | 3.05 | 2.62 | 5.67 |
| Italy.....kg.. | 100 | 99 lira..... | 100 | 71.15 lira... | 8.63 | 6.21 | 6.21 |
| Portugal.....kg.. | 100 | 14.5 milreis | 100 | ..... | 7.09 | ..... | 7.09 |
| Turkey..... | ..... | 10 per cent ad valorem. | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Canada: | | | | | | | |
| Foreign ...lbs.. | 100 | $1.26..... | ..... | ..... | 1.26 | ..... | 1.26 |
| English colonies, lbs. | 100 | $0.84..... | ..... | ..... | .84 | ..... | .84 |
| Australia: | | | | | | | |
| Foreign...cwt.. | 1 | 10s..... | 1 | 4s..... | 2.17 | .87 | 3.04 |
| English colonies, lbs. | 1 | 6s..... | 1 | 3s..... | 1.30 | .65 | 1.95 |
| East Indies..... | ..... | 5 per cent ad valorem. | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Egypt..... | ..... | 8 per cent ad valorem. | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| United States: | | | | | | | |
| Foreign...lbs.. | 100 | $1.90..... | ..... | ..... | 1.90 | ..... | 1.90 |
| Cuba.....lbs.. | 100 | $1.52..... | ..... | ..... | 1.52 | ..... | 1.52 |

[1] At expiration of Brussels sugar convention.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask a question of the Senator?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Has not the Senator added the consumption tax of those countries to the import duty?

Mr. BRISTOW. I said it is the consumption tax. It is the tax that is levied by those countries on sugar, including all taxes.

Mr. THOMAS. The consumption tax is collected alike on the home production and on the foreign importation?

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; that is, the tax on sugar. It is the consumption tax.

Mr. LODGE. They may put on a surtax, too.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is included.

I have some more data here that I think would be of interest. The average selling price of refined sugar in England for the first six months of 1913 was $3.387 per 100 pounds. The average in New York was $4.203 per 100 pounds, making a difference of 81.6 cents. If sugar was selling in the United States for the full European price plus the duty, as is alleged by my friend from Montana [Mr. WALSH], it would be $1.50 more than the price in London; but the average price shows that it is only 81.6 cents more, making approximately 70 cents less than the parity between the two countries.

I have here a table showing the English tariff duty, and I ask that it may be incorporated into the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the Senator from Kansas state what the English duty is at present?

Mr. BRISTOW. It is a graduated duty, very much like ours, not exceeding 76° pure by the polariscope test, in our money 20 cents per hundred.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the Senator will pardon me one word, even that duty has had the effect to stimulate the domestic sugar industry in England. The question recently arose in the British Parliament as to whether even that duty ought not to be repealed in order to be consistent with the policies of the English Government. It has operated to stimulate quite a considerable industry, amounting to several thousand tons, as a result of this small duty, which was never intended for protection at all.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have been advised that there is a movement in the British Isles now to undertake the development of the beet-sugar industry, and a proposition was made that rather than go to the American system of protection and the German and French systems of protection, it might be well to repeal this duty so that it would not stand as a protective duty in favor of this production, and to be consistent, as the Senator from Michigan has said, with the English system of tariff. But I understand that Lloyd-George has opposed any such movement as that.

I have here a table showing the quantity of sugar imported into the United States from Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, and all other countries. I think it will be of some interest to have it incorporated in the RECORD. I have the statistics from 1898 to 1912 showing the development of sugar production in those countries with which we have such close commercial relations, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. It makes a remarkable showing. Since 1898 the importations of sugar from Hawaii have increased—I will speak in round numbers—from 249,000 tons to 602,000 tons in 1912, showing a remarkable development in those islands. From Porto Rico we imported, in 1898, 49,000 tons in round numbers; that has increased in 1912 to 367,000 tons, a growth of approximately 320,000 tons since Porto Rico became a part of the United States. From Cuba we imported in 1898 but 220,000 tons, in round numbers, while in 1912 we imported from Cuba 1,593,000 tons. From the Philippines, in 1898, we imported 14,000 tons, and in 1912 we imported 217,000 tons. From all other countries—to show the influence of the preferential duties to Cuba and of incorporating these other possessions within our area—in 1898 we imported 811,000 tons, while last year we imported but 241,000 tons. I ask that this table be incorporated in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to do so is granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Sugar imported into the United States from Hawaii, Porto Rico, Cuba, the Philippines, and all other countries.*

[Short tons.]

| Fiscal year. | Hawaii. | Porto Rico. | Cuba. | Philippines. | All other countries. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1898 | 249,883 | 49,226 | 220,113 | 14,745 | 811,010 |
| 1899 | 231,212 | 53,604 | 331,772 | 25,813 | 1,347,790 |
| 1900 | 252,357 | 36,279 | 352,728 | 24,745 | 1,392,934 |
| 1901 | 345,439 | 68,601 | 549,702 | 2,347 | 1,435,454 |
| 1902 | 360,277 | 91,909 | 492,108 | 5,712 | 1,515,958 |
| 1903 | 387,413 | 113,072 | 1,197,964 | 9,387 | 900,703 |
| 1904 | 368,246 | 129,616 | 1,409,779 | 30,785 | 967,842 |
| 1905 | 416,361 | 135,660 | 962,421 | 38,999 | 774,706 |
| 1906 | 373,301 | 205,272 | 1,261,295 | 34,687 | 578,676 |
| 1907 | 410,507 | 204,075 | 1,583,082 | 12,582 | 548,183 |
| 1908 | 538,785 | 234,603 | 1,154,595 | 19,204 | 512,200 |
| 1909 | 511,432 | 244,226 | 1,436,130 | 41,824 | 621,725 |
| 1910 | 555,297 | 284,520 | 1,754,829 | 87,935 | 204,468 |
| 1911 | 505,608 | 322,917 | 1,673,803 | 115,176 | 179,989 |
| 1912 | 602,733 | 367,145 | 1,593,317 | 217,785 | 241,182 |

NOTE.—Computed from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, published by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and from the Statistical Abstract of the United States, and other official sources.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will ask that the English tariff be incorporated into the RECORD as I have figured it out here. It might be of some interest to those who care to study it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Tariff of the United Kingdom on sugar.*

[From Kelly's Customs Tariffs of the World, 1913.]

| Articles. | Rates of duty. | | Equivalent in United States. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | s. | d. | Cents. |
| Sugar: | | | |
| Not exceeding 76° polarization.....cwt.[1].. | 0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |
| Exceeding 76° and not exceeding 77°.....do.... | 0 | 10.9 | 21.8 |
| Exceeding 77° and not exceeding 78°.....do.... | 0 | 11.2 | 22.4 |
| Exceeding 78° and not exceeding 79°.....do.... | 0 | 11.6 | 23.2 |
| Exceeding 79° and not exceeding 80°.....do.... | 0 | 11.9 | 23.8 |
| Exceeding 80° and not exceeding 81°.....do.... | 1 | .3 | 24.6 |
| Exceeding 81° and not exceeding 82°.....do.... | 1 | .6 | 25.2 |
| Exceeding 82° and not exceeding 83°.....do.... | 1 | 1.0 | 26.0 |

[1] The English hundredweight=112 pounds.

*Tariff of the United Kingdom on sugar*—Continued.

| Articles. | Rates of duty. | | Equivalent in United States. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *s.* | *d.* | *Cents.* |
| Sugar—Continued. | | | |
| Exceeding 83° and not exceeding 84°.....cwt... | 1 | 1.4 | 26.8 |
| Exceeding 84° and not exceeding 85°.....do.... | 1 | 1.8 | 27.6 |
| Exceeding 85° and not exceeding 86°.....do.... | 1 | 2.2 | 28.4 |
| Exceeding 86° and not exceeding 87°.....do.... | 1 | 2.6 | 29.2 |
| Exceeding 87° and not exceeding 88°.....do.... | 1 | 3.0 | 30.0 |
| Exceeding 88° and not exceeding 89°.....do.... | 1 | 3.4 | 30.8 |
| Exceeding 89° and not exceeding 90°.....do.... | 1 | 4.0 | 32.0 |
| Exceeding 90° and not exceeding 91°.....do.... | 1 | 4.5 | 33.0 |
| Exceeding 91° and not exceeding 92°.....do.... | 1 | 5.0 | 34.0 |
| Exceeding 92° and not exceeding 93°.....do.... | 1 | 5.6 | 35.2 |
| Exceeding 93° and not exceeding 94°.....do.... | 1 | 6.1 | 36.2 |
| Exceeding 94° and not exceeding 95°.....do.... | 1 | 6.6 | 37.2 |
| Exceeding 95° and not exceeding 96°.....do.... | 1 | 7.1 | 38.2 |
| Exceeding 96° and not exceeding 97°.....do.... | 1 | 7.7 | 39.4 |
| Exceeding 97° and not exceeding 98°.....do.... | 1 | 8.2 | 40.4 |
| Exceeding 98°.....do.... | 1 | 10.0 | 44.0 |

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as all Senators know, my private opinion has been somewhat adverse to putting sugar on the free list, even at the end of three years. I was led to that opinion because of certain revenue reasons and also because of a plank in the Democratic platform that we would not destroy any legitimate industry. Without caviling about the word "legitimate," I thought the Louisiana cane-sugar industry might be permitted to be called a "legitimate industry," but I want now to say that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has reminded me of that quotation in the Scriptures, "Almost thou persuadest me." If I thought as the Senator from Massachusetts thinks, or as he says he thinks, about sugar, I would never have had the slightest hesitation in the world about putting it upon the free list, because its importation from all the world can not possibly hurt anybody in the United States, if his argument is correct.

The Senator went on to say that we will kill our trade with Cuba by putting sugar on the free list. Our chief importations of sugar have been from Cuba all the time, with a high tariff or with a low tariff, simply because Cuba produces the cheapest sugar in the world. Here is the Senator from Massachusetts, a scholar, a political economist, and all that, who absolutely wants the Senate and the country to believe that reducing the duty on sugar, which now applies to Cuba, and nothing will stop the importations of sugar from Cuba, because 80 per cent of our trade with Cuba is of sugar, and the Senator says we will kill our trade with Cuba by permitting the Cubans to send their sugar here free.

Then, the next position he takes is that our refiners will be able to master the entire market by reason of the fact that we will permit refined sugar to come from all the world to American shores—from far off Sumatra and Java and Holland and England and Cuba and Jamaica and all the balance of the world—that they will be permitted, after three years, to send refined sugar to the American market without paying a dollar of tax, and a Republican stands here and tells us that we are going thereby to kill our trade with Cuba and to destroy our trade or reduce it with Porto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and the Philippines.

A moment before that the Senator said that beet sugar and Louisiana sugar could not stand the competition with tropical cane sugar. Then a minute afterwards he said Cuban tropical cane sugar, raw and refined, could not compete with the American refiners; that Sumatran sugar can not do it; that Javan sugar can not do it; that none of the sugar of the balance of the world can do it. I suppose, judging by what the Senator said, that the people out in the country, not so wise as he is and not so learned, some few ignorant people may imagine that Porto Rico is not a tropical island; that Hawaii is not a tropical island; and that they do not raise tropical sugar there. They may imagine that their labor is so high that they can not refine it.

I have heard a great many remarkable arguments here, but we are now faced with a situation that I declare confuses my intellect. If it be true that we are going to kill our trade with Cuba and reduce our trade with the tropical islands under our flag by permitting the free entry of sugar, then what a wonderful "love's labor lost" has been the task of the Senator from Kansas and the Senators from Louisiana. You are going to have less competition after you get free sugar than you had before; our trade with Cuba is to be killed; our trade with our tropical islands is to be depressed and reduced, and all on account of free sugar!

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to interrupt him a moment?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. We shall lose the preference in the Cuban market, which, of course, will reduce our trade.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That brings me to the next point. Here is the thing that confuses my intellect. Here are a lot of people who opposed giving the preference to Cuba, in the first place, when we had the Cuban reciprocity treaty under consideration, because, they said, it would hurt our own people—no; our own producers, not our own people. I do not believe they ever said that; or, if they did, they did not mean it. Then they were opposing our grant of right to the Cuban producer to send his sugar here free; and then, in the next breath, they tell us what an immense injury we are going to do to Cuba by permitting the Cubans to send their sugar here free.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me there a moment?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I was a strong supporter of the reciprocity treaty with Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew the Senator was.

Mr. LODGE. Of course under this proposed legislation sugar will come here free instead of as now under a reduction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. In my judgment it will not alter the sale of Cuban sugar here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. But we now receive, in return for our preference to Cuba, a preference for all of our manufactures in her market. That preference we shall lose for our articles.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, it has been a long standing Democratic argument that just in proportion as you hampered imports you always hampered your exports to the country from which you imported, and I am glad to also have a recognition of that doctrine from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. A recognition of what doctrine?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is as true as twice two are four.

Mr. LODGE. What is it that is so true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Why, the doctrine that just in proportion as you hamper imports from a country to your market you necessarily hamper the exports from your country to their market.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from Mississippi did not hear what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You said the result of this would be that we would decrease our exports to Cuba.

Mr. LODGE. I said we would decrease our exports into Cuba, where we now have a preference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that may or may not follow. If the Senator means that by the destruction of the preferential in sugar, Cuba will, under the abrogation clause of that treaty, give notice of her intention to abrogate the entire treaty, then the Senator is necessarily and mathematically correct. We must necessarily lose some of our trade with Cuba in the shape of our exports to Cuba.

Mr. LODGE. That is all I meant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But under another clause of this bill there is also a provision that the President may, when, in his opinion, any country is acting unfairly, raise some duties.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does the Senator suggest that Cuba will be acting unfairly toward us if she should terminate the treaty when we take from her the only value the treaty has to her?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We do not take away the only value. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LODGE. It has no other value to her.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator had said "the major part," he would have been correct.

Mr. LODGE. Well, the major part.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we have given, without considering sugar, vast advantages to her tobacco and some other products. The advantage goes to her tropical fruit; the advantage goes to everything which she raises and may export from her shores to ours. If Cuba chooses to take that position, of course, what the Senator says will be true; but it will not flow from the economic principle of granting free entry of sugar, it will flow from the fact that there exists a treaty which contains a clause giving the right to abrogate it upon a change of duty in either country which, in the opinion of the other, changes the original conditions in a manner unfavorable to it.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, he is, of course, aware that we make no concession on tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is mistaken as to that.

Mr. LODGE. I will read from the treaty. I mean that under the language of the treaty Cuban tobacco gets no concession.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Cuban tobacco gets a concession now.

Mr. LODGE. There is no preferential at all on tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Find the clause.

Mr. LODGE. I read from the Cuban treaty:

It is agreed that the tobacco, in any form, of the United States or of any of its insular possessions, shall not enjoy the benefit of any concession or rebate of duty when imported into the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. The next article of the treaty provides:

It is agreed that similar articles of both countries shall receive equal treatment.

And so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know whether that concludes that question or not, but I have been under the impression, and I am under the impression now, that a differential is actually granted to Cuban tobacco coming into the United States, and that the treaty is construed in accordance with Articles II and III. The only thing I remember being exempted——

Mr. LODGE. If I am wrong, this table will show in a moment, and if I am wrong I will very gladly say so. I will look at it to see.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know whether the Senator is wrong or not. Speaking frankly, I arrived at the conclusion I have stated from what I have heard. I have not hunted up the figures at all, but I understood that everything either way had a differential except our tobacco exported to Cuba, and, of course, articles on the free list.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought so.

Mr. LODGE. Cuba does get a preferential on tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not examined the figures.

Mr. LODGE. I thought that a subsequent article prevented it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Cuban tobacco is granted a concession in our markets, but by express clause in the treaty American tobacco exported to Cuba receives no concession.

Mr. LODGE. I was under the impression that Article VII, providing that similar articles of both countries shall receive equal treatment, prevented a concession to Cuban tobacco.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The question of Cuban tobacco is construed according to the second article instead of by the seventh.

Now, one other matter. The Senator says that several trusts in this country have been advocating free trade in sugar. I think the Senator is mistaken. One of them has been doing so; there is no doubt about that. The Federal Refining Co. have not only been advocating it, but they have been keeping a lobby here; I do not understand why; it is one of the things that has been confusing this poor intellect of mine that has already been confused twice in this short speech; but Mr. Atkins came down here on January 15, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, and said that he favored and that his company favored the retention of the duty on sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, not the present duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But he favored the retention of either the present duty on sugar or a duty.

Mr. SMOOT. A duty.

Mr. THOMAS. No specific duty was mentioned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My recollection is that he used the words "favored the retention of the duty," although he may have said he favored the retention of a duty.

Mr. SMOOT. A duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. He said furthermore that his company had no connection with the Federal Sugar Refining Co. I do not remember what the Arbuckles want.

Mr. LODGE. When I said in my speech a year ago that the Arbuckles and the American Sugar Refining Co. were not favorable to it, they wrote to me and said they were.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Who did that?

Mr. LODGE. The Arbuckles.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Arbuckles wrote and said they were. I said I did not know where the Arbuckles stood.

Mr. President, this proves one thing—and it is the only thing it does prove—it proves that Senators on the other side are wrong all along the line; it proves that the great refiners, paying twice as much for their labor, but for highly organized, efficient labor, are willing to take their chance against the world in importing free sugar and refining it upon the American continent.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. It proves that you are wrong about your idea that the cheaper the labor is per diem or per man the more protection you have got to have. That is the first proposition.

The next proposition is that if you are not wrong about that, then you are wrong about their not being undersold by foreign refiners; and if you are not wrong about that, then you are wrong about refined sugars not being cheaper, even if raw sugar costs as much; but every one of you admits that raw sugar will cost less.

I say that one of the effects of free trade in sugar is going to be that in a few years there will be refineries in Cuba; there will be refineries in the tropical islands; and the gloom and the cloud that have gone over all of the tropical islands because of the fact that the world tried to hothouse into existence sugars that were not naturally produced at a profit, having been destroyed in the market of 90,000,000 people, there will be a revival of the old-time prosperity in the cane fields of the West Indies.

I did not want to give away $30,000,000 of revenue on sugar; I would rather have reduced the revenue upon the people's clothing, their hats, and other things. I did not want to give it away, because I think the Senator from Massachusetts is right when he says that Louisiana cane sugar being an exotic can not stand in the face of the competition of tropical cane sugar. I also believe that the beet-sugar people will be checked up for some time; but if I believed, as the Senator says he believes, that there will be no reduction in the price of sugar, that the refiners of the world can not compete with the refiners of the United States, and if I furthermore believed that it would raise the price of sugar in the American market, then I would owe an apology to everybody with whom I have differed upon this particular question.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. So that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position which I have taken in regard to the American refiners being able to compete with the foreign refiners, I desire to say that I have not believed for four years that the American sugar refiners needed any protective duty. I offered to the tariff bill under consideration four years ago an amendment removing the differential which they had as a protective duty; that is, the 12½ cents as it was in the Dingley bill and the 7½ cents as it is in the present law. I did that because I believed that the American sugar refiners can refine sugar as cheaply in this country as can the refiners of any country in the world.

If the Senator will remember, in the data that I submitted this morning I included a table in regard to wages in the different foreign countries as compared with the wages paid in our country. I stated at the time that I did not think the difference in the cost of production was measured accurately by this very wide difference in the wages paid; but, taking everything into consideration, I undertook to summarize and state what, in my opinion, was approximately the difference in the cost of production. I do not want to have it understood that I believe the American Sugar Refining Co., the Arbuckles, or Spreckels—that is, the Federal Co.—need any protection whatever in meeting any competition in refined sugar—that is, for the process of refining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am glad to have that admission, even from a Republican not of the stand-pat variety. I am glad to have an admission that a manufacturing enterprise in the United States can produce at a cheaper price and can successfully compete with a foreign manufactured product. Sugar is a manufactured product of the highest character, involving not only the ordinary industrial processes, machinery, and all that, but chemistry, and all the balance of it. I am glad to have the Senator admit that they are not dependent for their power to compete upon the price of labor per day or per week; in other words, that the cost of labor entering into a product is not to be measured by the price of the labor by the day or by the week, but by the efficiency with which the labor is handled, the amount of machinery which is brought to help it, the intelligence in the administration of the business, the overhead part of it, and a dozen other things; in other words, that the cost of production is not fixed by the price per week of labor, except in the things closest to the very ground itself, like chopping wood in the forest, or something of that sort.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will permit me again, I do not want him to take the statement which I made as to the refining of sugar and apply it as a general proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah!

Mr. BRISTOW. There are occupations and there are products that are produced in this country where the difference in the wages does make a difference in the total cost of production. I was dealing wholly and exclusively with the question of protection for the sugar refiners. Indeed, I might say that the hearings show that these refiners have stated that they believe they can refine as cheaply here as the refiners in any country in the world. They do not claim, as I have read the record, that they need any protection for the process of refining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that is just the quarrel. The quarrel is that whenever you are arguing one way you argue as if the price of labor were everything, and when you argue the other way you argue as if the price of labor were a subordinate factor in the cost of production. Everybody knows, of course, without any instruction from the Senator from Kansas or from me, that there are products in which the price of labor is the main factor. When I go out and promise to deliver 100 cords of wood to the Senator from Iowa, everybody knows that in a primitive, primeval pursuit like hiring men to cut down trees and chop them up the price of labor is the main factor. But whenever I go into a silk mill, a sugar refinery, a cotton factory, a woolen factory making the finer classes of goods, with an immense amount of machinery used, where the efficiency of labor, the intelligence of labor, the amount of labor performed by a man in a day, the amount of machinery used, the character of the administration of the business, and all that, count, then you come into a business where the mere manual part cuts hardly any figure.

I am willing to bargain with you Republicans now, as far as I am concerned. I am willing to leave out this whole thing of the cost of production, because nobody can tell what it is. You can not tell it from day to day in the same business. But I should be willing to find out what the labor cost is per yard, per bushel, per ton, per bale, of everything in the world and compromise with you on a tariff to cover it, because I would have the lowest tariff America has had since 1815.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will yield for a moment, the illustration which the Senator gave as to cutting wood, of course, is a very apt illustration. Does he not think that the difference in the wage scale in the production of a ton of beets would influence very materially the cost of producing that ton of beets?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That depends upon the character of the labor in the two localities. If you are given equally efficient or equally inefficient labor, of course it does. If you are given equally efficient or equally inefficient management, of course it does. If you are given equally high or equally low priced lands, of course it does.

Mr. BRISTOW. The data which I submitted here this morning show that the wages in an American beet field were from two to three times more than they were in Germany; yet when you take into consideration all the elements, they show that the cost of producing a ton of beets was not three or four times as much in America as in Germany, but only from 50 cents to $1 more.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not intend to get off into all those things. I was just calling attention to some of these inconsistencies. I do not agree with the Senator about that as applied to beet culture in this country. It requires highly intelligent labor, and still more highly intelligent management. We are beginning to make the inventions, and the balance of the world looks to us for them. We have passed the stage where they make them and we look to them. But the general proposition will not do.

Take the simple process of cotton cultivation. I suppose that has more labor in it, in proportion to the balance of the factors that enter into the price of the cotton, than almost anything else in the world. It is the sort of agriculture that can be carried on by very ignorant labor. Yet I pay from five to seven or eight times as much for my labor as they do in British India, and there is not a port in the world in which I can not beat them selling cotton by superiority of management and superior efficiency of agriculture.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very much interested in the proposal just made by the Senator from Mississippi. I have an amendment pending to this bill in which it is proposed to do the very thing just suggested by the Senator from Mississippi. I should like to see a tariff bill made upon that basis, no matter how low the duties might go. I have here an amendment which provides for the creation of a commission——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator must pardon me, but I do not wish to go into that.

Mr. CUMMINS (continuing). An independent, impartial, nonpartisan or bipartisan commission——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not wish to go into that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, but that amendment provides that as to any article in this bill——

Mr. WILLIAMS. The commission is to determine it.

Mr. CUMMINS (continuing). They may hear and decide on what the difference is between an efficiently conducted and well-located enterprise in this country and a similar one abroad, and that thereafter the duty shall be that difference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not want to go into five or six discussions.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the proposition just made by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My opposition to that is well known to every citizen in a freedom-loving country. In the first place, gentlemen talk about getting the tariff out of politics in that way. You can not get it out of politics in that way without having a row as to what standpoint, what viewpoint, your commission is going to take.

Mr. CUMMINS. I agree that you can not get it out of politics. I agree to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the only reason I have heard for it.

Mr. CUMMINS. But we can create a tribunal that is better calculated and better adapted than we are to find the difference between the costs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I must decline to yield further. I want to sit down. The Senator admits that we can not get the tariff out of politics. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] recently said that that was the reason for having a commission—to get it out of politics. Now the Senator admits that we can not get it out of politics. Now you are proposing, by your own admission, to take away from the elected representatives of the people a political question and surrender it to a commission appointed by somebody.

I do not believe any free country governed by commission could exist free for many years. We have too many commissions already. I am the commissioner from the State of Mississippi, or one of them, elected to sit in judgment on this question. I am not going to admit that my people made a mistake when they sent me here as a commissioner. I am a tariff commissioner now, and I am acting as one, with a full sense of my responsibilities. I am not going to turn over my duties to a bureau that works in secret and is influenced by God only knows what.

That is my opposition. It is a political opposition. It is a governmental opposition. It is an opposition from the standpoint of a citizen of a free and self-governing country, a representative Government.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the more nearly mechanically accurate you can make this or that or the other governmental operation the better Government you have. That is a secondary consideration. Mere efficiency of administration is a secondary consideration. The great, prime consideration is the education of the people in governing themselves. I would far rather live in a country where the Government was not quite so good than to live in a country like Prussia, where it was awfully efficient, but where the bureaucrats did the governing. I am one of the old-fashioned fellows who believe that the right of self-government carries with it the right of self-misgovernment at the same time.

But I was through with what I had to say five or six or seven minutes ago, and have been carried on by questions from one thing to another.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if he understands that the sugar refiners want this low rate of duty—50 cents a hundred pounds—as suggested by Mr. Lowry and others, for a protective duty?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know. I confess that when one of them comes here wanting free sugar it confuses my intellect about what they do want and what they are up to.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. They do not want the 50 cents as a protective duty. That is not what they want that low rate for. They want it so that the Cuban treaty will not be abrogated. They want a duty of 50 cents a hundred so that Cuba can have a preferential of 20 per cent, and they will speculate on the other 80 per cent, the same as they have done in the past—upon the difference between the 100 per cent to the world and the 80 per cent to Cuba. They know that if Cuban sugar is allowed to enter this market at a preferential rate they make the great part of that preferential rate. The refiners want to make millions out of handling Cuban sugar, and they can do so with a preferential rate against the other sugars of

the world. It is not protection they want the 50-cent rate for; it is for the reason I have stated that the sugar refineries of this country want a small rate of duty on sugar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina, as it is 5 minutes of 6 o'clock now, if he will not lay the bill aside?

Mr. SIMMONS. I think we have sufficient time to take a vote to-night.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President; there will not be sufficient time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Unless some Senator wants to speak there will be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let us take a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Would it not be better to vote on the amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] has offered a substitute for the first two sections. Before that substitute is in order, as I understand, we must have an opportunity to perfect those two sections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been so ruling since the commencement of the debate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask for a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that wherever there is an amendment to the bill offered here by the committee, and some Senator wants to offer an amendment to that amendment, it is not proper to consider it first?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be in order if it were offered as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I understand this is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not offered in that way. It is offered as an amendment not only to paragraph 179, but also to paragraph 180. It proposes to strike out the paragraphs as they appear in the bill. The Chair has consistently ruled that the committee amendments are first in order.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think the way we have been proceeding has been to perfect the committee paragraph before the substitute was voted upon. Since mine is a substitute for this paragraph, I see no objection to voting first upon the committee amendment, unless some Senator wants to speak to that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the point, Mr. President. The Senator from Kansas is perfectly correct in case of a substitute; but, as I understood, there was to be an amendment offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think I can clarify the atmosphere as far as the Senator from Utah is concerned. He probably refers to me. I intend to offer an amendment to strike out the three-year clause—that is, commencing after the proviso. But I have no amendment to offer to the committee amendment, and I am perfectly willing to vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I misunderstood the Senator from Nebraska. I thought he was going to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any objection to that.

Mr. BRISTOW. Is not the committee amendment the three-year clause?

Mr. SIMMONS. No.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, no; that is true. I see now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 8, after the words "polariscopic test," it is proposed to insert:

*Provided*, That the duties imposed in this paragraph shall be effective on and after the 1st day of March, 1914.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. I have an amendment to offer after the amendment that is now pending is disposed of, and I will read it. I wish to inquire if it will be precluded if the amendment of the committee is adopted?

The amendment is as follows:

*Provided, however*, That so much of paragraph 216 of an act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, approved August 5, 1909, as relates to the color test denominated as No. 16 Dutch standard in color, shall be and is hereby repealed.

The committee amendment makes the bill take effect on the 1st of March next. My amendment will repeal the provision in existing law relating to the color test, making the bill, so far as the color test is concerned, go into effect at once. My inquiry is, Will it be in order for me to offer this amendment after the committee amendment has been adopted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Where does the Senator from Kansas propose that his proviso shall enter the bill?

Mr. BRISTOW. If my amendment should be defeated, I will then move at the end of line 13, page 53, to insert the proviso.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would undoubtedly be in order after the committee amendment shall have been agreed to or rejected. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is now on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

Mr. BRISTOW. There are a number of Senators who want to speak on the amendment before it goes to a vote. I take it for granted that the Senator from North Carolina will not insist on having them speak to-night. It is now 6 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator asserts that there are other Senators who desire to speak——

Mr. BRISTOW. I have been so advised.

Mr. SIMMONS. The hour of 6 o'clock having arrived, of course in accordance with the understanding we have been operating under I could not insist on going on. But, Mr. President, I wish to give notice that on Wednesday before we adjourn, if we have not made better progress than we have made to-day, I shall move that the Senate meet at 10 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock as now.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought we made excellent progress to-day upon this schedule. I will say to the Senator that if I had known the schedule was coming up to-day I certainly would have been prepared to have voted on the schedule this afternoon. I think all the time has been very profitably taken up, with no inclination on the part of anyone to filibuster in any way. Of course, if the Senator insists upon a vote upon it, then I would content myself by speaking when the schedule came into the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am not making the motion now. I said I would make it on Wednesday before we adjourn, so as to apply to Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the bill will be temporarily laid aside.

SENATOR FROM ALABAMA (S. DOC. NO. 165).

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a situation exists in the Senate which will require the most careful and painstaking investigation. I allude to the vacancy which has occurred on account of the death of my late lamented colleague, Senator JOHNSTON.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the opinions of the legal advisers of the governor of Alabama, upon which opinions he doubtless based his action in the appointment of Hon. H. D. CLAYTON to serve for the unexpired term of the late Senator JOHNSTON.

I wish to say to the Senate that the Governor of Alabama has no pride of opinion in the action that he has taken. When the vacancy occurred and the conditions were put up to him as to what action he would take, he called upon his legal advisers for opinions as to his legal and constitutional authority in the matter, and it is these opinions that I desire to have printed in the RECORD in order that the Senate before taking any action on the matter may have an opportunity to read and study the opinions upon which the governor acted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall ask the Senate for permission to print the opinions, which are not very long, in the RECORD, and I shall also ask to have them printed as a public document, because if printed as a public document it will be much more convenient for Senators to examine them in that form.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For information I desire to know whether the credentials of the appointee have been presented to the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They have not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, as a matter of fact, the Senate has no jurisdiction over the matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senate can give its consent to the publication of the opinions in order that it may have the opinions before them when they come to act upon the question. That is what I am asking.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Probably for the information of Senators; but the governor of that State is privileged to change his mind at any moment and withdraw the appointment, leaving no question for us to consider.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is not a question here of jurisdiction. It is a matter of information. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that there is not a possibility that the governor of Alabama will change his mind, as he now sees the situation. I hope the Senator from Michigan will not object to the publication.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not ordinarily object to matters of this kind, and I am especially loath to object to anything that is requested by the Senator from Alabama, but that our RECORD should be encumbered by the views of the governor of Alabama upon a question that has not yet been presented to the Senate, and in the absence of jurisdiction over the subject matter, seems to me of doubtful wisdom. If the Senator from Alabama is seeking to justify the governor of his State for some hasty or precipitate action concerning the vacancy which exists in this Chamber from Alabama, I would seriously object.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that we are all interested in this question. I understand it is only a lawyer's brief, and we should like to read it as lawyers to know the reasons which have been given for the appointment. I do not think the question of the appointment of a Senator has come up, or that it will come up to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This is more than a question of courtesy to the governor of Alabama and one that we ought to consider. The Senate should take no part in the local politics of Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would not be willing at this time to consent to the request in its present form. If it is the earnest wish of the Senator from Alabama that this information should be printed as a public document at the Government expense in order that we may know the views of the chief executive of Alabama, well and good; I am not going to object to it, but it does not strike me that it is desirable or proper at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I look at it from another point of view than that occupied by the Senator from Michigan. If the Senator from Alabama says to the Senate that the credentials of Mr. CLAYTON, who has been appointed by the governor, are to be presented to the Senate, then I think we ought to consent to the printing of the argument in the RECORD or as a public document, because we will all be interested in the conclusion to which an examiner or student must come. But unless he gives the Senate the assurance that the credentials are to be presented, then I would think that this argument ought not to be either made a public document or embodied in the RECORD.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is not a particle of doubt of the fact that the credentials will be presented to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. With that assurance, Mr. President, I make no objection myself, nor do I think anyone should make an objection to the printing.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Alabama ask that it be printed as a public document and also go into the RECORD?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I ask that it be printed as a public document, because it will be very much more convenient to Senators to have it on their desks in a form in which they can refer to it at all times.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought. If the Senator will request that it be printed as a public document I have no objection, or if he desires to have it printed in the RECORD let it be printed in the RECORD, but let him state his choice as to one course or the other, and not have it printed in both forms.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection that it be printed as a public document and that it be omitted from the RECORD. My only purpose was to have the opinions printed as a matter of convenience to Senators, and the document will be more convenient in that form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, and the opinions will be printed as a public document.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, August 19, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate August 18, 1913.*

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

John Van A. MacMurray, of the District of Columbia, now Chief of the Division of Near Eastern Affairs in the Department of State, to be Secretary of the legation of the United States of America at Peking, vice Edward T. Williams.

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION.

Henry M. White, of Washington, to be commissioner of immigration at the port of Seattle, Wash.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 18, 1913.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

William H. Sawtelle to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William G. Barnhart to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Joseph W. Beery, Saguache.
A. J. Horan, Crested Butte.
Henry Clay Monson, jr., Steamboat Springs.
Michael F. O'Day, Lafayette.

MICHIGAN.

Frank M. Ennis, Baraga.

NEW MEXICO.

Walter P. Wilkinson, Santa Rita.

NEW YORK.

Anthony J. Beck, St. James.
Clarence Fox, Cobleskill.
Charles H. Huntting, Smithtown Branch.
Cornelius T. Seaman, Hewlett.

OHIO.

Frank T. Campbell, Marion.
Edwin E. Curran, New Straitsville.
Charles C. Fowler, Canfield.
Orange V. Fritz, West Alexandria.
William B. Meyer, Oxford.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry W. Fee, Indiana.
Albert H. Fritz, Quarryville.
Robert H. Gracey, Glenside.
William H. Gruber, Palmerton.
C. Steck Hill, Hughesville.
John Orth, Marietta.

# SENATE.

TUESDAY, *August 19, 1913.*

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

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LABOR CONDITIONS AT PATERSON, N. J.

Mr. JONES. I have a resolution here from citizens of Spokane, Wash., asking for an investigation of the strike conditions at Paterson, N. J., and especially with reference to the imprisonment of Alexander Scott. It is accompanied by a copy of a statement printed in one of the New York papers purporting to give the facts in connection with this matter. I have not offered any resolution in reference to the matter, and I do not intend to do so, but if the statements contained in the article are correct it would seem that the authorities have come very near a violation of the constitutional rights of individuals.

I move that the petition together with the statement be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and I ask that committee to look into the matter very carefully to see whether or not any action should be taken by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.